DEVELOPING LISTENING COMPREHENSION SKILL THROUGH METACOGNITIVE STRATEGY TRAINING IN TABLET-ASSISTED LEARNING ENVIRONMENT

Büşra ÖZKAN [a**]

[a] Gendarmerie and Coast Guard Academy, Ankara, Turkey

Abstract

The aim of this study was to develop listening skills and metacognitive awareness of students learning English as a second language through metacognitive strategy training in tablet-assisted learning environment. The study included 35 students studying at a preparatory school at a private university in Ankara. The experimental and control groups were randomly generated and quantitative data collection tools were used. During the five-week metacognitive strategy training, 18 students in the experimental group were informed about the listening strategies and it was aimed to make the students aware of these strategies by using listening materials prepared for this purpose. In the control group, 17 students were provided with the same listening materials at the same time but they were not informed about the strategies. Listening comprehension pre and post-tests which were presented to the experts were used as data collection tool. In addition, Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) was used as a pre and post test to determine students' metacognitive awareness. The data obtained from listening comprehension and pre and post tests and Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire were analysed through SPSS program. As a result of the data analysis, it was found that strategy training had a significant effect on students' listening skills and metacognitive awareness development. The study showed that metacognitive strategy training can contribute to students' listening skills and increase their metacognitive awareness.

Keywords: Listening comprehension skill; metacognitive strategy training; metacognitive awareness

[*] Corresponding author: Büşra Özkan
E-mail: busrasrngr1234@gmail.com

1. Introduction

As is known, listening is an important part of the communicative competence. In communication, listening takes up most of the total time in comparison to speaking, reading and writing (Mendelsohn, 1994). Another aspect which makes listening essential for communication is that "it is a complex, active process in which the listener must discriminate between sounds, understand vocabulary and grammatical structures, interpret stress and intonation" (Vandergrift, 1999, p.168). Therefore, it is one of the most problematic skills in the process of language learning. Since listening is the way of receiving input, it has a very important role in learning. Additionally, it is the skill that is used most frequently in daily life (Rost, 2002). Despite its importance, it is the "Cinderella skill" (Nunan, 1997) which is generally neglected because productive skills receive most of the attention.

Byrnes (1984) defines listening as a "highly complex problem solving activity", which requires composing different sub-skills from discrimination of the sounds to interpretation of the stress. Therefore, in order to comprehend the information that they listen to, listeners need to use various mental processes. (Esmaeili, Taki, and Rahimian, 2017). The complexity of the listening process necessitates using some strategies effectively. In addition to this, technology has been used for the educational purposes so learners have many opportunities to use mobile devices in classroom environment. Some of the schools make use of the tablets rather than using traditional books. Although using tablets enable learners to reach many sources easily, they are not able to benefit from the advantages provided by these mobile devices especially for listening. For this reason, learners should be provided with metacognitive strategy training to guide, monitor and control themselves while listening in order to understand the message of the speaker properly.

1.1. Importance of the study

Listening is one of the most problematic skills in EFL context and educators try to come up with the effective ways to enable students to listen in a proper way. Although there are various studies conducted to improve listening comprehension skill, Goh (2008) suggests that more study is needed to find out the impacts of metacognitive strategies and awareness in particular contexts. Furthermore, there have not been researches on implementing metacognitive strategies to teaching listening comprehension at a university that has a tablet-assisted teaching and learning environment using tablets instead of traditional hardcopy course books. While improving their listening comprehension skills, students can also regulate their thinking process, which is explained by the term metacognition which involves both the awareness of thinking and learning. Lastly, most of the learners in the preparatory school have difficulties in listening exams and complain about not following the speaker in listening records, this problem may stem from the lack of strategy use or awareness as well as the

linguistic knowledge. For this reason, by applying metacognitive strategies, this study is expected to make a contribution to further research and studies on the second language listening skill.

1.2. Problem statement and research questions

Because listening comprehension has an important role to facilitate language learning, students should be trained to use metacognitive strategies so that they can comprehend better while they are listening via their tablets. Also, by applying these strategies, students will be able to "know about learning and control learning through planning, monitor and evaluate the learning activity" (Esmaeili, Taki, and Rahimian, 2017, p.255). Being aware of the strategies has improving effects on learners' listening development. Therefore, the main aim of this study is to find out whether students' listening comprehension skills and metacognitive awareness can be developed through metacognitive strategies in tablet-assisted learning environment. With all the above-mentioned problems in mind, this study aims to find answers to the following research questions:

1. What are the listening comprehension levels of students in the experimental group that is taught by metacognitive strategies and the control group who receives traditional instruction?

