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Abstract

This study reports the results of training eleven MEIF (Modelo Educativo Integral Flexible) students of English II at the Language Center of Córdoba of the Universidad Veracruzana on five metacognitive learning strategies for listening comprehension. The selection of the strategies studied was made, taking into consideration the students' needs. These strategies were: predicting, paying attention, planning for a language task, self-monitoring and self-evaluation.

The two research questions for this study were the following: Does a training program on metacognitive strategies help MEIF students of English II to improve their listening comprehension skills? and What is the impact of using metacognitive strategies on the students? Finally, the results revealed that training students on the use of metacognitive strategies has a positive impact, not only on the students' academic performance, but also on their emotional level, as emphasized by humanism.
Introduction

In recent decades, education has enormously changed from a traditional to a humanistic school. The area of language teaching is not the exception. From a humanistic perspective, learning is concerned with educating the whole person: the intellectual and the emotional dimensions; in other words, learning is affected by how students feel about themselves (Moskowitz, 1978 in Tudor, 1996).

Many aspects concerning the four skills related to second and foreign language learning have been studied from a humanistic perspective. In regards to the area of listening comprehension, research has paid special attention to the instruction of learning strategies in general; however, very few studies on the training of metacognitive learning strategies for this skill have been undertaken. The present study will examine the results revealed after eleven MEIF students followed a six-week training program on five metacognitive strategies: predicting, paying attention, planning for a language task, self-monitoring and self-evaluation.

As an English teacher for MEIF (Modelo Educativo Integral Flexible) students at the Universidad Veracruzana, I have observed how frustrated and disappointed they feel when failing listening exercises, especially during the midterm and final exam. Therefore, in the present study I attempted to answer two research questions: Does a training program on metacognitive strategies help MEIF students of English II to improve their listening comprehension skills? and What is the impact of using metacognitive strategies on the students?

In the following pages, first, I will examine some key concepts about listening comprehension skills, learning strategies and strategy training in the English as a foreign language area; then, I will describe the methodology that I followed in order to meet my research objectives; next, I will analyze the findings that this study
revealed and finally, in the last chapter, I will conclude and provide some suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER ONE:  Metacognitive Learning Strategies for Listening Comprehension

This chapter will examine key concepts in this study. It will be divided in four parts. The first part will discuss listening comprehension and some of the features that make it easy or difficult. The second section will deal with the definition of language learning strategies and the categories that some authors have proposed, in particular, of metacognitive strategies. The third part will describe the situation that students of English II at the MEIF program of the Language Center Córdoba of the Universidad Veracruzana face in regards to their listening strategies. Finally, the last section will summarize some studies that have been carried out recently about the instruction of learning strategies for listening comprehension.

1. Language skills: listening comprehension

This section will discuss what language skills are, especially, listening comprehension and some of the features that make it easy or difficult according to some authors.

1.1 Language skills

The process of learning a language entails the development of certain skills that allow people to understand what others say and also to express what they want to say. In this respect, language educators have long made use of the concepts of four basic language skills, which are: listening, speaking, reading and writing. Experts have classified language skills in two main groups: productive skills and receptive skills. As their names suggest, in productive skills, a product is expected, whereas in receptive skills this product is received. Therefore, language skills are integrated as follows:
Harmer (2002) claims that in productive skills the speaker/writer wants to say something, has a communicative purpose and selects from a language store, whereas in receptive skills, the listener/reader wants to listen to something, is interested in a communicative purpose and processes a variety of language.

For the purpose of the present study, I will only focus on one receptive skill and this is listening.

1.2 Listening comprehension

Listening is the most widely used language skill and according to the International Association of Listening (2007), the percentage of time that we devote to listen is of 45%. Statistics suggest that we spend almost half of our time listening and we do this for different purposes. The term *listening* in language teaching is used to refer to a complex process that allows us to understand spoken language. Listening is a skill that is often used in conjunction with the other skills of speaking, reading and writing. According to Rost (2001) “Listening is not only a skill area in language performance, but also a critical means of acquiring a second language. Listening is the channel in which we process language in real time – employing pacing, units of encoding and pausing that are unique to spoken language” (Rost, 2001:7).

