

Students' Metacognitive Knowledge about Listening

張玉蓮

Abstract

This study was concerned with students' metacognitive knowledge about listening before they received formal training in college. More specifically, it was designed:

- 1) to identify the demographic structure of student population in the listening class of Freshman English;*
- 2) to understand their strategy perception, strategy use, and listening difficulties;*
- 3) to explore possible interaction between their listening experience or listening proficiency (as measured in the classroom situation) and their ways of managing the aural text as revealed by their report of strategy perception, strategy use, and listening difficulties.*

The Results are as follows:

- 1) Demographically the Yes-group (those with previous listening experience) make up about 40% of the total 176 subjects, but only 65% of the Yes-group score above average in the given test.*
- 2) Students perceiving the usefulness of the investigated strategies are more than those not. The results regarding strategy use and listening difficulties are found to be consistent with previous related studies.*
- 3) Relatively more subjects of the Yes-group use strategies, but less suffer from listening difficulties. A more important finding is in the comparison between students' strategy perception and their strategy use. There are not many students who perceive and actually use the specific strategies; furthermore, there are constantly more students who perceive only but not use the specific strategies than those vice versa.*
- 4) The similarities/ differences between the High-group (those scoring above average in the given test) and the Low-group (those under average) seem to have been duplicated from the Yes- and No- group comparisons. And the High-group correspond with the Yes-group while the Low-group is echoed by the No-group.*

Pedagogically this study suggests that students' strategy use and difficulty in listening vary with their learning experience and proficiency to some extent. It thus can be expected that strategy training could further facilitate their learning to listen. However, the similarity of popular strategies used by all groups (Yes- and No-, High- and Low-) also suggests their metacognitive knowledge about listening is quite limited. For this reason, teachers should attend to helping students explore a wider range of strategies rather than introducing those the learners most frequently use only. Besides, the discrepancy showed between "know that" and "know how." Therefore, the point is how to make students "know how" as well as "know that" - - which is a focus of strategy training.

摘要

本研究探討學生進入大學接受聽力訓練之前，對聽力方面認知學習的認識。更明確的說，本研究的目的在於：

1. 找出大一英文聽力課程的學生結構；
2. 瞭解大一學生對聽力學習的策略認識、策略使用和聽力困難；

* 本文作者現任教於國立交通大學

3. 分析學生的聽力學習經驗及聽力能力，與其處理聽力教材的策略之間可能的關聯。

研究結果發現：

1. 受試的276位學生中，大約40%的學生有過聽力學習經驗，不過只有其中的65%在本研究的聽力測驗中得分高於總平均。
2. 認為本研究所調查的策略有助於聽力的學生比不認為者為多。有關策略使用和聽力困難的分析結果，與相關文獻之報導相當一致。
3. 和沒有聽力學習經驗的學生相對之下，比較多有聽力學習經驗的學生使用策略，但遭遇聽力困難的卻較少。另一重要的發現則是學生的策略認識和其策略使用間的差異。知道某一策略並真正使用該策略的學生不多，倒是知而不（或不曾）用的學生總是比用而不知的學生多。
4. 高分組（高於總不均者）與低分組（低於總平均者）間的異同猶如有經驗組（有過聽力學習經驗者）與無經驗組間的差異。高分組對應於有經驗組，低分組則與無經驗組相呼應。

就教學而言，本研究顯示出學生的策略使用和聽力困難隨著他們的學習經驗和聽力的增進而改變至某一程度。因此可預期的是策略訓練得以幫助學生增進聽力。然而各組（有經驗組和無經驗組，高分組和低分組）最常使用的策略卻又極具類似，這說明了學生對聽力方面認知學習的認識非常有限。為此緣故，教師應該留意幫助學生尋求策略的多樣性而不僅僅是介紹慣常使用的策略而已。再者，學生的策略認識與其策略使用間有所不符，也顯示知與用之間仍有一段差距，所以重點應在如何使學生能知能用——這也就是策略訓練的焦點。

Introduction

Nyikos and Oxford (1993) emphasize that, for the purpose of effective language learning, learners must know how to access and use learning strategies. Take listening strategy for example. This can help students transform comprehensible input into comprehensible intake (Nyikos and Oxford 1993). However, studies do show that second and foreign language students are not fully aware of their own learning strategies. What's more, they are even "less aware of the wide range of alternative learning strategies used by highly successful language learners" (Oxford 1990). In other words, second and foreign language students seem not to be strategy-wise enough.

To explore second and foreign language students' metacognitive knowledge about listening is to get a picture about the students' metacognitive ability of listening strategies (What they should be doing in listening). To put it in listening tasks, the metacognitive ability includes the listener's knowledge about his own cognitive resources and the ability to form an ideal connection between the listener and the listening situation.