2. Does training metacognitive strategies cause any differences between listening comprehension levels of the students in the experimental group and the control group?

3. Are there any differences between the students in the experimental group and the control group in terms of metacognitive awareness?

4. Does training metacognitive strategies cause any differences between metacognitive awareness of students in the experimental group and the control group?

2. Method

2.1. Research design

In order to have a fuller understanding, a quantitative model is used in this study by the help of pre- and post-tests that are made use of for both experimental and control groups. The study has an experimental design since as Dörnyei (2007) points out experimental designs consists of the experimental group which receives special training and the control group which is a baseline in order to make comparison.

2.2. Participants

The sample of this study consists of 35 intermediate level students who attend one year compulsory English course. There were 18 students in the experimental group and 17 students

in the control group. The ages of the students ranged from 19 to 22. The majority of the students in both groups were male. There are 5 females in the experimental and 7 females in the control group.

2.3. Data Collection Instruments

Quantitative data instruments are used as instruments in this study. To examine the influence of implementation process on listening and metacognitive awareness, Listening Comprehension Pre-test (applied at the beginning of the study), Listening Comprehension Post-test (applied at the end of the study) and the Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) (Appendix A) (applied at the beginning and at the end of the study, immediately after the listening comprehension pre- and post-tests) were used.

2.4. Data Collection Process

At the beginning of the study, both experimental and control groups' students took a listening test consisting of 10 questions as a pre-test in order to see their current levels. The pre-test was applied to both groups in the third week of the semester. In addition to the pre-test, to find out the students' current level of metacognitive awareness, Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) was conducted to experimental and control groups simultaneously. After identifying students' current level of listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness, the metacognitive strategy training started. To achieve this, activities in accordance with the metacognitive strategies were developed by the researcher by employing the themes of the course book that is compulsorily used in the classroom into consideration. The implementation of the metacognitive training was planned in line with the pedagogical stages and underlying metacognitive processes suggested by Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010).

During the five-week study, students in the experimental group receive listening metacognitive strategy instruction and apply them by the help of the activities designed accordingly. Listening strategies were introduced to the experimental group students explicitly at the beginning of the process.

When it comes to control group treatment, students in this group were provided with the same listening tasks during the five-week process. They received the lessons with the same pre-listening activities but they were not informed about what listening strategies were and how they developed and applied them while carrying out a listening task.

At the end of the treatment process that lasted five weeks, both experimental and control group students took the same post-test consisting of 10 listening comprehension

questions. Following the listening comprehension post-test, the MALQ was applied to both experimental and control groups one more time to identify their metacognitive awareness at the end of the five-week treatment.

3. Findings and discussions

3.1. Findings and discussions about the listening comprehension level of the students

Research Question 1: What are the listening comprehension levels of students in the experimental group that is taught by metacognitive strategies and the control group who receives traditional instruction?

The first question aimed to highlight the differences between the experimental group that was provided with the metacognitive strategies and the control group instructed through traditional ways in terms of the listening comprehension levels. In order to point out this, the same pre-test was applied to both groups in the beginning of the treatment process. The number of the students in the experimental (*n=18*) and the control group (*n=17*) were 35 (*n=35*). The answers of the students were analysed by means of SPSS 25.0 software. Table 6 shows the statistical analysis of the pre-test.

Table 1. Mean rank scores of the experimental and control group for the listening comprehension pre-test

	Groups	N	X	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	p
Pre-test Results	Experimental	18	5,72	2,7	,640	,449
	Control	17	4,88	2,4	,593	

Table 1 shows the number of the participants for each group, the arithmetic mean (pre-test scores out of 10), and the standard deviation and the statistical significance (p) that is obtained by the help of Paired Samples Test. The pre-test mean score of the experimental group is 5,72 out of 10 and the mean score of the control group is 4,88 out of 10. This result shows that both groups' listening comprehension levels are close to each other at the beginning of the process because the difference is no statistically significant p=449 (p > 0,05).

Research Question 2: Does training metacognitive strategies cause any differences between listening comprehension levels of students in the experimental group and control group?

After the treatment process that lasted five weeks, in order to reveal the differences between the two groups in terms of their listening comprehension levels, the same post-test

was administered to both groups. The results of the post-test were analyzed with the SPSS 25.0 software.