The phenomenon of listening, as a goal-oriented activity, involves two processes: “bottom-up” and “top-down”. In the former, the listeners attend to data in the incoming speech signals, whereas in the latter, the listeners use prior knowledge and expectations to create meaning. These two processes take place at different
levels of cognitive organization: phonological, grammatical, lexical and propositional. This process is often described as a “parallel processing model” of language understanding: representations at these various levels create activation at other levels (McClelland, 1987 in Rost, 2001). Listening is, therefore, a complex process that requires considerable effort while learning a foreign language. But, in general, what factors make listening easy or difficult for language learners?

1.3 What makes listening easy or difficult?

Listening to a child speaking may be easy, while listening to a doctor talking to a colleague may be difficult. But, what factors make listening easy or hard? According to Anderson and Lynch (1988), although a large number of factors are involved, they fall into three principal categories, related to:

1. The kind of language that people listen to, for instance, if it is formal or informal language;
2. The purpose for listening, that is, why people listen and,
3. The context where listening occurs, that is, where, how, who, and when people listen.

Other authors, such as Underwood (1989) and McDonough and Shaw (1993) classify the problems that language learners may encounter when learning to listen in seven groups:

1. The speed of delivery is not controllable. The speaker may speak fast.
2. The information is sometimes not repeated.
3. The lack of vocabulary and/or the lack of recognition of it when pronounced.
4. The failure to recognize “signals”, such as the use of expressions like “first”, “secondly”, “then”, etc.
5. The lack of contextual knowledge. For example, it may be difficult to follow a listening exercise without background information, such as, who the speakers are, what their relationship are, where they are, why they are speaking, to mention some.

6. The lack of concentration in a foreign language. It may be that when listening there are external reasons that make the listener lose concentration, such as, noises, personal problems or worries, anxiety, etc.

7. The listeners' learning habits, such as a wish to understand every word.

In addition to this information, Sigband (1997 in Abdulmajid 2005) gives several reasons for ineffective listening in language classes. Some of these are:

1. Students fail to concentrate. In language classes, it may be difficult for some students to concentrate when there are several distractors in a classroom, such as, partners speaking, external noises, the voice of the speaker itself, etc.

2. In language classes, effective listening exercises require hard work and time.

3. Students' lack of techniques for listening, for example: paying attention to key elements, such as the number of speakers, rate of delivery or any other situational elements; finding key words; identifying paraphrasing and intonation to mention some of the most common.

Similarly, Nunan (1991) points out that the difficulty of listening tasks is particularly influenced by the following:

1. How the information is organized and asked in a listening exercise. For instance, research has shown that those texts in which the order in which the information was presented matched its chronological sequence in real life were easier than texts in which the information was presented out of sequence.

2. How familiar the topic is for the listener. A certain text may be easier to be understood if the information is part of the listener's schemata.
3. How explicit and sufficient the information is. For example, if the listener has to make use of background information in order to deduce certain information.

4. How expressions are used. The use of pronouns instead of using nouns may make texts more difficult to be understood.

5. How the information is described. Listening to a horror story may be different to listening to the description of a car, just to mention an example.

In sum, there are many elements that make the listening comprehension process difficult for language learners. However, as language teachers, we can help our students to identify these aspects of listening comprehension in a foreign language and also to overcome them by using their own tools. These tools, in the language learning-teaching process are better known as language learning strategies which will be defined in the following section of this paper.

2. Language learning strategies

In the last years, cognitive psychology has had a considerable influence on language teaching methodology. From this perspective, the form in which individuals interact is vital for learning to take place and this is clearly observable in the changing roles expected from the two main actors of education: the teacher and the student. In a cognitive approach, the teacher is not a provider anymore, but a facilitator, whereas the student is not a receiver, but an active individual who analyzes her/his own learning and seeks opportunities to learn.

One of the movements that came from cognitive psychology and have had important repercussions for language teaching has been called constructivism, which grew mainly with the work of Jean Piaget, Jerome Bruner and George Kelly. For Piaget, it was really important to take account of the learner as an individual, actively involved in constructing meaning. For him, when learners learn a new language, they are actively involved in making their own sense of the language
input that surrounds them as well as the tasks presented to them. Thus, it is important for teachers to help and encourage learners in this process, rather than seeing them as passive receivers of the language. (Williams and Burden, 1997:23)

Similarly, for Bruner, a central aim of education is the development of conceptual understanding and of cognitive skills and strategies, rather than the acquisition of factual information. One particularly significant aspect of Bruner's ideas is the education of the whole person. For him, one of the central elements of education is the need to learn how to learn, which is the key to transfer what has been learned from one situation to another (Idem: 24).

