

# **The Impact of Listening Strategy Instruction on the Learning of English and an Additional Foreign Language**

**CHRISTIAN JACOBSEN**

*Department of Foreign Languages and Applied Linguistics, Yuan Ze University, Taiwan*

## **ABSTRACT**

While English is one of the most common second or foreign languages learnt in the world today, more and more language learners are pursuing the goal of acquiring more than one second language in order to gain an advantage in an increasingly globalized world. One factor that helps facilitate the acquisition of more than one second language is metacognitive awareness of language learning. Listening in a second language is one particular language skill that has received a lot of attention with respect to metacognitive awareness. This study details a study investigating the impact of an English listening strategy instruction course on participants' learning of not only English, but also their additional foreign language, Japanese, at a university in Taiwan. The study approach was designed to compare and contrast data from Metacognitive Awareness of Listening Questionnaires (MALQs) and participant survey responses with the aim of describing potential benefits and barriers of English listening strategy instruction in the context of dual foreign language learning. The results describe the potential positive impact of listening strategy instruction in this context. Additionally, perceived barriers for this instruction are discussed from a metacognitive perspective leading to pedagogical implications aimed at improving the positive development and transfer of listening skills for learners of English and an additional foreign language.

**KEYWORDS:** listening strategy instruction, metacognitive awareness, strategy transfer, dual foreign language learning

## Introduction

English is one of the most popular second or foreign languages being learnt around the world today, especially in the Asia-Pacific region (Nunan, 2003). However, many motivated language learners are not content to learn just one second language, instead striving for competence in a range of additional foreign languages that provide a further advantage in the realm of global communication (Ruiz, 2008). With the growing number of multiple language learners globally, the language learning process in these contexts has received a lot of attention in recent years with a particular focus on the role of metacognition and language learning (Cenoz, 2003; Jessner & Onysko, 2006; Rivers & Golonka, 2009).

Metacognition is generally referred to as the knowledge about, and regulation of, one's cognitive activities in learning processes (Flavell, 1979) with the essential view that there are three types: person knowledge, task knowledge, and strategy knowledge. When it comes to language learning, metacognitive awareness of language acquisition can be promoted through language learning strategy instruction (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990). Empirical studies on the impact of such instruction have been conducted in a range of language learning contexts. Although previously under-researched compared to other language skills (Oxford, 2011; Vandergrift, 2007), listening as a language skill is one area that is currently drawing the attention of researchers and instructors on a global scale. Given that listening comprehension plays a significant role in second language acquisition (Feyten, 1991; Krashen, 1982) and has been described as lying at the heart of language learning (Vandergrift, 2007), listening strategy instruction (LSI) research has advanced to demonstrate benefits for a range of ELT contexts, first language backgrounds, and proficiency levels. Furthermore, LSI has been shown to be valuable in other foreign or second language learning contexts such as French, Russian and Japanese (Seo, 2000; Thompson & Rubin, 1996; Vandergrift, 2002).

However, despite this apparent propensity for LSI research, there are still a number of unresolved concerns surrounding this approach to language teaching. For instance, the localized and small-scale nature of many empirical studies reduces the generalizability of the results (Berne, 2004) and the effectiveness of metacognitive activities for a wider range of learner needs has not yet been fully investigated (Goh, 2008). In addition, there remains a debate over the value of listening strategy instruction since it is competing with other approaches for valuable classroom time and resources (Graham, 2011; Renandya & Farrell, 2011). Furthermore, language learning strategy research still needs to consider matters such as strategy transfer across languages (Chamot, 2004). Ultimately, there is an ongoing need for studies in a broader range of language learning contexts (Goh, 2008; Vandergrift, 2007).

One context in particular that has not yet been considered is that of dual language learning; more specifically, contexts where English is being learnt alongside an additional foreign language. It is in such contexts where efforts to raise metacognitive awareness of listening strategies in English may have positive effects on listening in another language, promoting listening confidence and self-efficacy. Indeed, focus within this context would start to examine questions surrounding strategy transfer as well as contribute to the ongoing discussion surrounding the perceived value and appropriateness of this pedagogical practice.

## Literature review

### *Listening strategies*

Comprehending the input of spoken language is a complex cognitive process requiring online bottom-up and top-down processes (Rost, 2002; Rubin, 1994), which is also described as the interaction between linguistic knowledge and world knowledge (Vandergrift, 2007). To further understand this interaction, the broader research area of language learning strategies has given rise to a field of research on L2 listening strategies (Oxford, 2011) which considers the cognitive aspects of bottom-up and top-down processing as well as the metacognitive processes of second language development. Research on L2 listening strategies to date has developed an inventory of cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective strategies (see Appendix A) that are used and orchestrated by L2 listeners (Vandergrift, 1997). *Cognitive strategies* are used to manipulate input or material, or to apply a specific skill or strategy to a particular task whereas *metacognitive strategies* are what learners do to oversee, regulate or direct their learning. *Socio-affective strategies* are an ancillary group of strategies concerned with learning during person interaction or techniques for dealing with anxiety or stress. Knowledge and procedural experience of listening strategies is thought to be a key characteristic of successful and motivated listeners (Goh, 1997, 2008; Graham, 2011; Vandergrift, 2007; Vandergrift et al., 2006; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012).

### *Metacognition in listening instruction*

Metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive awareness and the concept of self-regulation are associated terms under the umbrella term of metacognition (Veenman, Van Hout-Wolters, & Afflerbach, 2006). Based on Flavell's (1979) research in developmental psychology, the essential view of metacognitive knowledge is that there are three types: person knowledge, task knowledge, and strategy knowledge. *Person knowledge* is essentially knowledge of one's self; that is, one's ability to learn, and the internal and external factors that affect one's learning. *Task knowledge* concerns the purpose, demands, and the nature of learning tasks. *Strategy knowledge* is useful for choosing appropriate strategies for achieving learning goals. Collectively, metacognitive knowledge can be described as the declarative knowledge learners have about these three dimensions. Further to this, Wenden (1998) discusses metacognitive knowledge in relation to the field of L2 learning and points out that metacognition is a broad term which includes not only a metacognitive knowledge component, but also the component of metacognitive strategies or "general skills through which learners manage, direct, regulate, guide their learning" (Wenden, 1998, p. 519). When metacognitive awareness is raised in learners, these self-regulatory strategies can become internalized as procedural knowledge. Metacognitive strategies can be categorized more simply as planning, monitoring, and evaluating strategies as is often done in the case of metacognitive listening strategy research (see, for example, Chen, 2009; Coşkun, 2010; Cross, 2009; Holden, 2004; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010).

