An Investigation of Metacognitive Strategies Used by EFL Listeners

Huei-Chun Teng & Chi-Yeu Chan
National Taiwan University of Science and Technology
June 26, 2008

The main intent of the present study is to find out what metacognitive strategies Taiwanese college students employ in EFL listening process. Four research questions explored in the study include: (1) What are the metacognitive strategies adopted by EFL listeners when they listen? (2) What are the differences of metacognitive strategies between proficient and less proficient listeners in listening process? (3) What are the metacognitive strategies of EFL listeners when they listen to familiar and unfamiliar passages? (4) What is the relationship between EFL listeners' metacognitive strategies and their listening comprehension performance? Listeners' comprehension was evaluated from written recall as product data, whereas metacognitive listening strategies were identified from retrospective verbalization as process data. Listeners' recall protocol was evaluated with pausal units from Johnson (1970). For retrospective verbalization, the transcribed data was analyzed based on the four categories of metacognitive strategies from Vandergrift (1997), i.e., planning, monitoring, evaluation, and problem identification. Results show that proficient listeners generally adopted more metacognitive listening strategies of "planning", "monitoring", and "evaluation" than less proficient listeners did. Additionally, the results from both written recall protocol and strategy frequency affirmed the influence of cultural background knowledge on EFL listening comprehension as well as metacognitive strategy use.

Keywords: EFL, listening comprehension, metacognitive strategies, cultural background knowledge

Introduction

Before1990s, there has been little research that would directly clarify what listeners actually did while listening to oral texts in academic settings. Vandergrift (1997) addressed that knowledge about listening comprehension strategies is still vague because attention of most language learning strategy research has been devoted to reading, writing, and speaking. It is salient that few studies provided detailed empirical analysis of comprehension strategies during listening process. The current study will explore the significant role of metacognitive strategies during EFL listening comprehension process.

The purpose of the study is to conduct research in a design that examines the metacognitive strategies of EFL learners in listening comprehension process. Specifically, the present study

will investigate two variables related to metacognitive strategy use, i.e. listening proficiency, and cultural background knowledge. The major research questions explored in the study will be: (1) What are the metacognitive strategies adopted by EFL listeners when they listen? (2) What are the differences of metacognitive strategies between proficient and less proficient listeners in listening process? (3) What are the metacognitive strategies of EFL listeners when they listen to familiar and unfamiliar passages? (4) What is the relationship between EFL listeners' metacogtive strategies and their listening comprehension performance?

For the past ten years, researches related to L2 learning strategies and learning strategy instruction became an academic focus in language teaching and learning. Learning strategies were further researched in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Rubin (1994) pointed out that although second language strategy research has expanded in recent years, the number of studies in listening comprehension is relatively small, and the research base for listening strategies is even more limited (cited in Vandergrift, 1999). Listening became a fundamental skill due to the fact that most students are exposed mostly to good language models (teacher and realistic recordings) instead of the imperfect utterances of classmates in classrooms. It is efficient for students to develop tools to become more effective and autonomous in absorbing language input.

This study will mainly adopt qualitative method to analyze EFL listeners' performance both on written recall protocol and immediate retrospective interview as well as their attitudes in semi-structured interviewing. The main intent of the study is to find out what metacognitive strategies Taiwanese college students use in the EFL listening comprehension process.

Literature Review

The role of language learning strategies has been promoted for the past decade. Many studies revealed that students will perform better if they use learning strategies appropriately. Learning strategies help teacher to train students to be independent learners and to be competent learners. Under the trend of Communicative Language Teaching, learning language is to be able to communicate. Oxford (1990, p.10) stated, "strategies are especially important for language learning because they are tools for active, self-directed involvement, which is essential for developing communicative competence." Different from the traditional teaching methods that regard teachers as authorities, directors, and lecturers, teacher's role has been recently transferred to a facilitator, a consultant, or a co-communicator. It has been reported (Wenden, 1985) that teachers need to have these new teaching capacities which include identifying students' learning strategies, conducting training of learning strategies, and helping learners become more independent.