Table 2. Mean rank scores of the experimental and control group for the listening comprehension post-test

	Groups	N	X	Standard Deviation	Standard Error Mean	p
Post-test Results	Experimental	18	5,94	1,5	,374	,884
	Control	17	4,94	2,0	,496	

As observed in Table 7, the mean score of the experimental group in the listening comprehension post -test is 5,94 out of 10 and the mean score of the control group is 4,94 out of 10. These mean difference score indicates that the students who were provided with metacognitive strategies for listening comprehension outperformed the students who received traditional listening comprehension instruction. In order to decide whether this difference is statistically significant, Paired Samples Test was used. The result shows that this improvement is not statistically significant because p=,884 (p > 0,05).

Table 3. Pre and post-test results of the experimental group

Experimental group	Mean	N	Standard deviation	Standard Error Mean
Pre-test	5,72	18	2,7	,64
Post-test	5,94	18	1,5	,37

As Table 3 shows, mean score of the experimental group's pre-test result is 5,72 while post-test mean score of the group is 5,94. Also, the pre-test standard deviation is 2,7 and the post-test standard deviation is 1,5. As can be seen clearly, listening comprehension mean score of the experimental group increased from 5,72 to 5,94 at the end of the five-week treatment.

Table 4. Statistical difference between pre and post- test listening comprehension scores of the experimental group (paired samples test)

	Mean	N	Standard deviation	t	p
Pre-test	5,72	18	2,7	-,416	0,017
Post-test	5,94	18	1,5		

As indicated in Table 4, according to the Paired Samples Test, there is a statistically significant different between the pre-test and post-test scores of the experimental group

students. The significance level is p= 0,017 (p<0,05). This reveals that there is an improvement in the listening comprehension means score of the experimental group by the help of metacognitive strategy training.

3.2. Findings and discussions about the metacognitive awareness of the students

Research Question 3: Are there any differences between the students in the experimental group and control group in terms of metacognitive awareness?

Prior to the five-week process of the metacognitive strategy training, in order to highlight the metacognitive awareness of the students both in the experimental and the control groups, Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) was applied in the beginning of the process. The students answered the 21 Likert scale items in the questionnaire using a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). To indicate the metacognitive awareness of the students, there are five factors in the questionnaire: Planning and Evaluation, Directed Attention, Personal Knowledge, Mental Translation and Problem Solving. The answer of the students in the questionnaire were analyzed by means of the SPSS 25.0 program

Table 5. Analysis of the MALQ responses of the experimental and the control group

FACTORS	Groups	Item N	Max	x	Standard deviation	p
Planning and Evaluation	Experimental	5	30	25,55	5,6	0,830
	Control	5	30	25,52	2,4	
Directed Attention	Experimental	4	24	19,50	5,2	0,285
	Control	4	24	18,23	3,1	
Personal Knowledge	Experimental	3	18	11,27	4,5	0,156
	Control	3	18	10,88	2,4	
Mental Translation	Experimental	3	18	15,05	2,4	0,416
	Control	3	18	14,00	3,1	
Problem Solving	Experimental	6	36	12,88	1,8	0,931
	Control	6	36	11,16	3,0	

To reveal the metacognitive awareness level of the students in both groups before the treatment process, the results of the MALQ was analyzed by taking the five factors of the metacognitive knowledge into consideration. The number of items in each factor and the

maximum score that participants can get from each category are presented in Table 10. Also, the table indicates the arithmetic mean scores of each group (x), standard deviations of the scores and statistical significance (p) that was obtained through the employment of the Paired Samples Test. The arithmetic means of the scores for planning and evaluation factor are 25,55 for the experimental group and 25,52 for the control group out of 30. Although the experimental group's score is higher than the control group's score, this is not statistically meaningful since p=0,830 (p > 0,05). For directed attention, the mean score of the experimental group is 19,50 and it is 18,23 for the control group. This difference is not meaningful because p=0,285. Also, the arithmetic means of the experimental and control groups' MALQ responses to personal knowledge (11,27 and 10,88) and mental translation (15,05 and 14,00) did not indicate any statistically meaningful difference because p=0,156 and p=0,416 (p > 0,05) respectively. Lastly, the arithmetic mean of the experimental group's responses to problem solving is 12,88 and this score is 11,16 for the control group's responses. According to the analysis of these scores, it can be concluded that there is not a statistically meaningful difference since p=0,931. In the light of these results, even though the mean scores of the experimental group students are slightly higher than the control group students' scores, it can be remarked that the awareness level of the students in both groups were similar at the beginning of the five-week implementation process.