Likewise, Kelly has been considered one of the pioneers of the constructivist movement. For him, worthwhile learning does not entail the reception of ready-made facts, but must involve the building of new personal meanings and understandings. Putting it in other words, for language learning, language is not learned by the mere memorization of items of grammar, discourse, function or other aspects of language. Rather, learners are involved in an active process of making sense, of creating their own understanding of the world of language that surrounds them (Idem: 28).

In the same way as cognitive psychology, another school of thought in psychology which has had a great influence in language teaching is humanism. According to Williams and Burden (1997: 30) humanistic approaches emphasize the importance of the inner world of the learner and place the individual's thoughts, feelings and emotions at the forefront of all human development. These are aspects of the learning process that are often unjustly neglected, yet they are vitally important if we are to understand human learning in its totality.

One of the most well-known proponents of the humanistic school was Carl Rogers for whom the significant learning will only take place when the subject matter is perceived to be of personal relevance to the learner and when it involves active
participation by the learner. Learning which is self-initiated and which involves feelings as well as cognition is most likely to be lasting. For Rogers, learning is most likely to happen when independence, creativity, self-reliance and self-evaluation are promoted. Rogers thought that the most important was preparing learners to cope with the demands of the world by means of learning to learn. Putting it in Pine and Boy’s words:

i. “Our best preparation for an evolving society is helping children face the future with confidence in their own abilities and with a faith that they are worldwhile and important members of whatever culture they might find themselves in.” (Pine and Boy, 1977:47 in Williams and Burden, 1997)

In brief, some of the maxims that humanism has offered to language teaching methodology are: make learners to create a sense of belonging; make the subject to be learned relevant; take into consideration the learner as a whole person; encourage self-knowledge and self-esteem; involve the feelings and emotions; avoid criticism; develop knowledge of the learning to learn process; encourage self-initiation and self-evaluation.

Both of them, cognitive psychology and humanism brought a change of perspective in language teaching; the learner is responsible and takes charge of their own learning. Therefore, s/he needs to develop a whole range of learning strategies which help her/him to feel successful whenever the learning is taking place. These resources are better known as learning strategies.

Researchers have paid particular attention to the term “learning strategy” among all the various and complex factors that affect language learning. Some of the many definitions that exist of language learning strategies are compiled and cited in the following chart by Marín (2007:16):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rubin (1975: 43)</td>
<td>“By strategies, I mean the techniques or devices which a learner may use to acquire knowledge.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stern (1983:405)</td>
<td>“In our view strategy is best reserved for general tendencies or overall characteristics of the approach employed by the language learner, leaving techniques as the term to refer to particular forms of observable learning behaviour.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamot (1987:71)</td>
<td>“Learning strategies are techniques, approaches or deliberate actions that students take in order to facilitate the learning, recall of both linguistic and content area information.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubin (1987:23)</td>
<td>Learning strategies are strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner constructs and affect learning directly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wenden (1987:6)</td>
<td>“The term learner strategies refers to language learning behaviours learners actually engaged in to learn and regulate the learning of a second language.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author/Reference</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen (1990:5)</td>
<td>&quot;Learning strategies are viewed as learning processes which are consciously selected by the learner. The element of choice is important here because this is what gives a strategy its special character.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O'Malley and Chamot (1990:1)</td>
<td>&quot;The special thoughts or behaviors that individuals use to comprehend, learn, or retain new information.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford (1990:8)</td>
<td>&quot;Learning strategies are specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situation.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen-Freeman and Long (1991:212)</td>
<td>&quot;We turn now to implications of research on learning strategies, those unconscious and conscious activities undertaken by learners that promote learning.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen (1998:4)</td>
<td>&quot;Language learning and language use strategies can be defined as those processes which are consciously selected by learners and which may result in action taken to enhance the learning or use of a second or foreign language, through the storage, retention, recall, and application of information about that language.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Therefore, learning strategies are conscious thoughts and behavior that learners use with the goal of improving their knowledge of the target language. The concept of "learning strategy" was first introduced in the terminology of language teaching in the early 1970s when Rubin conducted some research on the attitudes and behaviors of language learners. Her research focused on the strategies that successful learners use. She believed that once identified, these strategies could be used by less successful learners. In 1975 Stern detected ten strategies necessary to attain language learning competence. However, this list was modified by Naiman (1978) whose main focus was on personality traits, cognitive styles and strategies in successful learners. According to this list, good language learners:

1. actively involve themselves in the language learning process by identifying and seeking preferred learning environments and exploring them,
2. develop an awareness of language as a system,
3. develop an awareness of language as a means of communication and interaction,
4. accept and cope with the affective demands of the language learned,
5. extend and revise the language learned system by inferencing and monitoring (Wenden and Rubin, 1987: 20).