In the recent decade, more and more studies involved the research of L2 listening comprehension strategies. Lee (1997) proposed a study to explore the listening strategy use of Chinese junior college EFL students in learning settings of the classroom and / or at home. A

Chinese Listening Comprehension Questionnaire (LCQ) developed by the researcher was administered to the students. Additionally, to explore frequencies of the EFL listening comprehension strategy use, Teng (1997) conducted a study to investigate the EFL listening comprehension strategies used by college freshmen in Taiwan. Similar study related to frequencies of EFL listening strategy use was conducted by Chang (2003), which aimed to find significant difference of listening strategy use between high- and low- level college students and whether high-level students display higher frequency of listening strategy use than low-level ones. In addition, Chien & Li (1997) presented a model for listening comprehension based on strategies and processes employed by Chinese learners of English at an intermediate level. To investigate EFL listening comprehension strategies from different perspective, Fong, *et al*. (1998) conducted a study to examine the listening strategies more frequently used by effective EFL listeners who receive higher scores on think- aloud task. In order to explore the influence of listening strategy instruction on EFL learners, Teng (2003) conducted a study to examine whether listening strategy instruction can facilitate college students' use of EFL listening strategies and their perception toward the instruction of EFL listening strategies. From the survey of various listening strategy researches, it is significant to expand research dimensions. It has been proved that strategies are helpful for learners; however, more studies are required to provide practical instructional tips for teachers to guide and enhance students' listening strategy use cognitively, metacognitively, and socio-affectively.

As shown in some studies, learning is a process of the interaction between metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive strategies. The model of Nelson & Narens (1990), clearly depicted the relationship of learning and metacognition. Learning is a conscious process, which composes of cognition and metacognition, strategies and comprehension. Metacognitive knowledge, defined as "knowing about knowing", helps learners be aware of what they are doing in learning process. Therefore, learner's metacognitive knowledge and strategies are key elements of language development.

Furthermore, it is a fact that research of metacognitive strategies has grown for years. A large amount of studies were related to strategy instruction. In order to enhance metacognitive listening strategy instruction, many scholars proposed various instructional tips, such as Anderson & Vandergrift's verbal report formats (1996), Goh's listening diaries (1997), Vandergrift's performance checklists (1999) and listening tasks (2002, 2003), Goh's strategy practice for improving listening comprehension (2000), and Rost's pedagogical approach for developing metacognitive strategies for L2 listeners (2002). Compared with studies of listening comprehension strategies, researches of metacognitive listening strategies were obviously well developed and practically contributed. However, the amount of researches on metacognitive listening strategies is apparently less than studies of listening comprehension strategies, especially on EFL listening. Therefore, the present study aims to explore EFL

listeners' metacognitive strategy use in order to provide abundant instructional information.

Methodology

Participants

Listeners for the present study were eight Taiwanese college students from the Department of Applied Foreign Language in a university of central Taiwan. Due to the reason that listeners of English majored who have sufficient English learning background are more appropriate for investigating metacognitive listening strategies, the present study adopted purposeful sampling. Students from Department of Applied Foreign Languages were considered to be major participants.

Instrumentation

Four different kinds of research instruments were constructed for the present study, including listening test, listening passages, listening tasks, and interview. The listening test is based on the high-intermediate listening comprehension test of GEPT. In this listening comprehension test, there are three parts and forty-five items in total. For making the grading easier, each correct item represents two points; therefore, the total score is 90. The test lasts for thirty minutes. Eighteen college students participate in the listening comprehension test. The mean of all listeners' GEPT score is 53. Based on the grouping criteria, participants were divided into two proficiency groups. Participants whose score is higher than 60 are classified as proficient listeners whereas participants whose score is lower than 36 are classified as less proficient listeners. On the basis of GEPT score, eight students, four proficient listeners and four less proficient listeners, were selected as the main participants of the current study.

The listening passages used in the present study were two narrative texts selected from the book entitled *English Digest* (high level of GEPT, April and March, 2001). One passage entitled *Service with a smile – Taiwan's Betel Nut Beauties* described the phenomenon of betel nut beauties in Taiwan. The other passage entitled *What was St. Patrick?* described the origin of an Irish national day.

Two listening tasks were adopted in the current study to measure the listeners' metacognitive strategy use and comprehension of the listening passages under the effects of different cultural background knowledge. One was listening immediate recall protocol, constructed to examine the listeners' performance in recalling the listening passages. The other comprehension task was immediate retrospective verbalization in an hour-long session in Chinese verbal reports with English listening passages.