A pedagogical sequence for teaching listening is one way to develop learners' procedural knowledge of metacognitive strategies. Vandergrift (1997) lists four listening strategy categories, namely, planning, monitoring, evaluation and problem solving which are based on the cyclical approach of pre-listening, during listening, and post-listening tasks. The metacognitive pedagogical sequence is a process-based approach for listening that has been demonstrated as a successful instructional model by Vandergrift (1999, 2004) and Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010). This approach (as detailed in Appendix B) has several

phases: a planning and predicting stage, first listen and verification, second listen and verification, final listen and verification, and a final reflection stage. This process-based model of instruction has seen other recent applications in listening strategy instruction research with positive results (see, for example, Birjandi & Rahimi, 2012; Cross, 2009).

### *Listening strategy instruction research and assessment*

When investigating the effects of listening strategy instruction on learners' listening ability there are typically two approaches; that is, product oriented or process oriented (Vandergrift, 2007). When focusing on the product of listening, a comparison between pre- and post-listening test scores typically determines the success of an experiment and a number of studies have shown significant process-orientated listening improvements (Birjandi & Rahimi, 2012; Carrier, 2003; Coşkun, 2010; Thompson & Rubin, 1996).

However, in order to gain greater insight into the process of listening and the effects of strategy instruction, there have been a number of studies that utilize various qualitative approaches and retrospection techniques including reflection through learner diaries or reflective journals (Chen, 2009; Chen, 2005; Goh, 2000). Surveys or questionnaires are additional retrospective data collection techniques that have been used to gauge student responses to listening training (Vandergrift, 2002).

One validated method for measuring the effect of strategy training is the Metacognitive Awareness of Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) developed by Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, and Tafaghodtari (2006). The survey was created in response to the argument that learning can be positively influenced by the awareness of learning strategies, and unlike previous strategy assessing instruments, it has been validated through exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis on a large sample group. It consists of 21 six-point Likert-scale items (see Appendix C) that cover five metacognitive factors as follows (adapted from Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010):

- *Planning and Evaluation* - how listeners prepare themselves for listening and evaluate the results of their listening efforts (5-items: 1, 10, 14, 20, 21).
- *Problem Solving* - inferencing on what is not understood and monitoring those inferences (6 items: 5, 7, 9, 13, 17, 19).
- *Directed Attention* - how listeners concentrate, stay on task, and focus their listening efforts (4 items, 2, 6, 12, 16).
- *Mental Translation* - the ability to avoid mental translation as a listening strategy and use it sparingly (3 items: 4, 11, 18).
- *Person Knowledge* - learner perceptions concerning how they learn best, the difficulty presented by L2 listening, and their self-efficacy in L2 listening (3 items: 3, 8, 15).

The study by Vandergrift et al. (2006) was able to demonstrate a significant relationship between MALQ scores and actual listening behavior and processes. In addition, when comparing results of the MALQ and actual listening performance test scores, the relationship was found to be significant (Vandergrift et al., 2006, p. 449). Potential uses of the MALQ include student self-assessment or a conscious-raising tool for learners and instructors. However, the MALQ as a research tool to assess learners' growing awareness of listening strategies has prompted a number of studies regarding metacognitive awareness and second language listening. The MALQ survey is statistical in nature which makes it appropriate for quantitative investigations (for example, Kassaian & Ghadiri, 2011) and since the MALQ

aims to investigate the listening process, it has provided suitable data for triangulation in more qualitative studies (O'Bryan & Hegelheimer, 2009; Selamat & Sidhu, 2011). Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010) examined the effects of process-based listening strategy training in a study where MALQ response data was reported in conjunction with data from stimulated recall sessions and proficiency tests. The results established improved L2 listening proficiency as well as growing learner awareness of metacognitive listening processes over time.

### **The study**

This paper details an investigation into the effect of listening strategy instruction on learners of English and an additional foreign language, Japanese, at the university level. The goal is to utilize the MALQ to conduct a process-oriented investigation into the potential impact of an English LSI course in contexts where English is not the only foreign language being learnt. Additionally, by considering the perspectives of learners of dual foreign language learners and understanding more of the metacognitive processes of listening in more than one foreign language, instructors can be better informed of the benefits and barriers of LSI in this context. Therefore, there are three main research questions guiding this research:

1. Are there any differences in metacognitive listening strategy awareness between EFL listening and listening in an additional foreign language at the university level?
2. Does an English LSI course raise metacognitive awareness of listening in English and an additional foreign language at the university level?
3. What are university level dual foreign language learners' perceptions of the benefits and barriers regarding English LSI instruction in their language learning context?

### **Methodology**

#### ***Context***

The participants of this study were sophomore level undergraduates majoring in foreign languages with specific interests in English and Japanese as foreign languages (EFL and JFL respectively) at a private university in Taiwan. Multiple language learning contexts such as this occur around the world in wide variety of settings with respect to learners' educational environments, speech communities, age and sequence of acquisition, proficiency levels, and language typologies (Jessner & Onysko, 2006). Therefore, a clear contextual description should be given in order to avoid ambiguity about the learners, their language learning context, or the manner in which English and the additional foreign language is being learnt. In this study, the Taiwanese students are native speakers of Mandarin Chinese with possible competencies in Taiwanese (or other local dialects) gained as an additional mother tongue, or first language. That said, this study is concerned with the study of foreign languages gained through the formal context of education, namely English and Japanese as foreign languages. Since English is the predominant foreign language taught in Taiwan, compulsory in public schools starting from Grade 1 (Nunan, 2003), it should be designated as an L2. Thus, Japanese would be considered the L3 defined as a non-native language that is currently being used or acquired in a situation where the person already has knowledge of one or more L2s besides one or more L1s (Hammarberg, 2009).

### ***Participants***

Over 60 students were enrolled in an Advanced English Integrated Skills course that involved one hour of LSI per week over a period of 14 weeks during the fall semester of 2013/2014. Of these, 43 students (6 male, 37 female) met the criteria for participation in the study; that is, studying both EFL and JFL concurrently, completing all MALQ surveys, and providing consent. The participants' proficiency levels for each language can be described as intermediate to upper-intermediate for EFL (typically with more than eight years of education), and novice to intermediate for JFL (typically with under 4 years of education).