Learning strategy research has claimed that "students without metacognitive approaches are essentially learners without direction or opportunity to plan their learning, monitor their progress, or review their accomplishments and future learning directions" (O'Malley and Chamot 1990: 8). Then what is the metacognitive profile of our students when they just enroll in the listening class? This study was therefore concerned with students' metacognitive knowledge about listening before they received formal training in college. More specifically, it

was designed

- a) to identify the demographic structure of student population in the listening class of Freshman English;
- b) to understand their strategy perception, strategy use, and listening difficulties;
- c) to explore possible interaction between their listening experience or listening proficiency and their ways of managing the aural text as revealed by their report of strategy perception, strategy use, and listening difficulties.

Method

Subjects. In fall of 1993, six freshman classes from different departments at National Chiao Tung University participated in this study. They were pertaining to the three colleges of engineering, science and management; each college contained two of the six classes, with a total of 276 students. To our knowledge of the student population, there could be a large percentage of students had, more or less, ever been exposed to natural spoken materials during their high school days either through classroom teaching, cram centers, or self-study.

Test and Questionnaire. A test was adapted from the listening exercises of Chapter 1 in *Interactions I: A Listening/Speaking Skills Book*, which was later used as their listening textbook. There were three sections included in the test: listening for main idea, summarizing, and making inferences. For main idea listening, key-word method was emphasized; therefore, students were required to recognize stressed words as well as answer comprehension questions. In summarizing, the two main ideas to be identified were clearly labeled as Part One and Part Two. The inference section was recorded twice, providing an immediate feedback by giving the answer at the end of the second recording. All these helpful clues along with some situational information about each section of the text were included in the tape and the test paper as well.

A corresponding questionnaire was developed to elicit relevant demographic information from the subjects, as well as to investigate their metacognitive knowledge about listening to their second language. The questionnaire was broadly structured by three emphases: strategy perception, strategy use, and listening difficulties. Items on the questionnaire included:

- a) one yes/no question about their listening experience;
- b) two statements about their perception of the specific strategies (i.e. "situational information as clues" and "questions as guidelines");
- c) five yes/no questions pertaining to the use of effective strategies (ways to deal with the text effectively);
- e) six yes/no questions pertaining to the use of compensatory strategies (ways to deal with the difficulties);
- f) eight yes/no questions pertaining to their linguistic and nonlinguistic difficulties in listening.

Among the questions, the last one of c), d), e), f) categories was designed to solicit free ex-

pressions if the mentioned strategies/difficulties were not specific enough for the individual subjects. Furthermore, in order not to have the level of language proficiency in the second language affect the results on the metacognitive questionnaire, the subjects received it in their native language, Chinese.

Procedure. The test and the questionnaire were given to the subjects at their first English class meeting in fall 1993. The test was administered in the classroom situation; i.e. subjects were allowed to tackle the listening text in accordance with their own pace and re-play any difficulty part within a time limit of 40 minutes. Immediately after the test, subjects were asked to complete the corresponding questionnaire, based on the listening experience they just had.

Results

The results are presented in two sections. The first section provides the result of the Yes-group (those with previous listening experience) vs. the No-group (those without previous listening experience). The second section is devoted to the result of the High-group (those scoring above average in the given test) vs. the Low-group (those under the average). Each section is presented in line with the following two parts: (1) Questionnaire--descriptive statistics, and (2) Questionnaire--comparison, except that a t-test result is also provided in the first section to show the difference in listening score between the Yes- and No- groups.

1. Yes-group vs. No-group

Among the 276 subjects, 110 students reported they had had previous listening experience (i.e. the Yes-group was composed of 110 subjects), while the other 166 students had not had any exposure to spoken English (i.e. the No-group consisted of 166 subjects).

1.1 Listening Score

T-test was run to compare the listening score between the Yes-group (N=110) and the No-group (N=166). The result shows the Yes-group subjects performed significantly better than those of the No-group (df=274, $t=4.569$, $p>0.01$).

1.2 Questionnaire--Descriptive Statistics

1.2.1 Perception of the Usefulness of "Situational Information as Clues" (SIC) and "Questions as Guidelines" (QG)

Students indicated the usefulness of the two strategies on a scale of 1-5, with 5 indicating "very useful" and 1, "unuseful." For SIC, there were less than 60% subjects in each group (58% and 50% respectively) considering SIC rather useful (i.e. choosing 4 or 5 to indicate its usefulness) in listening. On the other hand, it was 75% vs. 64% in terms of the usefulness of QG in the Yes- and the No- groups.