Finally, each listener would be interviewed for knowing more about listener's attitudes towards their metacognitive listening strategy use. The interview guide of this study includes twelve questions, which are mainly based on Oxford's study (1990). Thus, the results of the study would be not only the scores of the participants' listening performance, but also a

description of their attitudes.

Procedures

The current study adopted immediate retrospective verbalization (IRV) and written recall (WR) protocol to collect data from eight excerpts of EFL listeners. The adoption of multimethods can avoid the flaw of single method that might be critisized. To familiarize each listener with the immediate retrospective verbalization and recall protocol task, the data collection consisted of two sessions, training and formal experimental sessions. In order to control for practice effects and avoid the order effect, four listeners were informed to write down their recall protocol for the first time and verbalized their thoughts for the second time (WR → IRV). Other four listeners were told to verbalize first, and then wrote down their recall protocol (IRV → WR). There were no time limitations for these two listening tasks, i.e., immediate retrospective verbalization and written recall protocol. Listeners verbalized what they were thinking as many as they could. They wrote down everything they remembered as well. All data collection sessions were conducted on an individual basis and were audio recorded for later verbatim transcription and coding.

Data Analysis

Two types of data were collected from the immediate retrospective verbalization, and written recall protocol. For rating these two listening tasks, the researcher and another trained rater analyzed each participant's transcription. The transcribed data from the immediate retrospective verbalization were analyzed based on the four categories of metacognitive strategies from the study of Vandergrift (1997). There are some sub-categories under the four main metacognitive strategies. From the results of the immediate retrospective verbalization, the inter-rater reliability is 0.80. As for written recall protocol, the data were scored on the basis of pausal units from Johnson (1970). The two listening passages were separated into pausal units based on the original speakers' pause locus. The order of pausal units was ranked similarly with the original passages. The score for each pausal unit is all the same. Every retained pausal unit receives one score. From the results of the written recall protocol, the inter-rater reliability is 0.91.

Results & Discussion

The main intent of the present study is to investigate the metacognitive strategies EFL listeners use when they listen and to compare the differences of metacognitive strategies between proficient and less proficient listeners in listening process. Table 1 to Table 4 displays the frequency of proficient and less proficient listeners' metacognitive strategy use. Each identified frequency represents one point. Table 1 presents the average frequency identified by two raters. Particularly, proficient listeners used twice as many "self-management" as less

proficient listeners in the category of "planning." Nevertheless, less proficient listeners utilized more "directed attention" than proficient listeners.

Table 1 Frequency of Metacognitive Strategies on Planning

Metacognitive listening strategies	English proficiency					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
MONITORING	N	%	N	%	N	%
2a.Comprehension Monitoring	4	2.96	4	3.45	8	3.19
2b.Auditory monitoring	1	0.74	2	1.72	3	1.19
2c.Double-check monitoring	4	2.96	4	3.45	8	3.19
Total	9	6.67	10	8.62	19	7.57

In the category of "monitoring", the frequency of all listeners is almost the same, except for "auditory monitoring." In general, proficient listeners deployed more strategies of "monitoring" than less proficient listeners did.

Table 2 Frequency of Metacognitive Strategies on Monitoring

Metacognitive listening strategies	English proficiency					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
PLANNING	N	%	N	%	N	%
1a.Advance organization	1	0.74	3	2.59	4	1.59
1b.Directed attention	29	21.5	23	19.83	52	20.71
1c.Selective attention	13	9.63	14	12.07	27	10.76
1d.Self management	7	5.19	14	12.07	21	8.37
Total	50	37.4	54	46.55	104	41.43

In the category of "evaluation", proficient listeners overall used strategies more frequently than less proficient listeners, especially "strategy evaluation." Compared with less proficient listeners, proficient listeners are more aware of their own strategy use. The frequency of "strategy evaluation" used by proficient listeners is twice as many the deployment of the strategy by less proficient listeners. Compared with other three main categories, "evaluation" shows the significant difference of strategy use between proficient and less proficient listeners.