### ***Classroom procedure***

Adhering to an essential protocol for LSI is necessary for evaluating the effectiveness and learner perceptions of this pedagogical practice. To this end, there are a number of instruction models that are designed to promote metacognitive awareness in the classroom (Anderson, 2002; Chamot & O'Malley, 1994; Mendelsohn, 1994; Oxford, 1990; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010). From these, a list of essential components that would make up a successful listening strategy instruction course can be summarized as follows: (a) listeners must be made explicitly aware of listening strategies through modelling and practice, (b) listeners must be given the opportunity to develop procedural experience, (c) listening instruction should involve a cyclical listening process with pre, while, and post-listening stages - a process further enhanced by multiple listens, (d) time must be made available for preparation and planning activities, (e) learners should be encouraged to expand their use of strategies by applying them to new situations and reflecting on this process, (f) integration and motivational considerations should be part of course development, evaluation and revision.

Further to this, texts should be selected to ensure material is as relevant and useful as possible (Mendelsohn, 1994). Video is preferred over audio in order to best reflect authentic listening conditions and this study has taken authenticity to mean texts that have been made in real-life conditions and not artificially made for the specific purpose of L2 listening. English listening texts were typically one to three minutes long and selected to integrate with themes in the English integrated skills course including university life, travel, business, and biographies.

Following the criteria described above, a 14-week LSI course was prepared that first explicitly introduced cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies over a period of 4 weeks before moving to a process-based approach to teaching listening strategies as described by Vandergrift and Goh (2012), and Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010) (see Appendix B) over the remaining 10 weeks. Each process-based class focused on particular cognitive and meta-cognitive strategies such as listening for gist, details, key points, prediction, elaboration, summarization planning and monitoring, and selective attention and extra strategy practice was given through regular listening assignments with reflective journal writing exercises every two weeks.

### ***Data collection and analysis***

This study employed a process-oriented LSI research methodology which is concerned with the listening process rather than the product of listening assessment. Further to this, given the implicit nature of listening, a multi-method assessment to collect convergent data was considered appropriate (Vandergrift, 2007). Therefore, the research methodology for this study utilized the quantitative Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ)

supported by student responses to post-instruction questions.

Vandergrift et al. (2006) established the MALQ as having robust psychometric properties and being significantly related to L2 listening comprehension success. Further to this, the MALQ can be tailored to be language specific, so that participants reflect on their listening in a specific language. For the purpose of this study, the MALQ was designed to allow students to reflect on either English or Japanese listening independently (an example of a Japanese targeted MALQ is presented in Appendix C). Therefore, a total of four MALQ surveys were completed by the participants in this study (English and Japanese targeted MALQs before instruction, and English and Japanese targeted MALQs post-instruction). Due to the large number of surveys and limited class time, MALQ surveys were discussed in class, and then published online to allow easy access for participants.

In order to answer the first and second research questions, the quantitative MALQ data was analysed statistically in the following way. First of all, average scores of each metacognitive factor were determined for each participant with respect to each target language - note that 6 items (3, 4, 8, 11, 16, and 18) required reverse coding before any averages could be determined. These participant averages were then transposed into the SPSS statistical analysis software package (version 20) in order to compile sample averages (for each metacognitive factor). These averages were then compared in two ways: between target languages (using an independent t-test) and between pre- and post-instruction stages (using a paired sample t-test). It should be noted that although an independent t-test is typically used to compare two different groups of people, in this test it was used to see if participants were responding in significantly different ways in two different survey formats (i.e. the same group considering two different target languages). Finally, all comparisons were reported and discussed in light of the MALQ interpretation guide (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012).

Table 1. Statistical analysis procedure for MALQ responses

	<b>Pre-instruction MALQ for Japanese listening</b>	<b>Post-instruction MALQ for English listening</b>
<b>Pre-instruction MALQ for English listening</b>	(a) Each factor compared with an independent <i>t</i> -test	(b) Each factor compared with a paired sample <i>t</i> -test
<b>Post-instruction MALQ for Japanese listening</b>	(b) Each factor compared with a paired sample <i>t</i> -test	(c) Each factor compared with an independent <i>t</i> -test

Following the English LSI course, the participants were asked to answer closed questions and provide reasons for their responses. Three questions concerning the participants' perceptions of the LSI course were as follows: (a) Do you agree or disagree that the English LSI course has helped with English listening? Give your reasons. (b) Do you agree or disagree that the English LSI course has helped with Japanese listening? Give your reasons. (c) Would you like the same kind of instruction again in a Japanese listening class? Give your reasons. The post-instruction questions were provided online and unlike the MALQ, the post-instruction survey was anonymous allowing the participants to express themselves freely whether their opinions were positive or negative. Any open-ended responses submitted in Chinese were subsequently translated into English by a bilingual professional (not the researcher).

## Results and discussion

### *Quantitative analysis of MALQ data*

The data collected from the four MALQ surveys are presented in Table 2. Mean scores for each meta-cognitive factor are presented alongside the mean differences between target languages, and pre/post instruction stages. For the purposes of reporting, E and J designate scores for English and Japanese targeted MALQs respectively.

By looking at the mean scores some generalizations about the metacognitive awareness of the participants at the pre-instruction stage can be made. The highest scoring metacognitive factors were for Planning & Evaluation, Directed Attention, and Problem Solving strategies. Each of these factors scored between 4 and 5 (partially agree – agree) on average for the whole sample whether it was English or Japanese listening. This implies a generally positive perceived use of these strategies. To be more specific, Planning & Evaluation scores (E = 4.17; J = 4.16) imply the common use of strategies such as preparation, prediction, goal setting and activating previous knowledge as well as reflection and being aware of one's level of comprehension whilst listening. Directed Attention scores (E = 4.28; J = 4.22) suggest a positive perceived use of strategies for recovering and maintaining attention in the face of listening comprehension difficulties. Finally, Problem Solving scores (E = 4.51; J = 4.43) suggest a generally positive perceived use of strategies such as inference, deduction, plausibility checking, interpretation based on general knowledge, and revision of comprehension.

A comparatively lower score for the metacognitive factor of Mental Translation suggests that listeners, in general, find some difficulty with automatically processing texts that they hear and, for the most part, rely on mental translation into their first language to comprehend a text. This is considered to be detrimental to listening success and commonly seen among lower proficiency students (Vandergrift et al., 2006). In this sample, mean scores for Mental Translation are below 3 (E = 2.93; J = 2.78) at the pre-instruction stage suggesting a tendency for mental translation in either target language.

Person Knowledge is the metacognitive factor with the widest range and variance at the pre-instruction stage. However, the mean scores are around 3 (E = 3.25; J = 2.78) which suggests a moderate amount of perceived anxiety and low confidence when it comes to listening in either language. In addition, this metacognitive factor shows the greatest discrepancy between target languages. According to an independent *t*-test, the mean positive difference for person knowledge (0.47) is statistically significant ( $p < .05$ ). This suggests that when listening in Japanese, the participants, in general, feel more anxious or less confident than when listening in English.