1.2.2 Strategy Use

1.2.2.1 Use of Inference Strategies

Although the instructions of this section clearly said (in both tape and the test paper) that the text would be recorded twice and that the answer would be provided at the end of the second recording, about 90% subjects of both Yes- and No- groups applied the strategy "guess based on understood parts" in comparison with less than 40% who applied the strategy "get the answer from the later part of the second recording." Our subjects did not directly "get the answer from the later part of the second recording" because they failed to do so rather than they preferred to apply the strategy of "guessing based on understood parts." This is obvious since only 18% of the Yes-group and 5% of the No-group indicated that they had understood most/whole of the text. Therefore, we are implied that if their comprehension does not reach a certain level, students simply can not benefit from the answer leak in the instructions (serving as the situational information in this case).

1.2.2.2 Use of Effective Strategies

Effective strategies refer to the ways to deal with the text effectively. It was not surprising and actually had been reported in Chang et al. (1992) that both groups were similar in terms of the preference of certain strategies: "guess based on understood parts," and "repeated listening." One point worth noting is that, although "repeated listening" was intentionally arranged to last appear in the long list of twelve strategies in this study, it still turned out to be the most common in both groups. This result indicates that students resort to "repeated listening" has not been a coincident case of "first come -- first chosen."

1.2.2.3 Use of Compensatory Strategies

Compensatory strategies refer to the ways to deal with listening difficulties. The Yes- and No- groups were in common as regarding the high percentage of the same favorite strategies: "guess from context" and "repeated listening." The implication here is that, the more they understand, the bigger the possibility is of making an intelligent guess; the momentum of comprehension is gathered along with the quantity of "understood parts."

1.2.3 Listening Difficulties

The subjects of both Yes- and No- groups suffered most from "failure to recognize already-known words in acoustic form" and "fast speed." Besides, more than half of the No-group reported they had difficulties in "obsessed with Chinese translation" and "small vocabulary"; in fact, the Yes- group subjects reporting these two difficulties also almost hit 50%. This result suggests that our students may lack aural input in the target language quantitatively; as a result, their biggest problems have much to do with the prosodic features of spoken language. Also, their sticking to detour thinking mode (i.e. via Chinese translation) could be related to the traditional reading-grammar-translation approach of English teaching in this country.

1.3 Questionnaire-Comparison

1.3.1 Overview of Yes- vs. No-groups in Strategy Perception, Strategy Use and Listening Difficulties

Proportionally more subjects with listening experience (the Yes- group) than subjects without listening experience (the No-group) identified the usefulness of the two specific strategies (i.e., "situational information as clues" and "questions as guidelines").

Regarding strategy use, we simply could not figure out any major difference between the Yes- and No- groups in terms of the rank of frequency. Yet a closer look at the percentage of strategy use quickly revealed that the Yes-group students were more likely to use strategies helpful for comprehension while more No-group students chose the items of "wild guess" and "skip," which have not been reported as good listeners' strategies in literature.

As for listening difficulties, the between-group comparison produced a reverse result -- that is, the No-group students demonstrated proportionally higher than the Yes-group ones in all the items except "failure to associate pronunciation with meaning." It is possible that the No-group subjects' proficiency is so little that they fail to segment certain stream of sounds into words that they may be able to recognize. In contrast, the Yes-group subjects recognize some sound clusters are a word, but they can not associate the word's pronunciation with its meaning.

1.3.2 Strategy Perception vs. Strategy Use in Yes- and No- groups

Subjects were divided into two groups: those who reported 5 or 4 as the usefulness of the skill (SIC-45 or QG-45, i.e. "perception +") and the rest who chose 1-3 (SIC-non45 or Qg-non45, i.e. "perception -"). In each of the groups, whether they actually used the skill was the basis for subdivision. It could happen that

- 1) a learner perceived "situational information is extremely/very useful for comprehension" and did "listen to the situational information carefully" (i.e. "perception +, use +"), or
- 2) the skill was not considered as useful and thus the learner did not use it (i.e. "perception -, use -"), or
- 3) their perception of the strategy was inconsistent with their use of it (i.e. "perception +, use -" or vice versa).

We would be happy for the occurrence of Case 1; students pertaining to Case 2 are not strategy-wise enough; Case 3 shows there is discrepancy between students' strategy perception and strategy use.

This section contains the following comparisons:

- a) Questionnaire item b-1 vs. Questionnaire item d-5
(i.e. The Perception of SIC vs. the Use of Effective 5)
- b) Questionnaire item b-1 vs. Questionnaire item c-3
(i.e. The Perception of SIC vs. the Use of Infer 3)
- c) Questionnaire item b-2 vs. Questionnaire item d-9

(i.e. The Perception of QG vs. the Use of Effective 9)

Effective 5: "listening to the situational information carefully"

Infer 3: "get the answer from the later part in the second recording"

Effective 9: "use the questions as guidelines."