Research Question 4: Does training metacognitive strategies cause any differences between metacognitive awareness of the students in the experimental group and the control group?

To investigate the effect of the metacognitive strategy training on the metacognitive awareness of the students, at the end of the implementation process, Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) was administered to the students in both groups. The results of the participants were analyzed by the help of the SPSS 25.0 program.

Table 6. Analysis of the pre and post MALQ responses of the experimental group

FACTORS	Experimental Group	Item N	Max	X	Standard deviation	Mean difference	p
Planning and Evaluation	Pre-test	5	30	25,55	5,6	-0,66	,000
	Post-test	5	30	26,23	2,4		
Directed Attention	Pre-test	4	24	19,50	5,2	-0,88	,008
	Post-test	4	24	20,03	3,6		
Personal Knowledge	Pre-test	3	18	11,27	4,5	-1,1	,000
	Post-test	3	18	12,27	4,2		
Mental Translation	Pre-test	3	18	14,22	3,1	-0,611	,606
	Post-test	3	18	14,83	2,2		

Problem Solving	Pre-test	6	36	11,16	3,0	-1,1	,003
	Post-test	6	36	12,27	2,2		

Table 6. shows the mean scores of the pre and post responses of the experimental group to the MALQ. The table includes the five factors of the metacognitive knowledge, the number of items in each factor, the maximum score that can be obtained for each category, standard deviation and statistical significance. Pre and post responses of the experimental group for planning and evaluation indicated an increase. Because the significance level is ,000 (p<0,05), it can be remarked that there is a statistically significant difference between pre- and post-responses of the experimental group. While the mean score for the directed attention was 19,50, it reached 20,03 at the end of the process. Also, this increase is statistically significant since p=0,008 (p<0,05). The arithmetic means of the responses to personal knowledge (11,27-12,27) and problem solving (11,16-12,27) increased throughout the process. The differences for the both factors are statistically significant since p=,000 and p=,003 (p<0,05) respectively. On the other hand, the mean scores of the mental translation did not indicate any statistically significant difference as p=,606 for the experimental group. When these results are taken into consideration, it can be claimed that metacognitive strategy training improves the awareness of the experimental group students. To compare the difference between the experimental and the control group students at the end of the process, control group students' pre and the post responses to the MALQ were analyzed.

Table 7. Analysis of the pre and post MALQ responses of the control group

FACTORS	Control Group	Item N	Max	X (Pre-test)	Standard deviation	Mean difference	p
Planning and Evaluation	Pre-test	5	30	25,52	2,4	0,11	,163
	Post-test	5	30	25,41	2,4		
Directed Attention	Pre-test	4	24	18,23	3,1	-0,11	,768
	Post-test	4	24	18,35	3,0		
Personal Knowledge	Pre-test	3	18	10,88	2,4	-0,41	,168
	Post-test	3	18	11,29	2,3		
Mental Translation	Pre-test	3	18	14,00	3,1	0,117	,824
	Post-test	3	18	13,88	2,6		
Problem Solving	Pre-test	6	36	12,82	1,7	0,058	,332
	Post-test	6	36	12,88	1,8		

To reveal the metacognitive awareness level of the control group students, the same analysis including five factors of the metacognitive knowledge, the number of items, maximum scores, standard deviation, the arithmetic means of the scores and statistical significance was carried out. As Table 12 makes clear, the mean scores of the responses to the directed attention (18,23-18,35) , personal knowledge (10,88-11,29) and the problem solving (12,82-12,88) indicate an increase, these differences are not statistically significant because p=,768, p=,168, p=,332 (p>0,05) respectively. In addition, the mean scores of the responses to the planning and evaluation and mental translation decreased at the end of the five-week treatment process. Lastly, to see whether there is a statistically significant difference between the experimental and control groups' pre and post responses of the MALQ, Paired Samples Test was administered and the results are presented in Table 7.