To examine whether or not the listening strategy instruction course could have had an impact on these factors for listening in either language, paired sample *t*-tests were conducted. According to the data, the most significant change in the mean MALQ scores occurred for the metacognitive factor of Planning & Evaluation for listening in both English and Japanese ( $t(42) = -2.49$ ,  $p < .05$ , and  $t(42) = -2.28$ ,  $p < .05$  respectively). The next greatest change (although not statistically significant according to a two-tailed test for significance) occurred for the metacognitive factor of Problem Solving for listening in both English and Japanese ( $t(42) = -1.83$ ,  $p = .075$ , and  $t(42) = -1.83$ ,  $p = .074$  respectively).

A final analysis examined the differences between each target language at the post instruction stage according to an independent *t*-test. As shown in Table 2, the significant difference between listening in English and listening in Japanese for this sample, at the post-instruction stage, remains for the metacognitive factor of Person Knowledge. All other metacognitive factor scores were not significantly different.

Table 2. Statistical analysis of four sets of MALQ data including mean scores for each meta-cognitive factor, the mean differences between target languages and the mean differences between pre/post instruction stages

MALQ Target Lang.	Meta-cognitive Factor	N	Pre-instruction				Post-instruction				Mean Diff.
			Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	Mean	SD	
English	Planning & Evaluation	43	2.00	6.00	4.17	0.75	2.80	5.80	4.49	0.66	**0.32
Japanese	Planning & Evaluation	43	2.00	5.20	4.16	0.63	3.00	6.00	4.43	0.59	**0.27
	Mean Diff.				0.01				0.06		
English	Directed Attention	43	2.50	5.25	4.28	0.66	3.00	5.50	4.42	0.65	0.14
Japanese	Directed Attention	43	2.00	5.75	4.22	0.80	2.00	5.50	4.33	0.72	0.11
	Mean Diff.				0.06				0.09		
English	Person Knowledge	43	1.33	6.00	3.25	1.09	1.33	5.00	3.19	0.87	-0.06
Japanese	Person Knowledge	43	1.00	4.67	2.78	1.03	1.00	5.00	2.72	0.97	-0.06
	Mean Diff.				*0.47				*0.47		
English	Mental Translation	43	1.67	5.00	2.93	0.66	1.00	4.67	2.77	0.82	-0.16
Japanese	Mental Translation	43	1.67	4.67	2.78	0.68	1.00	5.00	2.64	0.66	-0.14
	Mean Diff.				0.15				0.13		
English	Problem Solving	43	2.17	5.50	4.51	0.71	3.00	6.00	4.71	0.55	***0.20
Japanese	Problem Solving	43	2.00	5.50	4.43	0.72	3.33	6.00	4.65	0.53	***0.22
	Mean Diff.				0.08				0.06		

\* Statistically significant difference according to an independent *t*-test;  $p < .05$  (two-tailed test)

\*\* Statistically significant difference according to a paired sample *t*-test;  $p < .05$  (two-tailed test)

\*\*\* Statistically significant difference according to a paired sample *t*-test;  $p < .1$  (two-tailed test)

### *Discussion of MALQ data*

In answering the first research question, “Are there any differences in metacognitive listening strategy awareness between EFL listening and listening in an additional foreign language at the university level?” the data shows that the participants in this sample evidently exhibit the same degree of metacognitive knowledge of listening for both target languages with respect to task and strategy knowledge. In other words, learners report that they approach listening in either language in a similar way, from a metacognitive standpoint. This supports one theory of strategy transfer, the Linguistic Interdependence Hypothesis (Cummins, 1979), which suggests that not all language skills are language specific and some conceptual knowledge and cognitive proficiency that is developed may be language-independent, and thus, globally transferable across languages.

However, when it comes to person knowledge, there is a significantly different perception of each target language. While both languages appear to engender a certain amount of listening anxiety, it is listening in Japanese that produces the most concern for the listeners in this study, and this is likely due to the fact that this additional foreign language has been studied significantly less than English in this context and L3 proficiency is typically much lower than L2. This would impact confidence and limit listening success (Chen, 2005; Goh, 2000) and it would appear that the apparent use of metacognitive strategies across target languages does not compensate for this.

When comparing pre-instruction and post-instruction MALQ data, it can be seen that the overall metacognitive awareness changed for Planning & Evaluation, and Problem Solving over the course of the listening strategy instruction program in students’ English (L2) and Japanese (L3) listening. Given that the course was particularly focused on planning and evaluation strategies as well as the cognitive listening strategies associated with problem solving, it is likely that the instruction course is responsible for the increased awareness of these metacognitive factors in students’ English listening with an apparent transference to listening in their additional foreign language as implied by the similar increase of mean metacognitive factor scores.

These findings mean that the second research question, “Does an English LSI course raise metacognitive awareness of listening in English and an additional foreign language at the university level?” can be answered in the affirmative to a certain extent, but with some limitations. For instance, the positive indications for the more explicit metacognitive factors of Planning & Evaluation and Problem Solving in both L2 and L3 only consider the participant sample as a whole and do not take into account the impact on individuals. Additionally, the methodology of this study could not accommodate a control group, thus, any conclusions about causality drawn from the MALQ data must assume minimal external influence on the listening behaviour of the participants. With that said it could be argued that, according to the MALQ data, an English LSI course has dual benefits for English language learners who are also acquiring an additional foreign language.

It was interesting that there was no observable impact of English LSI on Person Knowledge in either target language. Although it is believed that raised metacognitive awareness of listening promotes listening success, this may not necessarily lead to an increase in confidence building and the LSI course delivered as part of this study did not explicitly focus on such socio-affective

strategies. Given that Person Knowledge was one of the lowest scoring metacognitive factors for listening in English (L2) and Japanese (L3), it is worth pointing out that it should not be neglected during course development. Finally, despite a focus on top-down listening strategies, the course did not appear to impact the factor of Mental Translation which appears to be a default listening strategy for many students in either language before and after instruction. Whether or not the course could be modified to have a more positive impact on the lower scoring factors of Mental Translation and Person Knowledge is a necessary consideration for future English listening course development. However, if it were possible, it is not yet known if increased scores for English (L2) listening would translate into increased scores for listening in an additional foreign language (L3) with respect to Person Knowledge and Mental Translation where lower proficiencies in an L3 tend to result in lower scores on the MALQ (Vandergrift et al., 2006; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012).