The results are as follows:

- a) The "perception +, use +" group consisted 33% of the subjects while 29% of the subjects made up the group of "perception -, use -." And there were about as many subjects of "perception +, use -" as those of "perception -, use +" in both Yes- and No- groups. (see Table 1)
- b) Table 2 shows the cases of "perception +, use +" were composed of only 19% of the subjects; the cases of "perception -, use -" had a higher percentage (26%). And there were not few subjects (63% and 50% of the subjects in the Yes- and No- groups respectively) showing discrepancy between their perception and use of the strategy, especially the No-group, in which the students of "perception +, use -" were statistically more than those of "perception -, use +."
- c) About 70% of the whole subjects agreed that "questions" may be extremely/very useful for topic identification. However, 60% of the QG-45 ("perception +") group did not actually use the skill of "questions as guidelines." Table 3 says statistically that such "perception +, use -" cases were more than the contrasting pairs of the "perception -, use +" group.

2. High-group vs. Low-group

Students who scored above the average in the given test are more than those scoring under the average. Precisely speaking, the High-group consisted of 154 subjects whereas the Low-group had 122 subjects.

2.1 Questionnaire-Descriptive Statistics

Regarding the descriptive statistics of strategy perception, strategy use and listening difficulties in the High-group (N=154) and Low-group (N=122), the results seem to have been duplicated from those of the Yes- and No- groups in two ways. First, there were more subjects considering the usefulness of SIC/QG than those not in each group (56% for the usefulness of SIC, 71% for the Usefulness of QG). Second, much like the Yes-/No- groups, the strategies/ difficulties reported by half or more subjects of each group are as follows:

1) Inference Strategy:	High-	Low-
"guess based on understood parts"	91%	87%
2) Effective Strategy:		
"listening in cluster"	62%	---
"listening to situational information carefully"	56%	---
"guess based on understood parts"	74%	68%
"repeated listening"	69%	71%

3) Compensatory Strategy:

"guess from context"	84%	63%
"repeated listening"	90%	89%

4) Listening Difficulty:

"obsessed with Chinese translation"	53%	52%
"failure to recognize words in acoustic form"	53%	60%
"fast speed"	58%	70%
"small vocabulary"	54%	56%

Actually the High-group subjects showed to correspond with the Yes-group subjects, and the Low-group students were echoed by the No-group ones.

2.2 Questionnaire-Comparison

2.2.1 Overview of High- vs. Low-in Strategy perception, Strategy Use and Listening Difficulties

Like the results in the descriptive statistics, a further step to compare the High- and Low- groups only finds the results seem to have been repeated from the comparison between the Yes- and No- groups. That is, their contrast features lie in the percentage difference between each strategy use and listening difficulty not in the items reported by the most subjects of each group. The High-group enjoyed the higher percentage as far as strategy use is concerned, while the Low-group exceeded in the percentages in the aspect of listening difficulties.

2.2.2 Strategy Perception vs. Strategy Use in High- and Low- groups

This section includes the following comparisons:

- a) Questionnaire item b-1 vs. Questionnaire item d-5
(i.e. The Perception of SIC vs. the Use of Effective 5)
- b) Questionnaire item b-1 vs. Questionnaire item c-3
(i.e. The Perception of SIC vs. the Use of Infer 3)
- c) Questionnaire item b-2 vs. Questionnaire item d-9
(i.e. The Perception of QG vs. the Use of Effective 9)

The results are as follows:

- a) Table 4 shows 33% of the subjects belonged to the "perception +, use +" group, and 29%, the "perception -, use -" group. As for the discrepancy between the perception of SIC and the use of Effective 5. It was composed of 36% of the subjects in the High-group and 42% in the Low-group. But this discrepancy was not so considerable as to interpret whether the students with perception only or the students simply using it were statistically more.
- b) As shown in Table 5, only 19% of the subjects perceived the usefulness of SIC and really used it; in contrast, as high as 31% of the subjects belonged to the "perception -, use -" group. In addition, there were 50% subjects in both the High- and Low- groups showing discrepancy cases, there were significantly more students who perceived but did not (maybe could not) use this strategy than those vice versa.

Considering the result of a) and b) together, we are implied that extracting the required information from an on-going text is even more difficult for our students than simply following the instructions.

