JER | Journal of ELT Research
Vol. 5, No. 1, 2020, 1-23 DOI: 10.22236/JER_Vol5Issue1

Metacognition – Strategy Use and Metacognitive Knowledge – in EFL Listening: A Pilot Study

Tasnima Aktar*

Comilla University, Bangladesh

DOI: 10.22236/JER_Vol5Issue1pp1-23

Metacognition, the term invented by Flavell (1979), has the potential to facilitate language learning and listening (Flavell, 1979; Vandegrift and Goh, 2012; Wenden, 1991). However, little has been known about holistic metacognition in L2 listening and in an 'input-poor' EFL context of Bangladesh. This pilot study aims to explore metacognition of tertiary level students in an EFL context of Bangladesh. A pilot study was conducted to trial four data collection instruments as part of the author's PhD research; however, this study reported pilot data collected via the three tools only. Listening Strategy Questionnaire (LSQ) was exploited to collect quantitative data on off-line, perceived strategy use and a Listening Test adapted from IELTS listening was used to assess learners' listening comprehension. Semi-structured Interview elicited qualitative data on students' perceptions of EFL listening i.e., metacognitive knowledge. The results of this pilot study revealed moderate use (M=3.55) of overall strategy among the participants, and highest use (M=3.69) of the category of metacognitive strategy. Among individual strategies, directed attention (a metacognitive strategy) was used most frequently (M=4.22) and grouping (a cognitive strategy) was used least frequently (M=2.88). The results of Pearson correlations between students' listening comprehension and strategy use showed significant positive correlation with planning (.309*) and substitution (.274*) strategies but significant negative correlations with linguistic inferencing (-.343*) and note-taking (-.281*) strategies. Thematic analysis of perception data of two representative samples revealed their awareness of a great number of aspects of Metacognitive Knowledge and showed considerable differences between the less successful listener (LSL) and the more successful listener (MSL) on their metacognitive knowledge, particularly in strategy knowledge. This study has pedagogical implications for raising awareness about metacognition among EFL listeners.

Key words: metacognition, metacognitive knowledge, strategy use, tertiary level, EFL listening

Metakognisi merupakan istilah yang ditemukan oleh Flavell (1979), yang memiliki potensi untuk memfasilitasi pembelajaran dan pemahaman mendengarkan bahasa (Flavell, 1979; Vandegrift dan Goh, 2012; Wenden, 1991). Namun, hanya sedikit yang diketahui tentang

* Corresponding author. Email: tasnima.aktar7@gmail.com
ISSN: 2502-292X, e-ISSN 2527-7448.

DOI: 10.22236/JER_Vol5Issue1

*metakognisi holistik dalam mendengarkan bahasa kedua dan "input-yang-buruk" dalam konteks bahasa inggris sebagai bahasa asing (EFL) di Bangladesh. Studi percontohan ini bertujuan untuk mengeksplorasi metakognisi siswa tingkat menengah dalam konteks EFL di Bangladesh. Sebuah studi percontohan dilakukan untuk menguji coba empat instrumen pengumpulan data sebagai bagian dari penelitian PhD; penelitian ini melaporkan data percontohan yang dikumpulkan melalui tiga alat saja. Listening Strategy Questionnaire (LSQ) dilakukan untuk mengumpulkan data kuantitatif secara off-line. Penggunaan strategi kemudian dikategorikan dan Tes Mendengarkan yang diadaptasi dari IELTS digunakan untuk menilai pemahaman mendengarkan peserta didik. Wawancara semi-terstruktur menghasilkan data kualitatif tentang persepsi siswa terhadap mendengarkan bahasa inggris sebagai bahasa asing yaitu pengetahuan metakognitif. Hasil studi percontohan ini mengungkapkan penggunaan medium (M = 3,55) dari keseluruhan strategi di antara para peserta, dan penggunaan tertinggi (M = 3,69) dari kategori strategi metakognitif. Di antara strategi individu, perhatian terarah (strategi metakognitif) paling sering digunakan (M = 4,22) dan strategi pengelompokan (strategi kognitif) paling jarang digunakan (M = 2,88). Hasil korelasi Pearson antara pemahaman mendengarkan siswa dan penggunaan strategi menunjukkan korelasi positif yang signifikan dengan perencanaan (0,309 *) dan strategi substitusi (0,274 *) tetapi korelasi negatif yang signifikan dengan kesimpulan linguistik (-343 *) dan pencatatan (-.281 *) strategi. Analisis tematik data persepsi dari dua sampel yang representatif mengungkapkan kesadaran mereka akan sejumlah besar aspek Pengetahuan Metakognitif dan menunjukkan perbedaan besar antara pendengar yang kurang berhasil (LSL) dan pendengar yang lebih sukses (MSL) pada pengetahuan metakognitif mereka, terutama dalam pengetahuan strategi. Studi ini memiliki implikasi pedagogi untuk meningkatkan kesadaran tentang metakognisi di antara pendengar EFL.*
Kata kunci: metakognisi, pengetahuan metakognitif, penggunaan strategi, level tersier, pemahaman mendengarkan bahasa inggris sebagai bahasa asing (EFL)

INTRODUCTION

Listening as a Language Skill

Listening is a complex cognitive skill (Vandergrift and Goh, 2012; Rost, 2001; Field, 2008a; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990), which can be described within the context of cognitive theory (Anderson, 1985; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). In cognitive theory, individuals are said to "process" information, and the thoughts involved in the cognitive activity are referred to as "mental processes" (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990). Researchers now come to a consensus that listening is no longer a passive skill rather an active skill (Lynch, 2002; Buck, 2001; Vandergrift, 1999) involving a bundle of related processes (Lynch, 2002, p.193) for knowledge construction rather than simply reception of the incoming text (Rost, 1990, p.3).

Very nature of listening accentuates it as different from other language skills. Listening is a highly automatic process (Field, 2004) taking place in real time which entails the necessity for automatic processing (Buck, 2001), which characterises more successful or expert listening. Listening is never recursive, rather transient in nature (Field, 2008a) which also creates a sense of anxiety in the L2 learner. Moreover, the characteristics of 'natural fast speed' and the 'presence of a rich prosody' add to the difficulties of the skill (Lynch, 2002, p. 194). For such nature of listening, it is the skill L2 learners feel least comfortable with (Graham, 2006) and a source of frustration to learners (Graham, 2011). Listening has eventually become the most difficult skill to learn and make progress (Graham, 2011; Graham and Macaro, 2008; Vandergrift, 2004). Furthermore, listening being 'an invisible mental process', and difficult to describe (Vandergrift, 2003a), it has been overlooked, for a long time, in language pedagogy and research (Rost, 2001). Nunan (2002) rightly called listening skill the Cinderella of language skills; listening is still under-valued (Field, 2008b).