### *Dual foreign language learner responses to the English LSI course*

In order to answer the third research question, “What are university level dual foreign language learners’ perceptions of the benefits and barriers regarding English LSI instruction in their language learning context?” student responses to three post-instruction questions about their course were examined. The quotes presented in this discussion were taken verbatim and denoted as either translated from Chinese or presented in its original form (written in English).

#### *LSI impact on English listening*

Regarding the perceived benefits of the English LSI course, almost all of the participants (89.1%) responded that the course had benefited their L2 target language listening. When giving more detail, around half of the positive remarks about the course mainly referred to students’ general interest and enjoyment. The medium of video was commonly mentioned by students who described this medium of learning as ‘fresh’ especially since they can practice and learn through the wide range of content, as described by one student, “I like the part of showing new website and the video in the class, because I think it helps me know more kinds of information” (translated text). Even beyond entertainment there was a recurring sentiment that the exposure to varied content meant that students could “learn different cultures while practicing listening skills” (translated text) or, as one student put it, “it opened my sight of the world” (original text). Whereas some students appreciated content for broadening their horizons, others felt that the topics were somehow “related to our daily life” (original text). Comments such as these indicate the motivational benefits of stimulating content for listening in L2 that can have a positive effect on learning (Chen, 2007). Motivation from listening materials may also come from lowered affective barriers of listening (Chen, 2005) as one student goes on to describe that the course can “make me feel little pressure (even no pressure) during the class. I can improve my English ability unconsciously while enjoying the activity. I love it” (original text).

Other positive remarks from students referred to the learning and practice of listening strategies as one part of the course that they liked. These comments provide evidence of motivation that are more focused on skill development. For some, this course was a “different, and active way of learning” (translated text) where students might have a feeling that “I learned some new skills which I did not notice before” (translated text). Several students made specific references to

individual listening strategies that they appreciated practicing such as prediction, elaboration, listening for key points, checking subtitles or transcripts, and cooperation through discussion with one remark stating “I use the strategy that learned from the class during my daily life. I like to try those strategy and found it did useful” (original text). Alternatively, some comments refer to participants’ own specific listening problems that may have been dealt with throughout the course including accents, speaking speed, and vocabulary. Interestingly, a few students revealed their ‘bad listening habit’ as being a listening problem, and something that is “hard to change right away” (translated text). However, some students felt this course was beneficial to them with quotes such as “in this course, I can notice my own English listening habits” (translated text) and “I learned some useful ways to improve my bad habits” (original text). Ultimately, the wide range of perceived benefits regarding an English LSI approach reflects several aspects of listening improvement including motivation, comprehension, and raised strategy awareness.

Although the majority of students provided positive feedback on the course as a part of their English learning, a small handful of students (8.9 %) disagreed that the course had benefited them in their English listening. These students expressed dissatisfaction with this particular teaching approach. For example, there may be feelings that “discussion the strategies costs too much time” (original text) or it would be better to “have more time on practicing listening, and don’t spend too much time on pre-test or learning the techniques” (translated text). These two comments show that a course such as this cannot meet every student’s expectation. From a similar perspective, another comment reiterated that “studying strategies will be different from person to person. The course can provide advice, but will not be suitable for everyone” (translated text). This particular student considered the course to be unhelpful acknowledging that “maybe I can use the strategies in my life, but I won’t use most of them.” This candid opinion on listening strategies provides useful insight into how some English learners may demonstrate their own strategic awareness and an ability to discern what is useful for themselves as individual learners.

#### *LSI impact on listening in an additional foreign language*

When participants were asked whether or not the English LSI course had helped their Japanese listening, around two-thirds of the sample (63%) were in agreement whereas the remaining third (37%) were in disagreement. Therefore, in this context the LSI course has provided many students with a positive view of listening and a raised awareness of listening strategies in not only the L2 target language (English) but also in their L3 (Japanese).

After examining the learners’ positive perceptions of the transferability of listening strategies between L2 and L3 (or across the L1-L2-L3 triad), they could be classified in 3 different ways: *Natural transfer* without any concern for the differences between L2 or L3 learning; for example, “the skill in English listening is similar to Japanese listening” (original text) or “I think both English and Japanese are not my first language, and those strategies are helpful. I was not consciously using the strategies, but later I was” (translated text); *Selective transfer* acknowledging that “some methods are useful for Japanese learning” (translated text) and “there are some strategies that can be used in all kind of listening” (original text). Finally, *Potential transfer* or a desire to test, as put by one learner who wanted to “try if this kind of learning course will also help me improve my Japanese ability or not” (original text). This willingness to transfer skills learnt in an English LSI course, but also apprehension, is also shown by this

student who said, “The strategy can also be used when I listen to different language although my improvement is not visible” (original text).

This latter sentiment is perhaps felt more strongly among participants who disagreed that the LSI course had helped their L3 listening. However, these participants provided more explicit reasons as to why they felt this way. The most frequent reasons provided can be classified as either a perceived difference in the learner’s L2/L3 language abilities, or the languages themselves. The first category directly reflects one of the barriers of LSI described by Chen (2005) as *Proficiency barriers*. Proficiency barriers arise from issues regarding vocabulary, grammar, or proficiency in general. For instance “the biggest problem is vocabulary, not lack of practicing” (original text), or “it is not useful for Japanese listening with my present language ability” (translated text). Put simply, some learners in this context may feel that “my Japanese is not good enough” (translated text).

On the other hand, the issue of different languages was specifically mentioned by some dual foreign language learners. Participants in this study felt that the ‘grammar is so different’ or refer to more obscure problems such as the languages having ‘different speaking types’ or Japanese as having ‘too many details’. Unfortunately, this study was unable to investigate these problems further, but it would appear that one perceived barrier is that “English and Japanese are quite different. The language systems are not the same” (original text).

However, LSI has proven to be successful with target languages that are, in some cases, radically different from English such as Russian (Thompson & Rubin, 1996) or indeed Japanese (Seo, 2000). Therefore, this barrier of ‘different languages’ may be related in part to Proficiency barriers but also in part to what Chen (2005) describes as *Belief barriers*. Chen noticed that some listeners were limited in realising the potential of listening strategies because they “believed that other language skills such as vocabulary or grammar development were more important” or “regarded listening as a task to apprehend every spoken word” (Chen, 2005, Barrier category 6: Belief barriers, para. 1-3). In other words, strategies may be the last priority for students who are more focused on language form at the earlier stages of foreign language learning.