- c) The discrepancy between the perception of QG and the use of Effective 9 is found to have no less subjects than the above two comparisons. In fact, they were composed of 58% and 48% of the subjects in the High- and Low- groups respectively. Again, this result is disappointing: there were statistically more students with the perception only than those who used it but did not give a positive report of its usefulness. (see Table 6)

Discussions and Conclusions

1. Demographic Structure of the Student Population

This study shows that 40% of the total 276 subjects had previous contact of listening text (the Yes-group) either through classroom teaching, the cram school, or self-study. But only 65% of the Yes-group scored above average in the given test; on the other hand, about half of those without listening experience (the No-group) scored above average. This result suggests that a growing number of high school students have been offered (or have made) opportunities to learn English through listening. However, the Yes-group's not-so-satisfactory performance may explain that their aural exposure seems not to have been provided regularly, systematically and effectively.

2. Strategy perception, Strategy Use, and Listening Difficulties

Corresponding to the listening tasks in the given test, the author designed the questionnaire with a focus only on the perception of two strategies "situational information as clues" (SIC) and "questions as guidelines" (QG). The result shows that more students perceived the usefulness of SIC/QG for listening comprehension than those not. The strategy use was investigated in three areas: inference strategy, effective strategy (the ways to deal with the text effectively), and compensatory strategy (the ways to deal with difficulties). The strategy/difficulty reported to have been used/confronted by half or more students are shown in Table 7. Generally speaking, these findings are consistent with related studies.

3. Interaction between Listening Experience (or Listening Proficiency) and Strategy Perception (or Strategy Use, or Listening Difficulties)

3.1 Yes- group vs. No- group

We can not present any new findings in terms of the rank of frequency in the areas of strategy use and listening difficulties. Yet a closer look at the statistics quickly revealed that the Yes-group students enjoyed higher percentage in every strategy which is helpful for comprehension whereas the No-group exceeded in the items such as "wild guess" and "skip." As for the difficulties, a reverse result is found; that is, the No-group students demonstrated proportionally higher than the Yes-group ones in all but one item, "failure to associate pronunciation with meaning" (Yes- vs. No- =43% vs. 36%). It is possibly because that the No-

group subjects had skipped (or given up) exactly the part where they were to confront with the difficulty of associating pronunciation with meaning.

Another point worthy of noting is the low percentage of students who perceived and really used the strategies, and the high percentage of cases showing discrepancy between strategy perception and strategy use in listening. In the following comparisons, there were constantly more students in both groups declaring the usefulness of a certain strategy but not using it than those vice versa. Some of them even showed statistically significant in terms of difference:

	Yes-	No-
a) the perception of SIC vs. the use of effective 5	n.s.	n.s.
b) the perception of SIC vs. the use of infer 3	n.s.	*
c) the perception of QG vs. the use of effective 9	**	**

(n.s.: non significant at 0.05 level; *: $p < 0.01$; **: $p < 0.001$)

3.2 High-group vs. Low-group

The similarities/differences between the High- and Low- groups seemed to have been duplicated from those between the Yes- and No- groups in the following comparisons:

- a) strategy perception of "situational information as clues" (SIC) and "questions as guidelines" (QG);
- b) strategy use, including the use of inference strategy, effective strategy, and compensatory strategy;
- c) listening difficulties;
- d) strategy perception vs. strategy use.

The High-group showed to correspond with the Yes-group while the Low-group was echoed by the No-group.

Pedagogical Implications

Findings from this study suggest that students' strategy use and difficulty in listening vary with their learning experience and proficiency to some extent. Students with listening experience and/or with more proficiency are likely to show higher percentage in strategy use but lower percentage in listening difficulties than those vice versa. It thus can be expected that strategy training could further facilitate their learning to listen. However, the similarity of their favorite strategies in all groups (Yes- and No-, High- and Low-) also suggests their metacognitive knowledge about listening is limited. For this reason, teachers should attend to helping students explore a wider range of strategies so that they may not always resort to the most frequently used strategies, say, "repeated listening," and "guess based on understood parts." Other strategies such as "making use of world knowledge," "listening for key words" and others are not meant to replace their favorite ones but to provide more alternatives to acquire their listening proficiency. Besides, the discrepancy between students' strategy perception and strategy use implies there is a gap between "know that" and "know how." Therefore, the point is how to make students "know how" as well as "know that" --which is a focus of strategy training.