Nowadays, the importance of listening as a language skill as well as an integrative skill is well accepted. In 1980s and1990s, research highlighted the important role of listening in language acquisition (Brown & Yule, 1983; Faerch & Kasper, 1986; Feyten, 1991). With the emergence of Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) approach, listening earned 'its rightful place' (Vandergrift, 2009, p.395), although even in the CLT approach, learners face challenges such as neglect of listening in favour of speaking, indirect assessment of listening comprehension. Listening was often 'the sleeping partner in the business of oral communication' (Vandergrift and Goh, 2012, p. 8). However, it is learner-oriented instruction that teaches learners how to listen. Research on learner-centred learning and teaching (see Macaro et al., 2007; Mendelsohn, 1994; 1998) called for a strategy-based approach to listening instruction. Finally, a metacognitive approach to teach listening was proposed by Goh (1997, 2008) and Vandergrift and Goh (2012).

Metacognitive framework of learning and teaching aim to deepen learners' understanding of themselves as L2 listeners, raise awareness of the demands and goals of listening, and teach learners how to manage their listening (Vandergrift and Goh, 2012, p. 12). Metacognition emphasises on both Metacognitive Knowledge and strategy use holistically. Therefore, this study is an attempt to gain a holistic metacognitive understanding of EFL listening and listeners by exploring EFL listeners' strategy use and Metacognitive Knowledge in a predominantly monolingual Bangladesh where exposure to EFL listening is mostly limited to academic domain (Alam & Sinha, 2009).

Key Definitions

Metacognition

Flavell's (1997) invented the term metacognition, which is the awareness of cognition- a perception of the ways how different factors act or interact to affect the course and outcome of different cognitive enterprises (Goh, 1997). Flavell's model of metacognition consists of four cognitive enterprises: (a) metacognitive knowledge, (b) metacognitive experiences, (c) goals (or tasks), and (d) actions (or strategies). By strategies Flavel mainly indicated metacognitive strategies. Wenden (1991) and Goh (1997,1999, 1998) follow Flavell's model of metacognition to a great extent. Following them, Vandergrift and Goh (2012) define metacognition but with a deviation. Vandergrift and Goh' s metacognition consists of three components -metacognitive knowledge, strategy use, and metacognitive experience, first two of which are amenable. This pilot study followed Vandergrift and Goh (2012)'s definition and classification of metacognition-strategy use means use of all categories of strategies which is the execution of metacognitive knowledge, particularly of strategy knowledge. This study thus purported to investigate both amenable components of metacognition- Metacognitive Knowledge and strategy use meaning metacognition in action.

Metacognitive Knowledge

Metacognitive knowledge, as defined by Flavell (1979), is primarily knowledge or beliefs about what factors or variables act and interact in what ways to affect the course and outcome of cognitive enterprises. There are three major categories of metacognitive knowledge—*person, task,* and *strategy knowledge*(p2). This typology was also maintained by Wenden (1991) and Goh (1997, 1998, 1999). They are defined by Flavell (1997) as follows:

Person Knowledge - 'The person category encompasses everything that you could come to believe about the nature of yourself and other people as cognitive processors.' (p2)

Task Knowledge - 'One subcategory of the task category concerns the information available to you during a cognitive enterprise… Another subcategory includes Metacognitive Knowledge about task demands or goals.' (p2)

Strategy Knowledge - 'As for the strategy category, there is a great deal of knowledge that could be acquired concerning what strategies are likely to be effective in achieving what sub-goals and goals in what sorts of cognitive undertakings.' (p2)

Language Learning/Listening Strategies

Numerous studies (Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, and Todesco, 1978; Macaro, 2006; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Rost, 2002; Rubin, 1975) attempted to define, classify, and identify LLSs. Early studies e.g., Naiman, Frohlich, Stern, and Todesco (1978), Rubin, (1975) looked into good language learners and claimed frequent use of use strategies by successful learners. This strategy was interchangeably called, "operation, routine process, procedure, action, tactic, technique, plan, and step" by different researchers (Macaro, 2006, p. 324). Researchers (e.g., Macaro, 2006; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Rost, 2002) tried to define and classify LLSs depending on their goals and purposes, and how they function.

Much quoted strategy definition and classification come from the same year from Oxford (1990) and O'Malley and Chamot (1990). Oxford (1990) defined language learning strategies (LLSs) as "steps taken by students to enhance their own learning" (p. 1) and:

> [Language] learning strategies are operations employed by the learner to aid the acquisition, storage, retrieval, and use of information…specific actions taken by the learners to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations (Oxford, 1990, p.8).

O'Malley and Chamot (1990) defined learning strategies/listening strategies as, "the special thoughts or behaviours that individuals use to help them comprehend, learn, or retain new information" (p.1). Strategies are "complex procedures that individuals apply to tasks; consequently, they may be represented as procedural knowledge which may be acquired through cognitive, associative and autonomous stages of learning" (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990, p. 52). Thus, they tried to identify learning strategies in these three stages of skills acquisition theory by Anderson (1985).

While Macaro (2006) defined strategies as "conscious mental activity… applied in pursuit of a learning goal, which is transferable to other situations or tasks" (Macaro, 2006, p. 328), Rost (2002) defined them as, "conscious plans to manage incoming speech, particularly when the listener knows that he or she must compensate for incomplete input or partial understanding" (p. 236).

This study followed O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) definition and classification of language learning strategies as they view strategies as basically a cognitive phenomenon which can be explained through information processing theory in cognitive psychology (O'Malley &

Chamot, 1990) and include a good variety of strategies related to listening. O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) also followed Anderson's (1985) three-phase model of perception, parsing, utilisation is also supported by other researchers of listening, for example, O'Malley et al. (1989), and Goh (2000). (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990) classify strategies as three different categories of metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective strategies.

Relevant Research on Metacognition

There is a paucity of research which looked into metacognition holistically including both strategy use and metacognitive knowledge. Although Goh (1998) studied a cohort of students' metacognitive strategies and metacognitive knowledge, she did not mention this as metacognition; therefore, addressing the components of metacognition seems loose. Other existing literature looked into metacognition partially only-either researching strategy use or metacognitive knowledge.