This potential explanation for a ‘different language barrier’ to transferring listening strategies is supported by comments from learners when asked whether or not similar LSI in a Japanese listening class would be welcomed. Around one third of the sample (35%) said ‘no’. Although the most common reasons were related to language proficiency, a secondary factor that emerged was that the goal of learning JFL is viewed differently from that of EFL. Some students believed that there is “too much new vocabulary so the strategies are useless” (original text) and “Japanese listening is all about memorizing words and sentences” (translated text). This focus on language form is coupled with the fact that for some early language learners, “it’s too early to use strategies” (original text) or they might “feel panic while listening to Japanese” (translated text).

Learner beliefs may be considered a part of metacognitive awareness, however, according to Wenden (1998), their subjective and idiosyncratic nature distinguish them from metacognitive knowledge and they may in fact be “held more tenaciously than knowledge” (p. 517). For instance, the view that ‘it is too early’ to transfer listening strategy knowledge from the English learning classroom to learning an additional foreign language may be a particularly strong belief for some of the language learners in this study. Still, many scholars recognize that practice with language learning strategies should not be delayed until later stages of learning (see, for

example, Chamot, 2004; Cross, 2012) and previous research has shown the benefits of LSI for lower proficiency learners (Goh, 2008; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010). Besides demonstrating that English LSI had a similar impact on listening in dual target languages, the quantitative data from this study also highlights the difference in Person Knowledge scores between English as an L2 and Japanese as an L3. This could be related to why a sizable proportion of students still perceive barriers (*proficiency barriers* and/or *belief barriers*) for transferring what they have learnt between listening in English and their additional foreign language. Since Person Knowledge is tied to knowledge that can facilitate or inhibit learning including beliefs about self-efficacy (Wenden, 1998), it may be that while developed listening skills and knowledge about strategies and tasks are transferrable in theory, in practice, learners have not yet had the opportunity to realize more potential benefits for their L3 listening.

It should be noted that the intervention of this study did not offer practice or discussion about listening strategies for L3 listening. It is perhaps worth mentioning again that some of those students who agreed that the English LSI instruction course had assisted their L3 listening were more selective about which strategies were useful to them. One implication from this finding would be that students need more practice and discussion regarding how listening strategy knowledge can (or cannot) benefit them in their dual-language learning environment. As reported by Graham and Macaro (2008), learners' beliefs will have an impact on their willingness to try and adopt new strategies. Their study examines the importance of scaffolding in an LSI course, and it is such targeted scaffolding that could help learners of English and additional foreign languages realize more potential from listening strategies. For example, Wenden (1998) mentions several conditions that raise metacognitive knowledge and facilitate the transfer of language learning strategies to other tasks. These include enhanced person knowledge of how strategies might improve success, heightened strategic knowledge from informed and conditional knowledge of how and when to use strategies, and the promotion of task knowledge and the ability to determine similarities between learning tasks. By raising learners' awareness of these three facets of metacognitive knowledge through scaffolding, an LSI course designed more specifically for dual foreign language learners could have an improved positive impact in these language learning environments.

## Conclusion and implications

This study has detailed a study investigating the impact of English LSI on learners of EFL and an additional foreign language. The study approach was designed to compare and contrast data from MALQs and participant responses to the course with the aim of shedding light on how an English LSI can potentially benefit English learners in their context of dual foreign language learning.

The primary findings from the quantitative data conclude that learners in this study appear to exhibit a similar degree of metacognitive awareness of listening in English and their additional foreign language, Japanese, for all metacognitive factors except Person Knowledge. For this factor, the MALQ data suggests more anxiety is attached to participants' L3 listening which is usually attributed to lower proficiency levels. Following the LSI course, the strongest impacts were seen in the metacognitive factors of Planning & Evaluation and Problem Solving. Increased scores in these factors were noted in both English and Japanese MALQ responses suggesting

an apparent strategy transfer of metacognitive strategy use between languages and thus, a potential and additional benefit of LSI for EFL learners learning more than one foreign language.

This is supported by participant responses regarding the English LSI course which reveal how learners of English and an additional foreign language perceive the benefits and barriers of such a course. The findings suggest that in this context, LSI for English learning was in fact beneficial for the majority of the students' L3 listening since, as reported by the participants, listening strategies are the same regardless of target language, or alternatively, certain listening strategies may be appropriate for L3 listening and there is a willingness to practice in more than one target language. Thus, there is potential for English LSI in dual foreign language learning contexts to promote listening strategy use and self-efficacy which is essential for improving person knowledge and dealing with listening anxiety. That said, a proportion of the sample do oppose the idea that English LSI has an additional benefit for L3 learning by describing their barriers to transfer including proficiency barriers and/or belief barriers regarding differences between the language systems or learning goals of English and their L3 (Japanese).

However, there are certain methodological limitations with this kind of research that should be taken into account. Regarding the quantitative data, the use of two versions of the MALQ (L2 and L3 versions) was a novel approach with little precedent in previous research. As such, the methodology for administering the MALQ was also novel; that is, providing it online for students to do in their own time and in the order that suited them. The exploratory nature of this study created limitations such as MALQs not being done anonymously (to ensure identical samples were compared) and participants being asked to consider L2 or L3 listening in general terms without a specific context. In addition, the in-action approach that researchers/instructors may be encouraged to take can lead to potential researcher (and/or instructor) bias when compiling and interpreting data. Furthermore, it does not easily allow for control groups which can undermine any causality drawn from quantitative results.

Nevertheless, this study has made significant contributions to the research area of LSI. It has addressed the call for more empirical studies from a wider range of contexts and broadened the scope of LSI research to include learners learning to listen in foreign languages beyond primary L2s such as English. Furthermore, the innovative application of the already validated MALQ combined with added qualitative data has laid a foundation for other researchers interested in investigating LSI in the context of learners of English and additional foreign-languages. Finally, the findings disclose fresh perspectives on the debate over if and how the LSI approach should be considered at the university level.

### ***Pedagogical implications and further research***

The results of this study create a number of pedagogical implications for instructors of English in contexts where additional foreign languages are being learnt. For example, when developing a course it may be easy to underestimate the importance of certain strategies. One instance in this study would be the socio-affective strategy of building self-confidence which was not, in the researcher's view, given enough attention in the course. Learning EFL at the university level can create anxiety about language learning which is only increased when additional foreign languages are also being learnt. Learning strategies for building self-confidence and dealing with

listening anxiety are essential skills for dual foreign language learners. Such skills may also promote self-efficacy and work toward reducing any socio-affective barriers for strategy transfer across target languages.