Table 8. Statistical difference between post responses of the experimental and the control groups

FACTORS	Groups	Item N	Max	X (Post)	Standard deviation	p
Planning and Evaluation	Experimental	5	30	26,23	2,4	0,880
	Control	5	30	25,41	2,4	
Directed Attention	Experimental	4	24	20,03	3,6	0,735
	Control	4	24	18,35	3,0	
Personal Knowledge	Experimental	3	18	12,27	4,2	0,897
	Control	3	18	11,29	2,3	
Mental Translation	Experimental	3	18	14,83	2,2	0,845
	Control	3	18	13,88	2,6	
Problem Solving	Experimental	6	36	12,27	2,2	0,647
	Control	6	36	12,88	1,8	

The analysis of the post responses of the MALQ indicates that the mean scores of the experimental group for four factors are higher than the control group's scores. For planning and evaluation, the mean score of the experimental group is 26,23 and the score is 25,41 for the control group. Also, the arithmetic mean score of the responses to directed attention is 20,03 for the experimental and 18,35 for the control group. In addition, while the mean score of the personal knowledge is 12,27 for the experimental group, this score is 11,29 for the control group. Experimental group's mental translation mean score is 14,83, the control group's score is 13,88 for this factor. On the other hand, the control group has the higher score for problem solving than the experimental group. While the arithmetic score of the control group is 12,88, this score is 12,27 for the experimental group. The differences between the

experimental and the control groups mean scores are not statistically significant because statistical significance values (p) are >0,05.

To conclude, the results of the pre and post listening comprehension exams' results indicate that the experimental group outperformed the control group. In other words, when the statistically significant difference between the pre- and post-test results of the experimental group students are taken into consideration, it can be claimed that listening performance of the experimental group improved by the help of metacognitive strategy training. Additionally, the metacognitive awareness of the students who received metacognitive strategy training increased at the end of the process. However, this improvement is slight in the factors of Planning and Evaluation, Personal Knowledge, Directed Attention and Mental Translation. This growth in terms of the metacognitive awareness was not found statistically significant. The students in the control group who received traditional instruction did not demonstrate significant difference in terms of the metacognitive awareness.

4. Conclusion

Listening is one of the challenging skills for most of the second language learners. This problem is also observed among university students who attend preparatory schools. Some of the common problems related to listening skill are comprehending vocabulary, pronunciation of the speaker or the speed of the listening records. Most importantly, students do not know what they should do when they encounter one of these problems while carrying out a listening task. According to Goh (2008), when learners are not able to complete a listening task successfully, they may become anxious. They also do not know the way they listen to when they receive an input (Vandergrift, Goh, 2012). That's why; many learners do not know how to practice listening even though they focus on it. Since they are unable to control their learning process, they cannot use strategies during the act of listening. In order to achieve their learning goals of listening, the only way they apply is to listen to an input more than once. Because students' strategies are not sufficient to comprehend a listening material, they become unmotivated and passive. Students need guidance and support in terms of strategy training when they tackle with a difficulty during the listening process. There are many studies which support the relationship between the strategy use and the success of listening (Vandergrift, 1997; Yang, 2009; and Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010). Therefore, learners are required to understand what processes that they use while listening. In other words, learners should be instructed about metacognition which means "the act of thinking about thinking, or the ability of learners to control their thoughts and regulating their own learning" (Vandergrift, Goh, 2012, p.4). Metacognition has a crucial role in learning to listen and it improves thinking and comprehension (Wenden, 1998).

This study aimed to investigate the effects of metacognitive strategy training on preparatory school students who receive education in a tablet-assisted learning environment. To achieve this, students were exposed to metacognitive strategy training and the materials designed by the researcher. According to the results of the MALQ and pre and post listening tests that were applied at the beginning and at the end of the treatment process, it was concluded that implementation of the metacognitive strategies affects experimental group students' listening performance and metacognitive awareness in a positive way as it was expected. Strategies were selected according to the materials provided. Strategies were presented explicitly and a new strategy was added to each lesson according to the content of the listening material. In line with Vandergrift' (2004) pedagogical cycle, all strategies presented (planning/predicting, directed attention, monitoring, evaluation and problem identification) were repeated during the five-week process. Even though the difference between the experimental and the control group was not found statistically significant in terms of the metacognitive awareness, experimental group students' awareness level improved and this growth was statistically significant compared to the pre results of the MALQ. Also, during the class hours, it was noticed that students started to be more aware of their learning process and they had a tendency to use different strategies when they had any difficulties while listening.

To conclude, based on the findings of the present study, it can be claimed that use of the metacognitive strategies enhances the listening skill and makes students more aware of their learning processes. Students are able to evaluate their learning and the problems that they encounter while learning and most importantly by the help of metacognitive strategy training they "know what to do when they do not know what to do" (Anderson, 2002, p.2).