Research on Strategy Use

Listening strategy research using questionnaire have employed different types of questionnaires including the Strategy Inventory of Language Learning (SILL) (Oxford, 1990) and the Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) (Vandergrift et al., 2006). These studies looked into the pattern of off-line, perceived strategy use by different listeners in terms of age, gender, background, and different listening ability groups and strategy use's relationship with their listening performance.

Studies e.g., Chao (1996), Serri et al. (2012), and Teng (1998) investigated the pattern of listening strategies between two listening ability groups and also the correlations between listening strategy use and listening proficiency. However, Serri et al. (2012) revealed no significant relationships.

Serri et al. (2012) elicited strategy data from 40 TEFL undergraduate Iranian students using a questionnaire adopted by Liu (2008) and an IELTS listening test. They justified their non-significant results as participants' being never instructed on strategy use, their level of proficiency and a lack of good rapport with the teacher. However, the questionnaire Serri et al. (2012) borrowed from Liu (2008), who eventually adapted it from Vandergrift (1997)'s checklist. Therefore, there was validity and reliability issues of the questionnaire, which could potentially be the reason behind the non-significance. Moreover, Serri et al.'s (2012) sample size was small.

Many of the studies revealing a positive relationship seem not to use a standardised or direct measure of listening comprehension. For example, Teng (1998) and Liu (2008) used a listening strategy questionnaire which was not rigorously constructed or validated. Teng (1998) used a reliable questionnaire - Oxford's (1990) SILL; however, Teng's use of a t-test for analysing strategy categories and a chi-square test for individual strategies for same categorical data is questionable. Moreover, the sample size was small. In addition, the SILL is not much valid for eliciting listening strategies. Liu's (2008) questionnaire is Vandergrift's (1997b) checklist of listening strategies only - not a questionnaire with validation. Liu only tried to validate the checklist by piloting it with 20 students and by checking its reliability. Liu's ANOVA results of 101 Taiwanese university EFL learners' listening strategy use and their IELTS score revealed a statistically significant difference. However, Liu's (2008) participants

were heterogeneous in terms of the subjects they were studying; therefore, there could have been other confounding variables that might have affected the relationship. Eliciting strategy data via checklist, Vandergrift (1997) found that students with novice-level proficiency and intermediate-level proficiency employed different patterns of strategy use. Listening proficiency in this study was, however, measured by an oral proficiency interview which also raised validity issue as listening proficiency might be compensated by speaking proficiency.

Chao (1996), however, tried to develop a listening strategy questionnaire by trialling and validating it in different phases. Data elicited from a larger sample of participants (229) showed a significant relationship between strategy use and listening proficiency. A pilot study revealed a Cronbach alpha .87. Chao found that more proficient students used metacognitive strategies frequently. The students with prior experience of an English-speaking country were able to make inferences and guess more frequently. However, Chao's Japanese EFL context is comparatively richer than the input-poor EFL context of Bangladesh.

Further studies in different EFL/ESL contexts and with carefully constructed, valid and standardised measurement tools are, therefore, deemed important (Macaro, Graham, & Vanderplank, 2007; Oxford et al., 2014) to understand the pattern of off-line, perceived strategy use and nature of the relationship between listening strategy use and listening performance. This study is, therefore, an attempt in exploring the pattern of strategy use and its relationship with listening comprehension by exploiting an EFLLSQ developed mainly from taxonomies by O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and Vandergrift (1997) and validated (see methodology section), and an internationally standardised IELTS test in an 'input poor' EFL context of Bangladesh.

Research on Metacognitive Knowledge

Research on Metacognitive Knowledge as part of metacognition is comparatively a new trend (Vandergrift et al., 2006; Zhang, 2001). Flavell's (1979) typology of metacognitive knowledge was verified by Wenden (1991; 1998) in L2 learning and opined that L2 learners' metacognitive knowledge of language learning can offer us important information about their conceptualisations of the language-learning process. After that, numerous studies explored metacognitive knowledge about L2 listening in different ways - person knowledge such as problems during listening explored by Goh (2000), task knowledge such as factors affecting listening by Goh (1999); however, Metacognitive Knowledge as a whole was explored by a few studies e.g., Goh (1997). Metacognitive Knowledge has also been explored via MALQ (Vandergrift et al., 2006) by a number of studies e.g., Vandergrift et al. (2006), Goh and Hu (2014) in ESL contexts. More in-depth exploration of metacognitive knowledge about L2 listening is needed in different contexts. This study aimed to explore metacognitive knowledge in an EFL context to understand the differences between two listening ability learners which may inform about differing listeners and relationship between metacognitive knowledge and listening proficiency.

While investigating problems during listening among 40 tertiary level Chinese ESL learners using listening diaries and interviews, Goh (2000) identified 10 problems in perception, parsing and utilisation - Anderson's (1995) 3 phases of comprehension. She found similar problems between two listening ability groups but differences in the degree of cognitive constraints among each group.

Vogely (1995) explored "what makes a 'good' listener" via Metacognitive Awareness Strategy Questionnaire (MASQ). All the participants seemed to know what made a good listener but there was a difference in their evaluation of their own strategy use. More in-depth studies are therefore needed to explore listeners' perceptions of good listeners and themselves as listeners.

Goh (1999) investigated factors affecting listening amongst tertiary-level Chinese ESL learners and identified twenty factors under five categories of characteristics: text, listener, speaker, task, and environment. While the majority of the high-ability listeners reported twelve factors, the low-ability group reported only four, thus showing a difference between two listening ability groups.

Using MALQ, Goh & Hu (2014) and Vandergrift et al. (2006) found positive correlations between learners' Metacognitive Knowledge and listening comprehension. While Vandergrift et al. (2006) indicated that 13% of the variance in the participants' listening performance could be explained by their awareness of the L2 listening process, Goh and Hu (2014) revealed 22% of the variance in listening performance due to metacognitive knowledge.

A very few studies looked into metacognitive knowledge in depth, with its three components. A notable one is Goh (1997). Goh found that many of the students had clear ideas about three aspects of listening: their own role and performance as L2 listeners i.e. person knowledge, the demands and procedures of L2 listening i.e. task knowledge, and strategies for listening i.e. strategy knowledge. The study calls for more discussion to increase learners' metacognitive awareness in listening. However, this study did not show any difference between two listening ability groups. Further studies are needed to explore metacognitive knowledge in depth with different tools and including its three components, in different contexts.