Table 1:

The Perception of SIC vs. the Use of Effective 5 in Yes- and No- groups

	Not Use Effective 5 (Use-)			Use Effective 5 (Use+)		
	Yes- N=110	No- N=166	Total N=276	Yes- N=110	No- N=166	Total N=276
SIC- 45 (Perception +)	23 21%	34 20%	57 21%	41 37%	49 30%	90 33%
SIC- non45 (Perception -)	23 21%	57 34%	80 29%	23 21%	26 16%	49 18%
McNemar Test	Yes- : Non significant at 0.05 level No- : Non significant at 0.05 level Total : Non significant at 0.05 level					

* SIC-45: choosing 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Situational Information as Clues"

* SIC-non45: choosing 1-3 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Situational Information as Clues"

* Effective 5: "listening to the situational information carefully"

Table 2:

The Perception of SIC vs. the Use of Infer 3 in Yes- and No- groups

	Not Use Infer 3 (Use-)			Use Infer 3 (Use+)		
	Yes- N=110	No- N=166	Total N=276	Yes- N=110	No- N=166	Total N=276
SIC- 45 (Perception +)	40 36%	54 33%	94 34%	24 22%	29 17%	53 19%
SIC- non45 (Perception -)	16 15%	55 33%	71 26%	30 27%	28 17%	58 21%
McNemar Test	Yes- : Non significant at 0.05 level No- : $df=1$, $\chi^2=8.24$, $P<0.01$ Total : $df=1$, $\chi^2=8.53$, $P<0.01$					

* SIC-45: choosing 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Situational Information as Clues"

* SIC-non45: choosing 1-3 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Situational Information as Clues"

* Infer 3: "getting the answer from the later part in the second recording"

Table 3:

The Perception of QG vs. the Use of Effective 9 in Yes- and No- groups

	Not Use Effective 9 (Use-)			Use Effective 9 (Use+)		
	Yes- N=110	No- N=166	Total N=276	Yes- N=110	No- N=166	Total N=276
QG- 45 (Perception +)	48 44%	65 39%	113 41%	34 31%	42 25%	76 28%
QG- non45 (Perception -)	21 19%	32 19%	53 19%	7 6%	27 16%	34 12%
McNemar Test	Yes- : df=1, $\chi^2=30.56$, $p<0.001$ No- : df=1, $\chi^2=15.7$, $p<0.001$ Total : df=1, $\chi^2=42.46$, $p<0.001$					

- * QG-45: choosing 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Questions as Guidelines"
- * QG-non45: choosing 1-3 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Questions as Guidelines"
- * Effective 9: "using the questions as guidelines"

Table 4:

The Perception of SIC vs. the Use of Effective 5 in High- and Low- groups

	Not Use Effective 5 (Use-)			Use Effective 5 (Use+)		
	High- N=154	Low- N=122	Total N=276	High- N=154	Low- N=122	Total N=276
SIC- 45 (Perception +)	27 18%	30 25%	57 21%	59 38%	31 25%	90 33%
SIC- non45 (Perception -)	40 26%	40 33%	80 29%	28 18%	21 17%	49 18%
McNemar Test	High- : non significant at 0.05 level Low- : non significant at 0.05 level Total : non significant at 0.05 level					

- * SIC-45: choosing 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Situational Information as Clues"
- * SIC-non45: choosing 1-3 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Situational Information as Clues"
- * Effective 5: "listening to the situational information carefully"

Table 5:

The Perception of SIC vs. the Use of Infer 3 in High- and Low- groups

	Not Use Infer 3 (Use-)			Use Infer 3 (Use+)		
	High- N=154	Low- N=122	Total N=276	High- N=154	Low- N=122	Total N=276
SIC- 45 (Perception +)	50 32%	44 36%	94 34%	36 23%	17 14%	53 19%
SIC- non45 (Perception -)	41 27%	44 36%	85 31%	27 18%	17 14%	44 16%
McNemar Test	High- : df=1, $x^2=6.87$, $p<0.01$ Low- : df=1, $x^2=11.95$, $p<0.001$ Total : df=1, $x^2=18.12$, $p<0.001$					

* SIC-45: choosing 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Situational Information as Clues"

* SIC-non45: choosing 1-3 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Situational Information as Clues"

* Infer 3: "getting the answer from the later part in the second recording"

Table 6:

The Perception of QG vs. the Use of Effective 9 in High- and Low- groups

	Not Use Effective 9 (Use-)			Use Effective 9 (Use+)		
	High- N=154	Low- N=122	Total N=276	High- N=154	Low- N=122	Total N=276
QG- 45 (Perception +)	72 47%	41 34%	113 41%	37 24%	39 32%	76 28%
QG- non45 (Perception -)	28 18%	25 20%	53 19%	17 11%	17 14%	34 12%
McNemar Test	High- : df=1, $x^2=33.99$, $p<0.001$ Low- : df=1, $x^2=9.93$, $p<0.01$ Total : df=1, $x^2=42.46$, $p<0.01$					

* QG-45: choosing 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Questions as Guidelines"

* QG-non45: choosing 1-3 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of "Questions as Guidelines"