Table 3 Frequency of Metacognitive Strategies on Evaluation

Metacognitive listening strategies	English proficiency					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	57	42.22	26	22.41	83	33.07

Additionally, the results from the category of "problem identification" indicate that less proficient listeners encountered more problems than proficient listeners did during listening. Problems of vocabulary, content, and topic familiarity were presented by less proficient listeners. The total frequency of "problem identification" shows the great difference of proficiency between the two groups of listeners.

Table 4 Frequency of Metacognitive Strategies on Problem Identification

Metacognitive listening strategies	English proficiency					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
EVALUATION	N	%	N	%	N	%
3a.Performance evaluation	7	5.19	6	5.17	13	5.18
3b.Strategy evaluation	12	8.89	20	17.24	32	12.75
Total	19	14.07	26	22.41	45	17.93

Accordingly, from the data in Table 1 to Table 4, proficient listeners generally adopted more metacognitive listening strategies of "planning", "monitoring", and "evaluation" than less proficient listeners did. However, less proficient listeners used more metacognitive listening strategies of "problem identification" than proficient listeners did. In general, among the four main categories, EFL listeners deployed the strategies of "planning" the most frequently (41.43 %), the second most frequent strategy, "problem identification" (33.07 %), the third most frequent strategy, "evaluation" (17.93 %), and "monitoring" (7.57 %).

In the current research, results displayed that the metacognitive strategies more frequently adopted by EFL listeners when they listen include "Directed Attention" and "Selective Attention" in planning, "Strategy Evaluation" in evaluation, and "Problem Identification." From the results, EFL listeners incline to adopt some strategies more often than others. As a whole, EFL listeners use most of the four main categories of metacognitive strategies when they listen.

Moreover, results of the present study indicated that there were some major differences of metacognitive strategies between proficient and less proficient listeners in listening process. According to Rost (2002), there is a consensus that use of metacognitive strategies – planning

for listening, self-monitoring of comprehension processes, and evaluation of one's own performance and problems – are associated with proficient listeners. The notion is consistent with the findings of the present study that proficient listeners adopted more metacognitive listening strategies of "Planning", "Monitoring", and "Evaluation" than less proficient listeners did. Particularly in the category of "evaluation", proficient listeners overall used strategies more frequently than less proficient listeners did, especially "strategy evaluation." Compared with less proficient listeners, proficient listeners are more aware of their own strategy use. The frequency of "strategy evaluation" by proficient listeners is double the frequency by less proficient listeners. This might indicate that proficient listeners listened more strategically and they are more conscious about their own strategy use. Apparently, listening strategy of "evaluation" requires listeners' self-awareness more than other three categories. Additionally, the results from the category of "problem identification" indicate that less proficient listeners encountered more problems than proficient listeners did during listening. Results of immediate retrospective interview revealed that problems of vocabulary, content, and topic familiarity were encountered by less proficient listeners. On the other hand, results indicated that proficient listeners had much less problems during listening process. Accordingly, "evaluation" and "problem identification" are the two categories of metacognitive listening strategy, which differentiate proficient listeners from less proficient listeners.

In order to find out the influence of cultural schemata on EFL listening comprehension, the following results present the metacognitive strategies of EFL listeners when they listen to culturally familiar and unfamiliar passages. As shown in Table 5 and Table 6, both proficient and less proficient listeners used more metacognitive listening strategies of "planning" when they listened to familiar passage. In contrast, both proficient and less proficient listeners used less metacognitive listening strategies of "planning" when they listened to the unfamiliar passage.

Table 5 Frequency of Planning for Familiar Passage

Metacognitive listening strategies	Familiar Passage					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
PLANNING	N	%	N	%	N	%
1a.Advance organization	0	0	3	4.92	3	2.36
1b.Directed attention	16	24.24	14	22.95	30	23.62
1c.Selective attention	8	12.12	10	16.39	18	14.17
1d.Self management	6	9.09	8	13.11	14	11.02
Total	30	45.45	35	57.38	65	51.18

Table 6 Frequency of Planning for Unfamiliar Passage

Metacognitive listening strategies	Unfamiliar Passage					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
PLANNING	N	%	N	%	N	%
1a.Advance organization	1	1.30	0	0	1	0.74
1b.Directed attention	18	23.38	8	13.56	26	19.12
1c.Selective attention	6	7.79	5	8.47	11	8.09
1d.Self management	3	3.90	8	13.56	11	8.09
Total	28	36.36	21	35.59	49	0.36

According to the results of Table 7 and Table 8, listeners' metacognitive listening strategies of "monitoring" when listening to familiar passage is more than the strategy use of "monitoring" when listening to unfamiliar passage. Especially proficient listeners deployed more than twice as many "monitoring" when listening to the familiar passage than they did when listening to the unfamiliar one.