In the 1970s, Hosenfeld (1977 in Tudor, 1996) reported research on reading strategies of successful and unsuccessful learners obtained by the use of "think aloud" (type of introspection) processes. Also, in 1977, Tarone wrote about the different communication strategies used by learners in order to remain in a conversation. By the early 1980s Cohen and Aphek (in Tudor, 1996) discussed the strategies students use in learning vocabulary, whereas, in 1982 and 1986 Wenden added an important new dimension to the learning strategies theory: the metacognitive knowledge in language learning. Wenden identified 5 areas of metacognitive knowledge: 1) the language, 2) student proficiency, 3) outcome of the student's learning endeavors, 4) the student's role in the language learning process, and 5) how best to approach to the task of language learning. Wenden's
research has contributed important insights on metacognition in second language learning, namely, what learners know about their language learning (metacognitive knowledge) and how they plan it (a regulatory process) (Wenden and Rubin, 1987: 22). After Wenden, by 1985, Chamot and O'Malley proposed the first contrast between cognitive and metacognitive strategies and in the early 1990s, Oxford presented a taxonomy of learning strategies dividing them into two main categories: direct and indirect. Similarly, other authors have proposed several classifications of language learning strategies. Some of the main ones are listed in the following grid in order to show the correspondence among them:

Table 2 Different classification of language learning strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author (s)</th>
<th>Learning strategies classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O'Malley (1985)</td>
<td>1. Metacognitive Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Cognitive Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Socioaffective Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Clarification / Verification, Guessing / Inductive Inferencing, Deductive Reasoning, Practice, Memorization, and Monitoring).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Metacognitive Learning Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Planning, Prioritizing, Setting goals and Self-management).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Communication Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Social Strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Direct strategies:
   a. Memory (Creating mental linkages, Applying images and sounds, Reviewing well, Employing action).
   b. Cognitive (Practicing, Receiving and sending messages strategies, Analyzing and reasoning and Creating structure for input and output).
   c. Compensation strategies (Guessing intelligently, Overcoming limitations in speaking and writing).

2. Indirect strategies:
   a. Metacognitive strategies (Centering your learning, Arranging and planning your learning, Evaluating your learning).
   b. Affective Strategies (Lowering your anxiety, Encouraging yourself, Taking your emotional temperature).
   c. Social Strategies (Asking questions, Cooperating with others, Empathizing with others).
| Stern (1992) | 1. Management and Planning Strategies:
A. Decide what commitment to make to language learning.
B. Set himself reasonable goals.
C. Decide on an appropriate methodology, select appropriate resources, and monitor progress.
D. Evaluate his achievement in the light of previously determined goals and expectation.

2. Cognitive Strategies
A. Clarification/ Verification.
B. Guessing/Inductive Inferencing.
C. Deductive Reasoning.
D. Practice.
E. Memorization.
F. Monitoring.

3. Communicative - Experiential Strategies

4. Interpersonal Strategies

5. Affective Strategies |
Thus, even though different names are given to the categories of language learning strategies, all authors agree on the fact that language learning strategies are the key to learner’s autonomy, that is to say, learning how to learn. According to Brown (1994:124-125), as part of a standard communicative methodology, teachers help students to learn how to learn by becoming aware of their own style preferences and the strategies. From this perspective, some of the several tasks of a language teacher are those of encouraging and helping students to take responsibility for their own learning process and be more autonomous learners. Students make use of their own resources, such as self-monitoring, self-analyzing, identifying their weaknesses as well as their strengths in order to meet their goals and thus, feel motivated and successful when learning takes place as stated by Moskowitz (1978) and Stevick (1976) in Tudor (1996). This repertoire of resources is called metacognition and it is defined as follows.