Research Questions

Based on the literature reviewed, this pilot study addresses two research questions:

RQ1. What is the pattern of the use of listening strategies among the tertiary level EFL learners in a public university of Bangladesh?

RQ2. How do a more successful listener and a less successful listener perceive EFL listening?

METHODS

Participants

The pilot study was conducted in July 2014 among 54 first-year undergraduate students pursuing their BA (Honours) in English at a public university in Bangladesh. The pilot study involved trialling the instruments and procedures for the data collection for Phase I and Phase II for the main PhD study. 54 students participated in a listening test and a listening strategy questionnaire survey in phase I of pilot study. The missing value is cleaned up which resulted in 52 samples. The participants were divided into high scorers (2) and low scorers (50) based on their listening scores (listeners scoring below 50% are low scorers, scoring 50% or above are high scorers). 1 student from each group was randomly selected to participate in think aloud protocol and interview in phase II. The imbalanced group sizes (50 and 2) may indicate the listening ability among the tertiary EFL learners in Bangladesh.

Instruments

4 instruments were trialled in the pilot study:

Phase I

a. Listening Strategy Questionnaire
b. Listening Test

Phase II

a. Think Aloud Text and Tasks (not reported in this study)
b. Semi-structured Interview Schedule

Listening Strategy Questionnaire

Strategy Questionnaires seem to be the 'most efficient and comprehensive ways' (Oxford, 1996) and the most frequently used method for eliciting learner strategies (Cohen, 1998). For phase I, I developed 'Listening Strategy Questionnaire' (LSQ) based on mainly O'Malley & Chamot (1990, p. 137-139), and Vandergrift (1997, p. 392-395). Following their taxonomies, the developed 'Listening Strategy Questionnaire' has 40 listening strategy items falling into three categories of cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective strategies. Following Oxford's (1990) 5-point Likert scale used in the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL), the present study exploited 5 points response scale with a bit modification in option number 3 (instead of 'somewhat true of me', it will be 'sometimes true of me' to make the options similar).

While SILL is developed to elicit language learning strategies in general, Metacognitive Awareness of Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) by Vandergrift et.al (2006) looks into metacognitive awareness of using listening strategies and does not assess all the possible listening strategies used by listeners in listening comprehension process (White et. al., 2007). Therefore, I decided to adopt the taxonomy of language learning strategies proposed by O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and developed 'Listening Strategy Questionnaire' from O'Malley and Chamot (1990, p. 137-139), and Vandergrift (1997, p. 392-395). This initially constructed questionnaire was then validated and checked for reliability. Initial 48 listening strategy items had been worded and situated according to researcher's experience of Bangladeshi context and then were reduced to 40 items of 'Listening Strategy Questionnaire' after consultation with two Bangladeshi tertiary-level EFL teachers and pre-piloting with two tertiary-level EFL students. Statistical test Cronbach's alpha was computed to examine if the 40 items in the questionnaire formed reliability scale. The alpha .837 indicated items performing internal consistency reliability (see Table 1 below).

Table 1: *Reliability test*

Cronbach alpha	Cronbach's Alpha based on standardized items	No. of items
.837	.839	40

Listening Test

For phase I, the Listening Test is constructed to measure the EFL learners' listening performance in different tasks from two listening passages from academic listening in two sections taken from IELTS practice test. Each section contains questions for 10 discrete marks. Due to lack of a national standardized test to assess Bangladeshi EFL learners' listening performance, a practice IELTS test is chosen for its being internationally recognized as a secure, valid and reliable indicator of true-to-life ability to communicate in English for education (www.ielts.org).

Interview Schedule

Qualitative data on two listening ability listeners' perceptions of EFL listening were elicited through semi-structured interview designed for the main study. Participants were interviewed on their perceptions of what makes a 'good' listener, themselves as listeners, their practice to be 'good' listeners, and difficulties faced while listening and their strategies to solve them. Informed consent was sought from participants for interviews and they were audio/video recorded.

Data Collection and Analysis

Phase I

I sought consent from the Chair of Department of English and contacted a course teacher of the target participants of an intact class for data collection in phase I first. Students' consent was sought in written consent form and 54 students signed the informed consent form. Before administering the listening strategy questionnaire, students took part in a listening test adapted from IELTS practice tests. Unlike IELTS, they listened twice as requested by them. The reason for administering the listening test first was to give the students an opportunity to remember any prior listening experiences. Moreover, in the questionnaire, it was mentioned that they could think over any listening experiences they had from listening to their teachers' lectures. The whole process took about 1 hour. Quantitative data collected via questionnaire and listening test were analysed quantitatively using statistical package in SPSS version 21 by calculating descriptive and inferential analyses.

Phase II

As already mentioned, participants were divided into two groups based on their listening scores, and one participant from each group was invited to attend phase II. Qualitative data collected via interview were analysed employing thematic analysis.

Ethical considerations

Access to the institution and consent for data collection was sought from the Chair of the Department first and after that consent from the participants was sought via Informed Consent Forms for both phases separately. Participants' identities were kept confidential and after a certain period any clues regarding their identities were merged.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Results and findings in phases of the study are presented following each research question.

Research Question 1

To address research question 1, first descriptive statistics of the questionnaire and listening test data were performed to see the mean scores of the learners and then Pearson Correlations were computed to see relationship, if any, between learners' perceived use of listening strategies and their listening comprehension. The pilot study revealed moderate use of overall strategies (M=3.55), and highest use (M=3.69) of metacognitive strategy among them (see Table 2 below). As to the use of individual strategies, directed attention (a metacognitive strategy) was used most frequently (M=4.22) and grouping (a cognitive strategy) was used least frequently (M=2.88) by the learners.

Table 2: *Mean use of overall strategies and strategy categories*

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Mean_Metacognitive	52	3.69	.41
Mean_Cognitive	52	3.46	.55
Mean_Socioaffective	52	3.51	.56
Mean_Overall	52	3.55	.43
Mean Listening Score	52	3.42	2.14
Valid N (listwise)	52		

Pearson correlations showed no significant correlations between listening comprehension and use of overall strategy and strategy categories. However, significant positive correlations were found for planning and substitution strategies and negative correlations for linguistic inferencing and note-taking strategies (see Table 3 below).