Table 7 Frequency of Monitoring for Familiar Passage

Metacognitive listening strategies	Familiar Passage					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
MONITORING	N	%	N	%	N	%
2a.Comprehension Monitoring	2	3.03	3	4.92	5	3.94
2b.Auditory monitoring	1	1.52	2	3.28	3	2.36
2c.Double-check monitoring	2	3.03	2	3.28	4	3.15
Total	5	7.58	7	11.48	12	9.45

Table 8 Frequency of Monitoring for Unfamiliar Passage

Metacognitive listening strategies	Unfamiliar Passage					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
MONITORING	N	%	N	%	N	%
2a.Comprehension Monitoring	2	2.60	2	3.39	4	2.94
2b.Auditory monitoring	0	0	0	0	0	0
2c.Double-check monitoring	2	2.60	1	1.30	3	2.21
Total	4	5.19	3	3.90	7	5.15

From the results in Table 9 and Table 10, the influence of cultural schemata on EFL listening comprehension is not apparent on the basis of metacognitive listening strategy use of "evaluation." Different from the metacognitive listening strategies of "planning" and "monitoring", listeners used more strategies of "evaluation" when listening to the unfamiliar passage.

Table 9 Frequency of Evaluation for Familiar Passage

Metacognitive listening strategies	Familiar Passage					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
EVALUATION	N	%	N	%	N	%
3a.Performance evaluation	2	3.03	2	3.28	4	3.15
3b.Strategy evaluation	5	7.58	8	13.11	13	10.24
Total	7	10.61	10	16.39	17	13.39

Table 10 Frequency of Evaluation for Unfamiliar Passage

Metacognitive listening strategies	Unfamiliar Passage					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
EVALUATION	N	%	N	%	N	%
3a.Performance evaluation	5	6.49	4	6.78	9	6.62
3b.Strategy evaluation	7	9.09	12	20.34	19	13.97
Total	12	15.58	16	27.12	28	20.59

On the basis of the results shown in Table 11 and Table 12, both proficient and less proficient listeners used more metacognitive strategy of "problem identification" when listening to unfamiliar passage.

Table 11 Frequency of Problem Identification for Familiar Passage

Metacognitive listening strategies	Familiar Passage					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	24	36.36	9	14.75	33	25.98

Table 12 Frequency of Problem Identification for Unfamiliar Passage

Metacognitive listening strategies	Unfamiliar Passage					
	Less proficient listeners		Proficient listeners		Total	
PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION	N	%	N	%	N	%
Total	33	42.86	19	32.20	52	38.24

According to the previous studies of applying linguistic subunits to score the recall protocol, the present study adopted the criteria of pausal units from Johnson (1970) for scoring subjects' written recall protocols. The score for each pausal unit is all the same. Every retained pausal unit receive one score. From the results of the written recall protocol, the inter-rater reliability is 0.91. As shown in Table 13, proficient listeners apparently recalled more units (76.92 %) than less proficient listeners did (23.08%) in the two listening passages. Table 13 clearly presents the findings that proficient listeners recalled more units (78.6 7 %) when listening to familiar passage than they listened to unfamiliar passage (75.31%). In comparison, less proficient listeners recalled slightly more units (24.69 %) in the unfamiliar passage than they did in the familiar passage (21.33 %). There is apparent influence of cultural schema on proficient listeners. Therefore, the results of listeners' written recall protocol are consistent with the prediction that topic familiarity is relevant with listening comprehension.