* Effective 9: "using the questions as guidelines"

Table 7:

Overview of Strategy Use and Listening Difficulties Reported by Half or More Subjects in Yes-/No- and High-/Low- Groups

	High-	Low-	Total	Yes-	No-
1) Inference Strategy:					
"guess based on understood parts"	91%	87%	89%	90%	89%
2) Effective Strategy:					
"listening in cluster"	62%	----	54%	63%	---
"listening to situational information carefully"	56%	----	50%	58%	---
"guess based on understood parts"	74%	68%	71%	73%	70%
"repeated listening"	69%	71%	70%	68%	71%
3) Compensation Strategy:					
"guess from context"	84%	63%	75%	80%	71%
"repeated listening"	90%	89%	89%	88%	90%
4) Listening Difficulty:					
"obsessed with Chinese translation"	53%	52%	53%	----	55%
"failure to recognize words in acoustic form"	53%	60%	56%	55%	56%
"fast speed"	58%	70%	63%	58%	67%
"small vocabulary"	54%	56%	55%	----	60%

References

- Chang, Yu-lien. et al. 1992 listening Difficulties and Learner Strategies of Non-native Speakers. Paper Presented at the Ninth Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China, held at National Chung-Hsin University.
- Nyikos, Martha and Rebecca Oxford. 1993. A Factor Analytic Study of Language-Learning Strategy Use: Interpretations from Information-Processing Theory and Social Psychology. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77/i: 11-22.
- O'Malley, J. Michael and Anna Uhi Chamot. 1990. *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, Rebecca L. 1990. *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know*. Boston, Mass.: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Tanka, Judith and Paul Most. 1990. *Interactions I: A Listening/Speaking Skills Book*. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing Co.

Appendix 1: Listening Test

Dept.

No:

Name:

Interactions I -- Chapter 1

Part One: Getting the Main Ideas

A. Jack, Tom and Herb are new students at Faber College. They meet in the student lounge of their rooming house. Listen to the conversation. You may not understand every word. Listen for the main idea.

B. Listen again. The important words are "stressed"; these words give the main idea.

Example: My name is Tom.

Now fill in the blanks, which are to be of some missing stressed words (the other underlined words are also stressed ones for the conversation).

Jack: Hi! How are you _____ ?

Tom : Oh, hi! You're Jack, right?

Jack: That's _____ . What's your _____ again ?

Tom : Tom. Tom Riley.

Jack: _____ , this is my _____ Herb.

Tom : Hi, Herb.

Herb: Nice to _____ you.

Tom : Where are you _____ ?

Herb: Texas.

Tom : Oh, yeah, you have an _____ !

Herb: Ha! _____ the ones with the _____ !

D. Now listen to the rest of conversation. Underline the stressed words.

Jack: Listen, Tom. We're really hungry. Do you want to get something to eat with us?

Tom : I can't. I have to meet my new roommate, Kenji. I think he's Japanese.

Herb: Okay. See you later, then. We're up in 212. Stop by anytime.

Tom : Hey, we're on the same floor. Room 220.

F. Answer the following questions. You may answer them in either English or Chinese.

(Not Recorded)

1. Does one student forget Tom's name? _____
2. Do all those students live on the same floor? _____
3. Why does Tom think Herb is from Texas? _____
4. What can't Tom go with the others? _____

Part Two: Summarizing the Main Ideas

A. Listen to the following speech. You will not understand every word.

Think about these questions:

1. Who is speaking?
2. Who is listening to the speech?
3. Where are they?

B. Did the speaker say the following?

Welcome to Faber College.	Yes	No
Faber is a great school.	Yes	No
We hope you like it.	Yes	No
A campus tour begins in fifteen minutes.	Yes	No

C. If you answer *yes* to all statements, you understood the *main* or *important* ideas. Remember: You don't need to understand all words to understand the main message.

D. One of the students asks the tour guide this question: "Can you give us an idea of some good places to eat?" Listen to the answer to her question. The answer has two parts. Summarize each part in either English or Chinese. This is not a dictation. Do not copy or translate every word.

(Vocabulary: the student union, the Jones Hall cafeteria, the North Campus Espresso Bar)

Part A:

Part B:

Part Three: Making Inferences

Listen to the conversation among Jack, Tom, and Kenji. Circle the answer to each question you hear, and write down any two key words/phrases that help you make the inference for each item.

1. a. at a horse race
b. at the bookstore
c. at a pizza restaurant
2. a. another student in their class
b. a waiter
c. the teaching assistant in their chemistry class
3. a. It's a little unusual.
b. It's terrible.
c. It's fun.
4. a. at the recreation center only
b. on the telephone
c. by paying \$5
5. a. He is sure he and Kenji will win.
b. He is sure they will lose.
c. He is not ready.