Table 3: *Pearson Correlations of individual strategies reaching significance*

		Listening Scores
Listening Scores	Pearson Correlation	1
	N	52
Planning	Pearson Correlation	.309*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.026
	N	52
Linguistic inferencing	Pearson Correlation	-.343*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.013
	N	52
Note- taking	Pearson Correlation	-.281*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.044

	N	52
Substitution	Pearson Correlation	.274*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.049
	N	52

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)
**Correlation is significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed)

Research Question 2

RQ2 aimed to explore listeners' metacognitive knowledge. To this end, verbal data collected via interview were analysed following Flavell's (1979) concept of Metacognitive Knowledge which comprised of person knowledge, task knowledge, and strategy knowledge, each of which is comprised of its constituents as classified by Goh (1997) and as emerged from the data itself. Two students' Metacognitive Knowledge revealed differences between two listening ability students- the less successful listeners (LSL) and the more successful listeners (MSL).

Following Goh's (1997) metacognitive knowledge classification, O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) strategy classification, and Braun and Clark's (2006) thematic analysis, the themes (categories) of person, task and strategy knowledge (Flavell, 1979) consist of the following subthemes (subcategories) (see Table 4 below, see Appendix for further classification). Verbal data revealed that the MSL showed more awareness of a number of aspects of each subcategory of person, task, and strategy knowledge. The MSL was more specific in identifying his strengths and weaknesses, and chartering strategies in dealing with problems and difficulties faced.

Table 4: *Categories and subcategories of Metacognitive Knowledge*

Categories	Kinds of Person knowledge	Subcategories
Person Knowledge	Good Listener Knowledge	Linguistic factors
		Motivational factors
		Strategic factors
		Other factors
	Listening Self	Cognitive processes during listening
		Listener needs
		Obstacles to listening comprehension
		Obstacles to listening development
		Problems during listening
		Self-concept
Task Knowledge		Factors affecting listening comprehension
		Input useful for developing listening
		Nature of L2 listening
Strategy Knowledge		Strategies assisting listening comprehension

		Strategies assisting listening development
		Strategies that do not work always

Metacognitive Knowledge

The verbal data collected via interview revealed a distinction between a LSL's and MSL's perceptions of EFL listening which is analysed as students' metacognitive knowledge about EFL listening following Flavell's (1979) typology of metacognitive knowledge.

Person Knowledge

As per the definition of person knowledge by Flavell, person knowledge can be knowledge about the person themselves and any other persons; therefore, this study looked into perception of the listener him/herself and a 'good' listener. As seen in Table 4, thematic analysis of students' perceptions of themselves and of what makes a 'good' listener provides students' person knowledge which comprised both 'A 'Good' Listener' and 'Listening Self', each of which offered a number of factors associated with the person.

'Good' Listener

Several factors make a listener a 'Good' Listener- linguistic factors, motivational factors, strategic factors and some other factors.

Linguistic factors

Both the listeners believed that listening frequently was a characteristic of a good listener; however, good listener's vocabulary knowledge, grammar and pronunciation were mentioned by the LSL but the MSL focused more on pronunciation and accent.

Motivational factors

While both the listeners believed that a good listener has the motivation to learn and listen, the MSL further revealed that being self-motivated he liked to listen English often and practised listening more consciously from early years like grade 6.

Strategic factors

Both the listeners perceived that employing strategies in listening can make a good listener. While the MSL mentioned more strategies such as planning, selective attention, monitoring and inferencing, the LSL focused more on cognitive strategies such as inferencing and listening frequently with repeating.

Other factors

Among other factors that characterised a good listener, quick processing of the text was reported by the LSL as a characteristic of a good listener, the MSL reported grasping main ideas, listening with purpose, perseverance as factors related to a good listener. A good listener has a good memory is also reported by the LSL.

Listening Self

Listeners are aware of themselves and their perceptions of themselves revealed differences between them.

Cognitive processes during listening

While the MSL reported global listening i.e., obtaining overall meaning after listening to the whole, the LSL reported that he couldn't translate all when listening as it went fast.

Learner needs

This subcategory, not found in Goh (1997), is emerged from the data itself. Among learners' needs reported, listening practice was not enough and more exposure was needed was reported by the LSL. The MSL perceived continuous practice, at home or out of class needed. While the MSL perceived that he needed more practice with pronunciation and different accents, the LSL needed more vocabulary practice as well. The LSL felt he needed something both academic and recreational as he did not like academic stuff much, the MSL thought a course in listening could allow him more with techniques and strategies that he didn't know.

Obstacles to listening comprehension

As to the obstacles to listening comprehension, speed of the text and pronunciation were commonly reported by both listeners; however, vocabulary and good memory were reported by the LSL and different accents were reported by the MSL.

Mishu: It seems I am hearing many but can't remember them all after listening.

Abir: Different accents of different commentators are sometimes problematic.

Obstacles to listening development

Both the listeners find social environment as an obstacle to English practice; people do not take it as welcoming rather make fun of us. However, the LSL reported that he felt shy even in the classroom group activities and he also lacked motivation to practise more even at home:

Mishu: I don't like group work…because others take it funnily, I mean pronunciation, grammar mistakes.

Abir: Speaking in the department is ok but feel shy to speak outside.

Problems during listening

Several problems during listening were reported by the students; these problems can be seen in three comprehension stages of Anderson (1985). Among them, 'cannot keep concentrating' (perception) is reported by both but 'cannot remember what is heard already' (parsing) is reported by the LSL and 'understand individual words but sometimes cannot get overall meaning' (utilisation) was reported by the MSL. Break in concentration is a common problem in the perception phase and when 'cannot remember what is heard already' is a problem faced by the LSL in parsing phase but 'understand individual words but sometimes cannot get overall meaning' is a utilisation problem. Therefore, both faced problem in perception.

Self-concept

It seems both the listeners were aware of themselves - their weaknesses and strengths. The LSL thinks his condition is not that good but is satisfactory than previous whereas the MSL is quite satisfied with his level although he still needs to practise on some issues such as different accents. While self-evaluating, the LSL considers his improvement by understanding teachers' lectures much better than before. The MSL, on the other hand, perceives that he understands his teachers well as the topics are known but struggles in commentary or movies and tries to compensate from visuals and subtitles and the context. In response to the question - 'How do you try to get to that level of a good listener?', the replies are:

Mishu: I am not trying much, don't like something academic. Only sometimes I watch movies at home with subtitle.

Abir: I often practise English by listening to BBC, FM radio news, watching movies. Also, I listen cricket and football commentary. I love to do such things from my high school.

Task Knowledge

The students' verbal report revealed three subcategories-factors affecting listening, input useful for listening, and nature of L2 listening and these subcategories also revealed differences between LSLs and MSLs.