Table 13 Idea Units of Recall Protocol

Listeners	Familiar Passage		Unfamiliar Passage		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Proficient listeners	59	78.67	61	75.31	120	76.92
Less proficient listeners	16	21.33	20	24.69	36	23.08
Total	75	100	81	100	156	100

According to the findings, there is apparent effect of topic familiarity on proficient listeners' comprehension. In general, proficient listeners recalled more units when listening to familiar passage (78.67 %) than they did when listening to unfamiliar passage (75.31 %). The findings confirmed many previous studies that have proved the positive effect of cultural schema on listening comprehension (Markham and Latham, 1987; Long, 1990; Chiang and Dunkel, 1972; Schmidt-Rinehart, 1994; Teng, 1994). Surprisingly, less proficient listeners recalled more idea units when listening to unfamiliar passages even though cultural schema activated proficient listeners' comprehension in recalling familiar passage. This result might be related to three major reasons. First, less proficient listeners' higher recalled units in

unfamiliar passage is due to their higher frequent use of "problem identification" when listening to the familiar passage. Comparing with the unfamiliar passage, less proficient listeners encountered more problems when listening to the familiar passage. This result implied less proficient listeners' inefficient use of metacognitive strategies to enhance comprehension even though the listening passage is culturally familiar. Second, the influence of text structure on listening comprehension is the other reason. The organization of listening text might affect listeners' understanding. This result affirmed the fact that not only content schema, which pertain to the specific domain of a text, but also formal schema, which relate to the organizational structure of a text might influence listening comprehension. Third, the way of speakers' narration, i.e. text content, might influence less proficient listeners' comprehension of the familiar passage. According to less proficient listeners' verbal reports, they proposed that the central idea is more specific in the unfamiliar passage by compared with the culturally familiar article that contains more supporting information under the main topic of betel nut beauties.

In addition to the positive effect of topic familiarity on proficient listeners' idea units in the written recall, the strategy frequency displays some different results between familiar and unfamiliar passage. Among the four main categories of metacognitive listening strategies, both proficient and less proficient listeners reported more strategies of "planning" and "monitoring" when listening to familiar passage. Under the two main categories, every sub-category is activated more frequently when listening to familiar passage. This finding might indicate the positive interrelationship between listening comprehension and metacognitive listening strategy use under the effect of cultural background knowledge.

Conclusion

Many studies in the earlier review have affirmed the importance of metacognitive listening strategy instruction, e.g., Anderson & Vandergrift's verbal report formats (1996), Goh's listening diaries (1997), Vandergrift's performance checklists (1999) and listening tasks (2002, 2003), Goh's strategy practice for improving listening comprehension (2000), and Rost's pedagogical approach for developing metacognitive strategies for L2 listeners (2002). It has long been a general pedagogical phenomenon in Taiwan that listening instruction is mainly for enhancing students' learning product under the trend of assessment-oriented instruction. Getting better grade on listening represents successful teaching without regarding the importance of complex listening process. EFL listeners' performance in the present study reflects the setback of listening instruction of overemphasis on product rather than on process. Scholars have stated that students perform many tasks in the classroom; however, they are rarely asked systematically to describe in detail how they proceed in performing them. Moreover, teachers focus upon the learning results (the products) but not upon the learning strategies (the process) that students use to arrive at the results (Hosenfeld, 1976; Field, 1998).

Based on participants' verbal reports and attitudes, they expressed their lack of metacognitive listening strategies. According to Vandergrift (2004), research on instruction in L2 listening has to take into account the complicate cognitive processes that underlie the listening construct.

In conclusion, EFL listening strategy instruction is not promoted very actively in Taiwan. Therefore, to hold yearly workshop of strategy instruction for EFL teachers is strongly suggested. In order to achieve the goal of conducting effective strategy instruction, it is necessary to begin with strategy investigation. Relevant studies are encouraged to investigate more about listening strategies as well as instructional tips for teaching EFL listening. Results from the present study provided valuable information as important instructional guidelines that require further follow-up studies to apply into real teaching contexts.Moreover, to develop a communication system that connects theories with practice is the most important. Successful strategy instruction requires teachers with sufficient training. Besides conducting research on strategy investigation, introducing each strategy and developing relevant strategy teaching guides to instructors through training workshops become an important goal for follow-up studies.