Further to this, it may be important to raise student awareness of how strategies might be used across target languages. The course design for this study focused on how strategies can improve listening comprehension in the general sense, although all practice texts were with students' L2 (English). Not all students believed that there was an additional benefit for their L3 listening, and perhaps this would have been different if more time was made for class and group discussions about the transferability of listening strategies between target languages. Naturally, it would be ideal for such discussions to involve at least some practice with L3 texts and therefore some L3 competence from the instructor. Given the unlikelihood of this scenario, the alternative solution would be promoted communication and cooperation between language departments which might add value to LSI in contexts where English is not the only foreign language being acquired. That said, this does return to one of the major opposing arguments for this kind of instruction; the opportunity-cost versus whether or not it is actually beneficial for language learners (cf. Cross, 2012; Graham, 2011; Renandya & Farrell, 2011; Siegel, 2011). In any case, instructors in these contexts should strive to promote peer scaffolding where the learners themselves could be guided to consider how listening strategies could benefit their listening in more than one target language.

In addition to these pedagogical implications, there are a number of recommendations for further research. As this study is, to this researcher's knowledge, the first to examine listening strategies in the context of learners of more than one target language, replications of the novel methodology used in this study are recommended for similar language learning contexts in other countries. Alternatively, the methodology could be developed to include a comparison of different proficiency levels or a comparison of guided reflective journals for listening in more than one target language. Furthermore, a closer examination of individual listeners could be conducted by focusing on individual MALQ responses and more in-depth participant interviews.

### **Acknowledgements**

The author would like to acknowledge Dr. Yi-Chen Chen and Dr. I-Chung Ke for their guidance in completing the Master's Thesis on which this study was based. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 12<sup>th</sup> International Asia TEFL Conference and 23<sup>rd</sup> MELTA International Conference, held in Kuching, Sarawak, Malaysia in August 2014, and published in the conference proceedings.

### **References**

- Anderson, N. J. (2002). The role of metacognition in second language teaching and learning. ERIC Digest. *Education Resources Information Centre*.
- Berne, J. E. (2004). Listening comprehension strategies: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(4), 521-531.

- Birjandi, P., & Rahimi, A. H. (2012). The effect of metacognitive strategy instruction on the listening performance of EFL students. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 4(2), 495-517.
- Carrier, K. A. (2003). Improving high school English language learners' second language listening through strategy instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27(3), 383-408.
- Cenoz, J. (2003). The additive effect of bilingualism on third language acquisition: A review. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 7(1), 71-87.
- Chamot, A. U. (2004). Issues in language learning strategy research and teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 1(1), 14-26.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach*. White Plains, NY: Addison-Wesley.
- Chen, A. (2009). Listening strategy instruction: Exploring Taiwanese college students' strategy development. *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(2), 54-85.
- Chen, Y. (2005). Barriers to acquiring listening strategies for EFL learners and their pedagogical implications. *TESL-EJ*, 8(4), 1-23.
- Chen, Y. (2007). Learning to learn: The impact of strategy training. *ELT Journal*, 61(1), 20-29.
- Coşkun, A. (2010). The effect of metacognitive strategy training on the listening performance of beginner students. *Research on Youth and Language*, 4(1), 35-50.
- Cross, J. (2009). Effects of listening strategy instruction on news videotext comprehension. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(2), 151-176.
- Cross, J. (2012). Listening strategy instruction (or extensive listening?): A response to Renandya (2012). *ELT World Online*, 4, 1-6. Retrieved July 2, 2013, from [http://blog.nus.edu.sg/eltwo/files/2013/12/Listening-strategy-instruction-or-extensive-listening\\_editforpdf-15mvwem.pdf](http://blog.nus.edu.sg/eltwo/files/2013/12/Listening-strategy-instruction-or-extensive-listening_editforpdf-15mvwem.pdf).
- Cummins, J. (1979). Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children. *Review of Educational Research*, 49(2), 222-251.
- Feyten, C. M. (1991). The power of listening ability: An overlooked dimension in language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(2), 173-180.
- Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring. *American Psychologist*, 34(10), 906-911.
- Goh, C. (2000). A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems. *System*, 28(1), 55-75.
- Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development theory, practice and research implications. *RELC Journal*, 39(2), 188-213.
- Graham, S. (2011). Self-efficacy and academic listening. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(2), 113-117.
- Graham, S., & Macaro, E. (2008). Strategy Instruction in Listening for Lower-Intermediate Learners of French. *Language Learning*, 58(4), 747-783.
- Hammarberg, B. (2009). *Processes in third language acquisition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Jessner, U., & Onysko, A. (2006). *Linguistic awareness in multilinguals: English as a third language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Kassaiian, Z., & Ghadiri, M. (2011). An investigation of the relationship between motivation and metacognitive awareness strategies in listening comprehension: The case of Iranian EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(5), 1069-1079.
- Krashen, S. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon.

- Mendelsohn, D. J. (1994). *Learning to listen: A strategy-based approach for the second-language learner*. San Diego: Dominic Press.
- Nunan, D. (2003). The impact of English as a global language on educational policies and practices in the Asia-Pacific Region. *TESOL Quarterly*, 37(4), 589-613.
- O'Bryan, A., & Hegelheimer, V. (2009). Using a mixed methods approach to explore strategies, metacognitive awareness and the effects of task design on listening development. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 12(1), 9-38.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies*. Alabama: Heinle and Heinle.
- Oxford, R. L. (2011). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies*. Harlow, England: Longman.
- Renandya, W. A., & Farrell, T. S. (2011). 'Teacher, the tape is too fast!' Extensive listening in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 65(1), 52-59.
- Rivers, W. P., & Golonka, E. M. (2009). Third Language Acquisition Theory and Practice. In M. H. L., & C. J. Doughty (Ed.), *The Handbook of Language Teaching* (pp. 250-266). West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.
- Rost, M. (2002). *Teaching and researching listening*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Rubin, J. (1994). A review of second language listening comprehension research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 78(2), 199-221.
- Ruiz, R. (2008). *Most popular foreign languages*. Retrieved August 13, 2013, from [http://www.forbes.com/2008/02/22/popular-foreign-languages-tech-language\\_sp08-cx\\_rr\\_0222foreign.html](http://www.forbes.com/2008/02/22/popular-foreign-languages-tech-language_sp08-cx_rr_0222foreign.html).
- Salamat, S., & Sidhu, G. K. (2011). Student perceptions of metacognitive strategy use in lecture listening comprehension. *Language Education in Asia*, 2(2), 185-198.
- Seo, K. (2000). Intervening in tertiary students' strategic listening in Japanese as a foreign language. Ph.D. Dissertation. Griffith University, Brisbane.
- Siegel, J. (2011). Thoughts on L2 listening pedagogy. *ELT Journal*, 65(3), 318-321.
- Thompson, I., & Rubin, J. (1996). Can strategy instruction improve listening comprehension? *Foreign Language Annals*, 29(3), 331-342.
- Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring successful strategies. *ELT Journal*, 53(3), 168-176.
- Vandergrift, L. (2002). 'It was nice to see that our predictions were right': Developing metacognition in L2 listening comprehension. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 58(4), 555-575.
- Vandergrift, L. (2004). Listening to learn or learning to listen? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24(1), 3-25.
- Vandergrift, L. (2007). Recent developments in second and foreign language listening comprehension research. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 191-210.
- Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. C. M. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. New York: Routledge.
- Vandergrift, L., Goh, C., Mareschal, C. J., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2006). The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire: Development and validation. *Language Learning*, 56(3), 431-462.
- Vandergrift, L., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2010). Teaching L2 learners how to listen does make a difference: An empirical study. *Language Learning*, 60(2), 470-497.