Factors affecting listening comprehension

A number of factors which affected listening comprehension are reported by the students. They were pronunciation and accent, speed, vocabulary, subtitle, motivation. However, the students differ in their level of difficulty in each of the factors, and while the MSL tried to minimise the problem created by these by using context and co-text, the LSL was not much aware of how to use context. As mentioned earlier, while the LSL found he needed subtitle to watch movies, the MSL used subtitle only sometimes when he felt stuck due to pronunciation, accent or speed. It seems the MSL was more self-motivated to practise listening outside the classroom.

Mishu: The audio goes so fast, it is difficult to get all the words…can't get the meaning of all words as well.

Abir: Some accent I can't get properly and sometimes the speed is a problem if it goes so fast.

Input useful for listening development

The students reported several sources of input useful for listening - watching movies, listening to English songs, teachers' lectures, listening to English commentaries, BBC news. Both the students perceived watching movies as useful for listening improvement. However, while the LSL needed subtitle for most of the movie, the MSL needed it when he missed some parts. Teachers' lectures were a great source of listening for the LSL and he also found listening exercise helpful. The MSL also liked and audio-recoded teachers' lectures and further opined that a tailored course on listening might help him more with different techniques and strategies to facilitate listening.

Nature of second language listening

The students revealed a few aspects of nature of L2 listening. While the LSL reported the difference between reading and listening and L2 and L1 listening, the MSL reported on listening as an integrative skill and active skill.

Strategy Knowledge

Both students reported on their knowledge of strategy use for assisting and developing listening and strategies that did not work always. Strategy knowledge, however, revealed a considerable difference between the two listeners.

Strategies assisting listening comprehension

Both the groups reported using all three types of strategies; however, the MSL seems to be more aware of metacognitive strategies than his counterpart.

Metacognitive Strategies

Frequent use of metacognitive strategies was reported by the MSL. While the MSL was aware of self-management, selective attention, directed attention, monitoring strategies, the LSL reported selective attention and directed attention strategies.

Mishu: When I can't get all I listen I try to focus on important things only.

Abir: While listening I try to concentrate hard and try to check if I am listening right by remembering the previous part.

Cognitive strategies

Inferencing and substitution strategies were reported by both listeners, but the use of elaboration and summarisation were reported by the MSL.

Socio-affective strategies

Cooperation was reported by both the listeners but asking for clarification was reported by the MSL.

Strategies assisting listening development

A number of metacognitive and cognitive strategies were reported the students. Self-management, monitoring, planning, practising pronunciation and accent, and note taking were reported by the MSL. Proposing plans and frequent listening were reported by the LSLs.

Strategies that do not work always

There are some strategies employed by the listeners, but they sometimes failed to assist in comprehension or development of listening. Among these, the LSL reported directed attention and the MSL reported planning and selective attention. Inferencing was reported by both.

Mishu: I try my best to concentrate but find myself lost several times.

Abir: If it happens I don't understand the whole sentence, I can't use any context either to infer the meaning of the whole sentence.

DISCUSSION

Findings of RQ1 show a moderate use of overall listening strategies and of each of the categories indicating not a high degree of listening strategies used by tertiary EFL learners in Bangladesh. Use of metacognitive strategies is slightly higher among the learners which lend support to Chao (1996) but not Teng (1998).

Findings of no significant correlation between the learners' perceived use of listening strategies and their listening comprehension suggested no positive link between listening comprehension and strategy use among these learners. This finding is incongruent with previous studies such as Chao (1996), Teng (1998), and Liu (2008). Liu (2008), of course, did not found any clear linear relationship between listening attainment and use of listening strategy categories among different proficiency groups. The finding of this current study, however, lends support to Serri et al (2012). Serri et al (2012) failed to show significant correlation between the use of the three listening comprehension strategy categories and listening performance, the reason behind non-significance might be the small sample size.

Only few of the individual strategies are, however, significantly correlated with listening comprehension. Whereas planning and substitution show a significant and positive correlation; linguistic inferencing and note taking are slightly negatively correlated with listening comprehension. These suggest that the high scorers plan frequently before listening and they also substitute something they do not understand well with something similar. However, the pattern of using linguistic inferencing and note-taking suggests that the low scorers infer frequently to obtain the meaning from the previous or later parts of the text and they also try to take notes frequently. However, it might also be that although the low scorers use linguistic inferencing and note taking frequently, they cannot use them effectively or appropriately to generate meaning successfully, hence they fail to score high.

The findings of RQ2 reveal that students seem to be much aware of metacognition and this high degree of metacognitive awareness is found in Goh (1997, 1998). Unlike Goh (1998), the two listening ability learners differ slightly in person and task knowledge, but considerably in their strategy knowledge. However, this is to acknowledge that the sample size is quite small to come to a conclusion.

As mentioned earlier, unlike existing research on metacognitive knowledge which included only knowledge of the listeners themselves as person knowledge (Goh, 1997; 1998), this study includes two types of person knowledge: knowledge of listeners themselves (Listening Self) and knowledge about a good listener (Good listener). Therefore, any discussion on Listening Self is discussed with reference to person knowledge in existing literature.

Findings suggest while LSLs are bit more concerned with vocabulary and pronunciation as attributes of a good listener, MSLs are concerned with good listener's motivation and strategic knowledge. Like Goh (1998), the good listener is more exposed to target language is also reported by the MSL. Vandergrift (2003b) and Vogely (1995) also explored what makes a skilled or good listener in L2 listening. Vandergrift (2003b) showed that the skilled listener used more metacognitive strategies and Vogely (1995) revealed that effective comprehension strategies used by a good listener were understanding gist, word recognition, vocabulary, background knowledge, focuses on details, pronunciation. The students in this study also mentioned many of these strategies as good listener strategies.

The students report as many as five subcategories of Listening Self cognitive processes: learner needs, obstacles to listening comprehension, obstacles to listening development, problems during listening, and self-concept, of which 'learner' emerged from the data itself. Their reports show their extensive awareness of their Listening Self. This is incongruent with previous studies (e.g., Goh, 1997; 1998) which reported leaners' less awareness of person knowledge compared to task or strategy knowledge.