### 2.1 Metacognition and metacognitive strategies

The term “metacognition” has been broadly defined in recent years. Although many definitions have been proposed, some of the most important ones are shown in Table 3.

#### Table 3 Definitions of metacognition or metacognitive strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goh (1997)</td>
<td>“An individual’s metacognitive knowledge is their self-knowledge about learning, and this consists of knowledge about person, task and strategy.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Researchers agree on the fact that metacognitive strategies are those that involve planning and thinking about learning, such as planning one's learning, monitoring one's own speech or writing, and evaluating how successful a particular strategy is.
The term "metacognitive" means beyond, beside, or with the cognitive (Oxford, 1990). Therefore, metacognitive strategies are actions which go beyond purely cognitive devices, and which provide a way for learners to coordinate their own learning process.

Brown (1994:130,131) points out that building metacognitive strategies help learners:

1. To lower inhibitions
2. To encourage risk taking
3. To build students' self-confidence
4. To help students to develop intrinsic motivation
5. To promote cooperative learning
6. To encourage them to use right-brain processing
7. To promote ambiguity tolerance
8. To help them use their intuition
9. To get students to make their mistakes work FOR them
10. To get students to set their own goals.

Some of the metacognitive strategies that have been identified by most authors (Oxford,1990; Wenden, 1987; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990.) are: predicting, planning for a language task, paying attention to key situational elements, seeking practice opportunities, finding out about language learning, self-monitoring and self-evaluation. For the purpose of this study only five of them are going to be defined as follows:

2.1.1 Predicting

By means of this strategy, learners associate key information in a language activity with what they already know. Oxford (1990:138) states that this strategy can be accomplished in many different ways, but it is often helpful to follow three steps:
learning why the activity is being done, building the needed vocabulary, and making associations.

### 2.1.2 Paying attention

Learners decide in advance to pay attention in general to a language learning task and to ignore irrelevant distractors or they decide to attend to specific aspects of language input or situational details that assist in performance of a task. (O’Malley and Chamot, 1990: 137)

### 2.1.3 Planning for a language task

According to Oxford (1990:139) this strategy includes four steps: describing the task or situation, determining its requirements, checking one’s own linguistic resources, and determining additional language elements or functions necessary for the task or situation.

### 2.1.4 Self-monitoring

Self-monitoring includes checking, verifying, or correcting one’s comprehension or performance in the course of a language task. (O’Malley and Chamot, 1990: 137)

### 2.1.5 Self-evaluating

This strategy consists in checking the outcomes of one’s own language performance against an internal measure of completeness and accuracy; checking one’s language repertoire and strategy use.

Metacognitive strategies are not only important, but essential for making language learning a successful and meaningful process. However, recent research has shown that language learners rarely make conscious use of them. Students may
use metacognitive strategies, but they may not be very aware of them. It is at this point where the teacher plays a key role as a facilitator of the learning process in order to help students to become more independent and more responsible for their own learning. The facilitator creates learning environments to help learners become more autonomous, not only by giving them opportunities to internalize information in ways which are meaningful to them, but also by making them aware of a variety of strategies which may make the learning process more meaningful and enjoyable. Blakey and Spence (1990) point out that learning how to learn is developing a repertoire of thinking processes which can be applied to solve problems and all this is a major goal of education.

In the last two decades, educative institutions have faced new challenges as a result of the continuous change that our world has experienced. As many other educational centers, in the state of Veracruz, Mexico, the Universidad Veracruzana has reoriented its curricula in order to meet the rapid changing world's demands as well as to promote different learning environments where learners have a more active role and experience a more self-directed learning guided by teachers whose role is that of facilitator rather than the expert. This educational model of the Universidad Veracruzana will be defined in the next section.

3. The Modelo Educativo Integral Flexible (MEIF) at the Universidad Veracruzana (UV)

After more than 60 years since its foundation, the Universidad Veracruzana has been immersed in several transformative processes. One of the most significant changes that this institution has faced is the implementation of a new educational model called “Modelo Educativo Integral Flexible” (MEIF) since 1999. Many aspects of education have been reconsidered in the MEIF, such as the role of the teacher and the role of the student, being the latter the main focus of the learning process.
In 1999, the Universidad Veracruzana, taking into consideration the conditions of the world such as environmental problems, cultural diversity, the working market, increasing poverty, and others, considered a redefinition of its own role in our society. According to these exigencies, the future professionals' new learning forms were based on inter and transdisciplinary perspectives. This academic orientation points towards a more integral development for the students through a flexible curriculum, based on a credit system, where the learning activities must be selected according to the profile of each area of study and the students' needs and interests in order to compete effectively in life.