The present research describes the metacognitive strategies deployed by EFL listeners during listening process. The findings showed that certain metacognitive strategies might partially reinforce listeners' comprehension of familiar passage. Moreover, listeners' responses to their strategy use displayed the urgent need to include metacognitive listening strategies in EFL listening instruction. It is important to find effective ways to enhance EFL listening comprehension by providing efficient metacognitive listening strategies. By providing qualitative analysis and descriptions, the current study can contribute to our understanding of metacognitive strategy use of EFL listeners, and further to offer implications for designing instructional guidelines of teaching metacognitive listening strategies to EFL listeners.

References

Anderson, N. J. and Vandergrift, L. (1996) Increasing metacognitive awareness in the L2 classroom by using think-aloud protocols and other verbal report formats. In R. L. Oxford (ed.) *Language Learning Strategies Around the World: Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (pp.3-18). Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Bernard, H. B. (2000) Interviewing Unstructured and Semistructured. *Social Researc Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. California: SAGE.

Chang, H. F. (2003) Listening strategy use of high- and low- level technology college students. *Selected Papers from the 12ᵗʰ International Symposium on English Teaching*, 164-172.

Chiang, C.S. and Dunkel, P. (1992) The effect of speech modification, prior knowledge, and listening proficiency on EFL lecture learning. *TESOL Quarterly* 26, 354-374.

Charmaz, K. (2001) Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. In J. F. Gubrium and J. A. Holstein (eds.) *Handbook of Interview Research* (pp. 682-685). California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Chien, C. N. and Li, W. (1997) Developing a model of listening strategies and processes for EFL Learners. *Selected Papers from the 6th International Symposium on English Teaching*, 130-147.

Field, J. (1998) Skills and strategies: Towards a new methodology for listening. *ELT Journal,* 52, 110-118.

Fong, P. L., Lin, P. Y., Shih, S. C. and Tseng, C. M. (1998) The use of "think-aloud" with massive subjects in the study of listening strategies. *In The Proceeding of the 5th International Symposium on English Teaching*.

Goh, C. (1997) Metacognitive awareness and second language listeners. *ELT Journal* 51, 361-369.

Goh, C. (2000) A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems. *System* 28, 55-75.

Hacker, D. J. (1998) Self-regulated comprehension during normal reading. In D.J. Hacker, J. Dunlosky and A.C. Graesser (eds) *Metacognition in Educational Theory and Practice* (pp.165-191). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hosenfeld, C. (1976) Learning about learning: Discovering our students' strategies. *Foreign Language Annals* 9, 117-129.

James, C. (1987) *The Immediate Recall Protocol as An Elicitation Technique in the Listening Modality of University-Level Students of German* (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 299801).

Johnson, R. E. (1970) Recall of prose as a function of the structural importance of the linguistic units. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 9, 12-20.

Lee, H. M. (1997) A Study of the listening comprehension strategies of junior college EFL students in Taiwan. *In Proceeding of 1997 International Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the Republic of China*, 393-412.

Long, D.R. (1990) What you don't know can't help you. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12, 65-80.

Oxford, R. L. (1990) Looking at language learning strategies. *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know* (pp. 1-37). New York: Heinle& Heinle Publishers.

Patton, M. Q. (1990) Qualitative interviewing. *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (2nd ed) (pp. 280-284). California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Rost, M. (2002) *Teaching and Researching Listening*. England:Longman.

Teng, H. C. (1994) Effects of cultural schemata and visual cues on Chinese EFL students' listening comprehension. PhD dissertation, University of Minnesota.

Teng, H. C. (1997) An investigation of EFL Listening strategies by Taiwanese college students.

*The Proceeding of the 6*th *International Symposium on English Teaching*, 509-520.

Teng, H. C. (2003) Teaching EFL listening strategies to college students in Taiwan. *Proceeding of the 20*th *International Conference on English Teaching and Learning in the R.O.C.*, 385-394.

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

Vandergrift, L. (1999) Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring successful strategies. *ELT Journal* 53, 168-176.

Vandergrift, L. (2002) It was nice to see that our predictions were right: Developing metacognition in L2 listening comprehension. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 58, 555-575.

Vandergrift, L. (2003) From prediction through reflection: Guiding students through the process of L2 listening. *The Canadian Modern Language Review* 59, 425-440.

Vandergrift, L. (2004) Listening to learn or learning to listen? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 24, 3-25.