The MSLs reported a greater number of problems supported by Goh (2000). The nature and degree of the same problems by the two listening ability listeners are not supported by Goh (2000). Although the MSL miss the next part, he can redirect his attention and manage to return to the track, conversely the LSL feel lost when he loses his concentration even after trying to redirect his attention. The MSL's mention of the problem in utilisation corresponds to Goh (2000). Both the listeners, however, mention the problem of not recognizing sounds of words known already in written refers to a gap between their interaction with written English and Spoken English in the EFL context of Bangladesh. Since the English education system in an EFL Bangladesh emphasises more on reading and writing till 12 grades, the students are less exposed to listening, hence to spoken English with right pronunciation of many words. As a result, they can little map between graphic representation of words and their pronunciation in spoken English, when many of the English words are notoriously different in written and oral forms (Maniruzzaman, 2008).

Many of the obstacles to listening comprehension are also identified by Goh (1997). Among the obstacles reported, the MSL seem to be richer in vocabulary and knowledge of pronunciation. The LSL also feel anxious and fear listening. In this case, some strategies e.g., planning, selective attention, elaboration and affective strategies might help to manage fear and nervousness.

Cognitive processes were not much reported by the students, unlike Goh (1997). One possible reason can be that the students in Goh's (1997) study reflected against specific questions on completion of listening tasks and wrote down in their diaries which facilitated awareness of cognitive processes involved. The MSL's global listening and the LSL's translation reveals a difference between these two listening ability groups, which also indicates their preference for top-down and bottom-up listening.

Unlike, Goh (1997, 1998), this study found students' listening needs. The students explicitly state their needs in their comments. This showed the two listening ability learners often had different needs, and awareness of their needs can help both themselves and teachers find ways to address them.

Whereas the MSL had a positive self-concept, the LSL showed a negative self-concept. Goh (1998) also shows negative perception exclusively among low ability listeners. Bandura (1997) argues that low self-efficacy is linked to anxiety, hence students need to boost their self-efficacy and confidence in order to listen better. Graham (2011) believes that self-efficacy is instrumental to effective listening skills and that listening strategy instruction has the potential to boost self-efficacy.

Findings on task knowledge revealed three types of task knowledge - factors affecting listening comprehension, input useful for developing listening, and nature of L2 listening. The findings also revealed a difference between the LSL and the MSL, particularly in strategy knowledge.

Students' awareness of what affect their listening, negatively or positively, is revealed in their report. These factors can be identified in five types following Goh (1999) - text (vocabulary, speed), task (problems with performing two or more things at a time), listener (pronunciation skill, prior knowledge, anxiety and fear, motivation), speaker (accent), and environment (EFL context, social environment). Among factors reported, vocabulary, speed, types of input, and prior knowledge and experience support Goh's (1999). Prior knowledge is an influential factor in listening (Buck, 2001; Macaro et al., 2007). Whereas the LSL shows more awareness on his weaknesses, the MSL reported a balanced awareness of both positive and negative factors facilitating or inhibiting listening comprehension or development. The LSL might feel more motivated when he could give attention to what might facilitate his listening and thus tackle anxiety and frustration.

Students reported not much about input and nature of L2 listening. Five types of input useful for listening are watching movies, listening to English songs, teachers' lectures, listening to English commentaries, BBC news, are also mostly reported in Goh (1999). This shows that the MSL is more aware of other input for listening development-songs, documentary, and news and how they are useful. The MSL's mention of listening as an active skill and integrative skill create a strong sense in himself to approach the skill accordingly by active processing and being motivated after realising the importance of listening in developing other language skills.

Strategic knowledge comprised learners' knowledge of strategies assisting listening comprehension, strategies assisting listening development, and strategies that do not work always. In all these cases, the MSL showed more awareness than his counterpart. The students' report revealed all three categories of strategies: metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective strategies against the taxonomy adopted from O'Malley and Chamot (1990) and Vandergrift (1997). The MSL reported more metacognitive strategies as strategies assisting listening comprehension and development-planning, self-management, directed attention, selective attention, and monitoring strategies. The LSL frequently reported directed attention, self-management and note taking. Frequent use of directed attention and selective attention among MSLs and directed attention by LSLs is also revealed by Goh (1998). Both students revealed that some of the metacognitive and cognitive strategies did not work always. Inferencing was reported by both. The LSL reported directed attention and the MSL reported planning and selective attention. Limitations of inferencing is also reported in Goh (1998).

CONCLUSIONS

The key findings are: 1) the Bangladeshi tertiary-level EFL listeners use strategies moderately; therefore, there is a room to instruct more and frequent use of strategies. And, there is no significant correlation between strategy use and listening comprehension, except in the case of some individual strategies. One potential reason can be the small sample size of this study; a larger sample might generate an opposite result. 2) There is a high degree of metacognitive knowledge among the two listeners and an insight into their metacognitive knowledge reveals differences between the two listening ability learners. All these have pedagogical implications-students' awareness of EFL listening and learning to listen can be shared among the class and the strategies can be discussed and taught among these listeners and tailored intervention can be designed being mindful to the differences between the MSLs and the LSLs. Once students

become well aware of various aspects of listening and its learning processes, they will be more motivated to learn to listen and well placed to become autonomous listeners (Goh, 1997).

As a pilot study, this study is a small-scale research and acknowledges the limitation that the sample size is small for a correlation study and to identify the differences between two listening ability learners is difficult due to two listeners only, one from each group. More studies with a larger sample size in the EFL context of Bangladesh might produce more reliable findings and better insights into metacognition. However, the importance of the study lies in its preliminary insights into metacognition in an 'input-poor' EFL context of predominantly monolingual Bangladesh.

REFERENCES

Alam, Z. & Sinha, B. S. (2009). Developing listening skills for tertiary level learners. *The Dhaka University Journal of Linguistics*, 2 (3), 19-52.

Anderson, J. R. (1985). *Cognitive psychology and its implications*. New York: Freeman.

Bandura, A. (1997). Theoretical perspectives. *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*, 1-35.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Buck, G. (2001). *Assessing listening*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chao, J. Y. G. (1996). *The influence of strategy use on comprehension and recall of authentic English listening texts by Chinese students in Taiwan*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Minnesota.

Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.

Cohen & Macaro (2007). *Language learner strategies: 30 years of research and practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Færch, C., & Kasper, G. (1986). The role of comprehension in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 7, 257-274.

Feyten, C. M. (1991). The power of listening ability: An overlooked dimension in language acquisition, *Modern Language Journal, 75*, 173-180.

Field, J. (2004). An insight into listeners' problems: Too much bottom-up or too much top-down? *System, 32*, 363-377.