The MEIF program has two main objectives:

1. To provide students with more intellectual, humanistic, social and professional education, and
2. To develop in the students the necessary knowledge, abilities, and attitudes in order to achieve the acquisition of intellectual, human, social, cultural and artistic values; a logical, analytic and creative thinking; the establishment of interpersonal relationships based on tolerance and respect towards cultural diversity and finally, the practice of attitudes for self-development. For this purpose, far from providing students with encyclopedic information, the educative model of the University Veracruzana proposes a type of education where the students learn to use their own strategies in order to succeed not only in the academic field, but in every day life.

3.1 Basic area courses (Cursos del área de formación básica general)

The academic orientation in the Universidad Veracruzana called MEIF, is based on a flexible curriculum designed to include not only specific subjects according to each area of study, but also four more subjects called "Basic area courses (cursos del área de formación básica general)". Among these are:
1. Developing abilities to critical thinking (Habilidades del pensamiento crítico)
2. Computer science (Computación básica)
3. Reading and Writing (Taller de lectura y redacción)
4. English I and II (Taller de Inglés I y II)

These four courses are considered basic for all areas of study as well as for providing learners with key tools for their future academic life.

3.2 English I and II

As stated in the "Nuevo Modelo Educativo para la Universidad Veracruzana: Lineamientos para el nivel licenciatura 1999" (now called MEIF), English I and II have as their main objective to provide students with the basic knowledge to acquire the four skills when learning a foreign language: speaking, reading, writing and listening. In order to achieve a basic level of proficiency in these four skills, a series of tasks carried out inside and outside the classroom are proposed in the syllabi of these two subjects. In spite of the fact that a certain amount of time is devoted to the development of each of these four skills, test results as well as surveys suggest that of these four skills, listening comprehension is the ability that the majority of the students consider the most difficult to be mastered. In my experience as an English teacher for the MEIF program students, I have seen how most of the students fail the listening section of their midterm as well as their final exam. Most of the students often complain about not being able to understand what they hear and in some of the cases, this lack of success may lead to frustration and little motivation for finding possible solutions and overcome their learning problems. Therefore, it is pertinent at this point to set the question: How can language teachers help students to overcome this situation and make them experience some kind of progress mainly in the listening comprehension skill?
4. Language learning strategy instruction

It has not been until very recently that many authors have given emphasis to the term "learner training" in order to help students raise awareness of the process of learning a language as well as how they can face their own difficulties among other features of language learning. Dickinson (1987) and Holec (1985 in Hedge: 2000, 85) define "learner training" as a set of procedures or activities which raises learners' awareness of what is involved in learning a foreign language, which encourages learners to become more involved, active, and responsible for their own learning, and which helps them to develop and strengthen their strategies for language learning. Strategy training or development is also defined as teaching explicitly how, when, and why to apply language learning and language strategies to enhance students' efforts to reach language program goals (Carrell, 1996; Cohen, 1998; Ellis & Sinclair, 1989). In this respect, strategy instruction can be of two types: direct or embedded, using O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) terms; informed training and blind training, according to Brown, Bransford, Ferrara, & Campione (1983) or integrated versus separate following Reinders (2004). Integrated instruction refers to programming a specific time in class to focus on certain strategies, whereas, separate teaching, as its name suggests, involves an exclusive time for teaching some strategies.

An example of a strategy training model was suggested by Oxford (1990). This model provides a guideline for instructors in the teaching of learning strategies. The model consists of eight steps: the first five involve planning and preparation, and the last three are related to conducting, evaluating, and revising the training program:

1. Learners' needs and available time are determined,
2. Strategies are well selected,
3. Integration of strategy training is considered,
4. Motivational issues are considered,
5. Materials and activities are prepared,
6. "Completely informed training" is conducted,
7. The strategy training is evaluated, and
8. The strategy training is revised.

Similarly, Chamot and O'Malley developed an instructional model for language learners, called the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA). In this instructional model, teaching is based on collaborative learning principles, learners' prior knowledge, and metacognitive awareness and self-reflection of learners (Chamot et al., 1999).