5. Implications

As the conclusions drawn from the study show, metacognitive strategy training has an effective role in listening skill. However, this study has some limitations. One of the main limitations of the study was duration. The treatment process lasted five weeks because of the standard syllabus of the course. Further studies could be done over a longer course of a time. This short period of time was not enough for students to become aware of their cognitive processes completely. Another limitation was the number of participants (*n*=35). Despite some of the differences which were obtained from the results of the pre and post-test, the small number of participants may not be enough to make generalizations in terms of the effectiveness of the metacognitive strategy training on preparatory school learners who use tablets rather than traditional hardcopy course books in language learning. Further research could be conducted with a larger sample size. As another suggestion, in addition to the Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ), interview sessions should be

carried out to collect data about the metacognitive awareness of the learners. Finally, although using tablets has many advantages in language classrooms, it may distract some students from concentrating on the instructions provided.

References

Anderson, N.J. (2002). The role of metacognition in second language teaching and learning. *ERIC Digest*, 3–4, ED463659. *Applied Cognitive Psychology, 5*, 331–346.

Byrnes, H. (1984). The role of listening comprehension: A theoretical base: *Foreign Language Annals, 17,* 317-329.

Chapelle, C., & Douglas, D. (2006). *Assessing language through computer technology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics: quantitative, qualitative and mixed methodologies.* Oxford: Oxford University.

Esmaeili, Z., Taki, S. & Rahimian, Y. (2017). EFL learners' metacognitive strategy use in academic listening tasks. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research, 4*(3), 254-268.

Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: Theory, practice and research implications. *RELS Journal, 39,* 188-213.

Mendelsohn, D.J. (1994). *Learning to listen: A strategy-based approach for the second language learner.* San Diego: Dominie. metacognition in L2 listening comprehension. *The Canadian Modern Language*

Nunan, D., & Miller, L. (Eds.) (1995).. *New ways in teaching listening*. Washington DC: TESOL.

Rost, M. (2002). *Teaching and researching listening.* London: Longman.

Vandergrift, L. (1997). The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals, 30,* 387-409.

Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring

Vandergrift, L. (2004) 'Listening to Learn or Learning to Listen?', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24,* 3-25.

Vandergrift, L., & Tafaghodtari, M. (2010). Teaching L2 learners how to listen does make a difference: An empirical study. *Language Learning, 60*(2), 470-97.

Vandergrift, L. & Goh, C.M. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening: metacognition in action.* New York: Routledge.

Wenden, A. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 515–537.

Yang, C. (2009). A study of metacognitive strategies employed by English listeners.

Appendix A.

Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ)

The statements below describe some strategies for listening comprehension and how you feel about listening in the language you are learning. Do you agree with them? This is not a test, so there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. By responding to these statements, you can help yourself and your teacher understand your progress in learning to listen.

Please indicate your opinion after each statement. Circle the number which best shows your level of agreement with the statement. For example:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
I like learning another language	1	2	3	4	5	6

1. Before I start to listen, I have a plan in my head for how I am going to listen.	1 2 3 4 5 6
2. I focus harder on the text when I have trouble understanding.	1 2 3 4 5 6
3. I find that listening is more difficult than reading, speaking, or writing in English.	1 2 3 4 5 6
4. I translate in my head as I listen.	1 2 3 4 5 6
5. I use the words I understand to guess the meaning of the words I don't understand.	1 2 3 4 5 6
6. When my mind wanders, I recover my concentration right away.	1 2 3 4 5 6
7. As I listen, I compare what I understand with what I know about the topic.	1 2 3 4 5 6
8. I feel that listening comprehension in English is a challenge for me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
9. I use my experience and knowledge to help me understand.	1 2 3 4 5 6
10. Before listening, I think of similar texts that I may have listened to.	1 2 3 4 5 6
11. I translate key words as I listen.	1 2 3 4 5 6

12. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.   1 2 3 4 5 6

13. As I listen, I quickly adjust my interpretation if I realize that it is not correct.   1 2 3 4 5 6

14. After listening, I think back to how I listened, and about what I might do
differently next time.   1 2 3 4 5 6

15. I don't feel nervous when I listen to English.   1 2 3 4 5 6

16. When I have difficulty understanding what I hear, I give up and stop listening.   1 2 3 4 5 6

17. I use the general idea of the text to help me guess the meaning of the words that I
don't understand.   1 2 3 4 5 6

18. I translate word by word, as I listen.   1 2 3 4 5 6

19. When I guess the meaning of a word, I think back to everything else that I have
heard, to see if my guess makes sense.   1 2 3 4 5 6

20. As I listen, I periodically ask myself if I am satisfied with my level of

comprehension.   1 2 3 4 5 6

21. I have a goal in mind as I listen.   1 2 3 4 5 6