Field, J. (2008a). Guest editor's introduction: Emergent and divergent: A view of second language listening research. *System*, *36*(1), 2-9.

Field, J. (2008b). *Listening in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flavell, J.H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive development enquiry. *American Psychologist* 34, 906-11.

Goh, C. (1997). Metacognitive awareness and second language listeners. *ELT Journal*, *51*(4), 361-369.

Goh, C. (1998). *Strategic processing and metacognition in second language listening*. Doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK.

Goh, C. C. M. (1999). What learners know about the factors that influence their listening comprehension. *Hong Kong Journal of Applied Linguistics, 4*, 17–42.

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

Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive instruction for second language listening development: Theory, practice and research implications. *RELC Journal*, *39*(2), 188-213.

Goh, C. C., & Hu, G. (2014). Exploring the relationship between metacognitive awareness and listening performance with questionnaire data. *Language Awareness, 23*(3), 255-274. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2013.769558

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*, 747–783.

Liu, H. J. (2008). A study of the interrelationship between listening strategy use, listening proficiency levels, and learning style. *Annual Review of Education, Communication & Language Sciences, 5*.

Lynch, T. (2002). Listening: Questions of level. In KAPLAN, R. (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Applied Linguistics.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal, 90*(3), 320-337.

Macaro, E., Graham,S., &Vanderplank,R. (2007) A review of listening strategies: Focus on sources of knowledge and on success. In Cohen, A. and Macaro, E. (Eds), *Thirty Years of Research and Practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 165-185.

Maniruzzaman, M. (2008). *Teaching EFL pronunciation. why? what? and how?* Munich, Germany: Grin Publishing.

Mendelsohn, D. J. (1994). *Learning to listen: A strategy-based approach for the second-language learner*. San Diego, CA: Dominie Press.

Mendelsohn, D. J. (1998). Teaching listening. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 18,* 81-101.

Naiman, N., Frohlich, M., Stern, H. H. And Todesco, A. (1978) *The good language learner*. Research in Education Series, 7. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

O'Malley, J.M., & Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Malley, J.M., Chamot, A.U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics, 10*(4), 418-437.

Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* New York: Newbury House.

Oxford, R. L., Griffiths, C., Longhini, A., Cohen, A. D., Macaro, E., & Harris, V. (2014). Experts' personal metaphors and similes about language learning strategies. *System, 43*, 11-29.

Rost, M (1990). *Listening in language learning*. London: Longman.

Rost, M. (2001). Listening. In R. Carter and D. Nunan (Eds), *The Cambridge TESOL Guide*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 7–14.

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

Serri, F., Boroujeni, A. J., & Hesabi, A. (2012). Cognitive, metacognitive, and social/affective strategies in listening comprehension and their relationships with individual differences. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, *2*(4), 843.

Teng, H. C. (1998). *A Study of EFL Listening Comprehension Strategies*. Paper presented at the Annual Convention and Exposition of the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Seattle, WA.

Vandergrift, L. (1997). The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, *30*(3), 387-409.

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

Vandergrift, L. (2003a). From prediction through reflection: Guiding students through the process of L2 listening. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 59*, 425440.

Vandergrift, L. (2003b). Orchestrating strategy use: Toward a model of the skilled second language listener. *Language Learning, 53* (3), 463-496.
Vandergrift, L. (2004). Listening to learn or learning to listen? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24*, 3-25.
Vandergrift, L. & Goh, C. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. New York: Routledge.
Vandergrift, L., Goh, C. C. M, Mareschal, C., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2006). The Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ): Development and validation. *Language Learning*, *56*, 431–462.
Vogely, A. (1995). Perceived strategy use during performance on three authentic listening comprehension tasks. *Modern Language Journal, 79*(1), 41–56.
Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy*. New York: Prentice Hall.
Wenden, A. (1998). Metacognitive Knowledgeand language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 19*, 515–537.
Zhang, L. (2001). Awareness in reading: EFL students' Metacognitive Knowledgeof reading strategies in an acquisition-poor environment. *Language Awareness, 10*(4), 268-288.

The Author

Tasnima Aktar is an Associate Professor in the Department of English at Comilla University. She completed her PhD in TESOL from the Department of Education at the University of York, UK. She has more than ten years of experience of teaching TESOL, ELT, EAP, EFL, ESOL and research methodology in the higher education context in both Bangladesh and the UK. She is also an Associate Fellow of the Higher Education Academy, UK.
Contact details: tasnima.aktar7@gmail.com

APPENDIX

Inventory of Metacognitive Knowledge

Categories	Kinds of Person knowledge	Subcategories	Types
Person Knowledge	Good Listener Knowledge	Linguistic factors	Vocabulary Grammar Pronunciation and accent
		Motivational factors	Interest in English language Exposure from early years
		Strategic factors	Metacognitive strategies- planning, selective attention, monitoring Cognitive strategies- inferencing, substitution, listening frequently and repeatedly Socio-affective strategies- asking for clarification, cooperation
		Other factors	Quick processing of the text Good memory

			Getting main ideas Listening with purpose Perseverance
	Listening Self	Cognitive processes during listening	Translate words into L1 Global listening
		Listener needs	Continuous practice More exposure Practising vocabulary Practising pronunciation and accent Something both educational and recreational A tailored course on listening Practising strategies
		Obstacles to listening comprehension	Vocabulary Pronunciation and accent Speed Memory Unfamiliar topics
		Obstacles to listening development	Own personality Social environment
		Problems during listening	Perceptual processing Parsing Utilisation
		Self-concept	Positive or negative self-esteem Perceived improvement Self-efficacy and confidence
Task Knowledge		Factors affecting listening comprehension	Speed Vocabulary Pronunciation and accent Motivation Concentration Timing of listening e.g., night Prior knowledge Types of input Subtitle
		Input useful for developing listening	English movies English songs BBC news Cricket/football commentary Teachers lecture
		Nature of L2 listening	Difference from L1 listening Difference from reading Integrative skill Active skill
Strategy Knowledge		Strategies assisting listening comprehension	Metacognitive strategies- self-management, selective attention,

			directed attention, monitoring strategies Cognitive strategies- inferencing, elaboration, substitution, summarisation Socio-affective strategies- cooperation and asking for clarification
		Strategies assisting listening development	Metacognitive strategies- Self management, monitoring, planning Cognitive strategies- frequent practising, and note taking
		Strategies that do not work always	Metacognitive strategies-directed attention, selective attention, planning Cognitive strategies- inferencing