- Veenman, M. V., Van Hout-Wolters, B. H., & Afflerbach, P. (2006). Metacognition and learning: Conceptual and methodological considerations. *Metacognition and Learning*, 1(1), 3-14.
- Wenden, A. L. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 515-537.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A

List of listening strategies (adapted from Chen, 2009; Vandergrift, 1997)

<b>Cognitive Strategies</b>	
<b>Top-down processing</b>	<b>Bottom-up processing</b>
<p><b>1. Listen for gist</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listen for main ideas first</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Inferencing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Filling in missing information and</li> <li>• guessing meaning of words</li> <li>• Use contextual clues</li> <li>• Draw on knowledge of the world</li> <li>• Use visual clues</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Elaboration</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Embellishing an initial interpretation to make it meaningful and complete</li> <li>• Draw on knowledge of the world</li> <li>• Draw on knowledge about the target language</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Prediction</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anticipating the contents of a text</li> <li>• Anticipate general contents (global)</li> <li>• Anticipate details while listening (local)</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Visualization</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Forming a mental picture of what</li> <li>• is heard</li> <li>• Imagine scenes, events, objects etc. being</li> <li>• described</li> <li>• Mentally display the shape (spelling) of key words</li> </ul>	<p><b>6. Understanding each word and detail</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Try to figure out the meanings of most of words or sentences of the input.</li> <li>• Try to understand most of the details of the input</li> </ul> <p><b>7. Translation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changing words, phrases or sentences into L1 before interpretation</li> <li>• Find L1 equivalents for selected key words</li> <li>• Translate a sequence of utterances</li> </ul> <p><b>8. Fixation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Focusing attention on understanding a small part of text</li> <li>• Stop to think about the meaning of words or parts of the input</li> <li>• Memorize/repeat the sounds of unfamiliar words</li> </ul> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Cognitive</b></p> <p><b>9. Summarization</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Organize important information in my mind.</li> </ul> <p><b>10. Note taking</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Write down key words and concepts while listening</li> </ul>

<b>Metacognitive Strategies</b>	
<p><b>1. Planning</b> (Preparing mentally and emotionally for a listening task)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preview contents</li> <li>• Rehearse sounds of potential content words</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Directed Attention</b> (Monitoring attention and avoiding distractions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concentrate hard</li> <li>• Continue to listen in spite of difficulty</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Selective Attention</b> (Decide in advance to listen for specific aspects of input)</p> <p>Decide in advance to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Listen for familiar content words</li> <li>• Notice how information is structured (e.g. discourse markers)</li> <li>• Pay attention to repetitions</li> <li>• Notice intonation features (e.g. falling and rising tones)</li> </ul>	<p><b>4. Monitoring</b> (checking/ confirming understanding while listening)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Confirm that comprehension has taken place</li> <li>• Identify words or ideas not understood</li> <li>• Check current interpretation with the context of the message</li> <li>• Check current interpretation with prior knowledge</li> </ul> <p><b>5. Evaluation</b> (Checking interpretation of accuracy, completeness and acceptability after listening)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Check interpretation against external sources</li> <li>• Check interpretation using prior knowledge</li> <li>• Match interpretation with the context of the message</li> </ul>
<b>Social/Affective Strategies</b>	
<p><b>1. Cooperation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ask for explanation / clarification</li> </ul>	<p><b>2. Confidence Building</b> (encouraging oneself)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tell oneself to relax</li> <li>• Use positive self-talk</li> </ul>

**Appendix B**

Stages of listening instruction and related metacognitive processes as described by Vandergrift, 2007.

<b>PLANNING/PREDICTING STAGE</b>	
1. Once students know the topic and text type, they predict types of information and possible words they may hear.	1. planning and directed attention
<b>FIRST VERIFICATION STAGE</b>	
2. Students listen to verify initial hypotheses, correct as required and note additional information understood.	2. monitoring
3. Students compare what they have written with peers, modify as required, establish what needs resolution and decide on the important details that still need special attention.	3. monitoring, planning and selective attention
<b>SECOND VERIFICATION STAGE</b>	
4. Students selectively attend to points of disagreement, make corrections and write down additional details understood.	4. monitoring and problem-solving
5. Class discussion in which all class members contribute to the reconstruction of the text's main points and most pertinent details, interspersed with reflections on how students arrived at the meaning of certain words or parts of the text.	5. monitoring and evaluation
<b>FINAL VERIFICATION STAGE</b>	
6. Students listen for the information revealed in the class discussion which they were not able to decipher earlier and/or compare all or selected sections of the aural form of the text with a transcription of the text.	6. selective attention and monitoring
<b>REFLECTION STAGE</b>	
7. Based on the earlier discussion of the strategies used to compensate for what was not understood, students write goals for the next listening activity. A discussion of discrepancies between the aural and written form of the text could also take place at this stage.	7. evaluation

*Appendix C*

Example MALQ survey specific for Japanese listening (adapted from Vandergrift &amp; Goh, 2012)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Partially Disagree	Partially Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Practice Question: I like learning another language	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Before I start to listen in Japanese, 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 in Japanese is more difficult than reading, speaking, or writing in Japanese.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I translate in my head as I listen to Japanese.	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 in Japanese, 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 Japanese 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 in Japanese, 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 in Japanese.	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 when I think it is incorrect.	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 Japanese.	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 in Japanese.	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 in Japanese, 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 in Japanese.	1	2	3	4	5	6