(Source: Adapted from Tanka and Most's *Interactions I -- A Listening/ Speaking Skills Book*, Second Edition, Chapter 1.)

Appendix 2: Questionnaire

系級：_____ 學號：_____ 姓名：_____

- a. 你在中學（含國、高中）時是否修習過聽力課程或接受過課外的聽力訓練（含自修）？ 是__ 否__
- _____ b. 你認為正式對話前的情境（situation）說明或提示（如Part One--A，Part Two--A）對了解錄音內容有幫助嗎？
（請以1~5表示，5表示幫助極大，依序遞減，1表示毫無幫助）
- _____ c. 你認為在聽錄音內容前先看習作題目（如Part One--F）是否有助於你對錄音內容的掌握？（請以1~5表示，5表示幫助極大，依序遞減，1表示毫無幫助）
- d. 對於推論題（Making Inferences，如Part Three）之作答，你是否使用下列技巧？
1. 已聽懂全部或大部分內容 是__ 否__
 2. 從聽懂的部分篩選出關鍵字（Key Words），然後加以推測 是__ 否__
 3. 由第二次對話中獲得答案 是__ 否__
 4. 隨意猜 是__ 否__
 5. 其他（請說明）_____
- e. 你聽錄音內容時是否運用了下列技巧？
1. 從頭開始逐字的聽，務期聽懂每一個字 是__ 否__
 2. 以字串或片，偶爾略去一些不重要或不清楚的字 是__ 否__
 3. 運用文法知識，幫助了解（如If子句為條件子句） 是__ 否__
 4. 利用語調幫助了解 是__ 否__
 5. 仔細聽對話前的說明，以掌握主題 是__ 否__
 6. 利用與主題相關的知識或以往經驗，幫助了解 是__ 否__
 7. 找出與主題相關的關鍵字 是__ 否__
 8. 由聽懂的部分猜不懂的部分 是__ 否__
 9. 由問題猜內容的主題 是__ 否__
 10. 邊聽邊記（作筆記） 是__ 否__
 11. 重複聽 是__ 否__
 12. 其他（請說明）_____
- f. 聽不懂時，你是否使用下列技巧？
1. 略過去 是__ 否__
 2. 根據前後文的意思猜 是__ 否__

3. 重複聽 是__ 否__
4. 隨意猜 是__ 否__
5. 放棄，無心繼續往下聽 是__ 否__
6. 其他（請說明）_____

g. 聽不懂的原因很多，你是否遭遇下列困難？

1. 一聽不懂就開始心慌 是__ 否__
2. 想不起某些字的中文解釋 是__ 否__
3. 認得的字卻不見得聽得懂 是__ 否__
4. 字音和字意連貫不起來 是__ 否__
5. 對所謂的重音字（stressed words）沒有概念 是__ 否__
6. 速度太快 是__ 否__
7. 字彙太少 是__ 否__
8. 其他（請說明）_____

Appendix 3: Specific Terms and Abbreviations in this paper

Compensatory strategies: see Strategy

Effective strategies: see Strategy

Effective 5: see Strategy

Effective 9: see Strategy

Group

High-group: those subjects who were scoring above the average in the given test administered in a classroom situation

Low-group: those who were scoring under the average in the given test administered in a classroom situation

No-group: those who had not had previous listening experience

Yes-group: those who had had previous listening experience

High-group: see Group

Infer 3: see Strategy

Low-group: see Group

No-group: see Group

Perception

Perception + : see SIC-45, QG-45.

Perception - : see SIC-non45, QG-non45.

QG

QG: "Questions as Guidelines"

QG-45: subjects choosing 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of QG. They are also marked as "perception +."

QG-non45: subjects choosing 1-3 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of QG. They are also marked as "perception -."

SIC

SIC: "Situational Information as Clues"

SIC-45: subjects choosing 4 or 5 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of SIC. They are also marked as "perception +."

SIC-non45: subjects choosing 1-3 on a scale of 1-5 to show the usefulness of SIC. They are also marked as "perception -."

Strategy

compensatory strategies: ways to deal with listening difficulties

effective strategies: ways to deal with the text effectively

effective 5: referring to the fifth effective strategy listed in the questionnaire, i.e. "listening to the situational information carefully"

effective 9: referring to the ninth effective strategy listed in the questionnaire, i.e. "using the questions as guidelines"

infer 3: referring to the third inference strategy listed in the questionnaire, i.e. "getting the answer from the later part in the second recording"

Use

use + : subjects actually using the investigated strategy

use - : subjects not using the investigated strategy

Yes-group: see Group