In my experience as an English teacher for MEIF students, I consider it valuable and necessary to train students on how to use their own tools for taking responsibility of their learning. From this point and based on the previous literature review, I believe that once students are aware of their learning process and how to overcome their different challenging situations when learning a foreign language, they may feel more confident of what decisions to make during learning, and as a result of this, they may feel more motivated and successful. Thus, from a humanistic perspective, language learning will integrate both sides of the person: not only the academic, but also the emotional one.

4.1 Review of representative studies about instruction in language learning strategies for listening comprehension

Research in language learning strategies has been carried out and it describes very often the type of learning strategies used by good language learners and the differences in learning strategy used between more and less successful learners. However, it has not been until relatively recently that a few studies have focused on the teaching of language learning strategies within the classroom, especially in
the listening comprehension area. Some of the most outstanding studies are commented in this section.

Ross and Rost (1991) conducted a significant study where once having identified the listening comprehension strategies used by more successful students, they were taught to less successful learners. Another study of listening comprehension was carried out by Thompson and Rubin (1996) where students received strategy training over one academic year. The results showed improvement on a video comprehension post-test.

Ożeki (2000) undertook a similar study to that of Ross and Rost (1991) by identifying the listening strategies that students already used and teaching those strategies that students used least frequently. The listening comprehension strategy training consisted of 12 classes and each one of them followed this sequence: first, students were explicitly taught a new strategy and those strategies taught in previous classes were reviewed, and next, students practiced the strategies. Pre-test and post-test results revealed improvement in the learners listening comprehension ability.

Recently, Carrier (2003) taught listening comprehension strategies to high school English as Second Language (ESL) students during 6 weeks. Here, two approaches of listening were taught: bottom-up and top-down. Scores in the pre and post-test reflected significant improvement.

More recently, Vandergrift (2003) conducted some research on the listening comprehension strategies of French as second language university students. The purpose of this study was to raise awareness of the listening process in order to develop effective learning strategies. The class pattern was as follows: first, students were told the topic of the listening and predicted the information to be heard by writing a list of vocabulary items related to it. Next, after the first listening, they compared their work in pairs. Once they had already listened for a second time, students filled in additional information. Finally, after a third listening, learners wrote their personal impressions and reflections of the process they had followed.
to achieve the task, what they had learned, and the strategies that they had used. Students' written reflections showed positive attitude towards the listening tasks as well as the understanding of their own learning process.

In short, previous research in the listening comprehension area has paid special attention to the instruction of learning strategies in general; however, very few studies, on the training of metacognitive learning strategies for this same skill, have been undertaken. The present study examines the results that pre and post-test, questionnaires as well as students' journals revealed after eleven MEIF students of English II at the Language Center Córdoba (Universidad Veracruzana) followed a six-week training program in the use of five metacognitive learning strategies for listening comprehension: predicting, paying attention, planning for a language task, self-monitoring and finally, self-evaluating. All this aims to answer the following research questions: Does a training program on metacognitive strategies help MEIF students of English II to improve their listening comprehension skills? and What is the impact of using metacognitive strategies on the students?
CHAPTER TWO: Methodology

1. Context and participants

The present study was carried out in the Language Center Córdoba of the Universidad Veracruzana. This language center has been offering English I and II of the MEIF program since 2000 to students from different areas of study of the UV who come from different places around the region, such as Fortin, Potrero, Atoyac, Paso del Macho, Orizaba, Ciudad Mendoza, Rio Blanco, Nogales, Coscomatepec and Huatusco among others. Students have three main options to get the required credits for English I and II: they can enroll in face-to-face classes (5 hours of contact hours and 1 of counseling session per week for English I; and 4 hours of contact hours and 2 of counseling sessions per week for English II). They are also offered to take the course at a self access center where they are guided by counselors who help them plan and organize in terms of time and language contents, or they can opt to take a proficiency English examination called “examen de competencias”. Both courses have been designed to make students reach elemental communicative objectives. For instance, at the end of the English I course, students are basically expected to exchange personal information; describe people and places and talk about routines, likes and dislikes. On the other hand, in English II, they are expected to exchange personal information; talk about past experiences and future plans and intentions; give some suggestions; compare cities and people, and express desire.

The participants in this study were eleven university students enrolled in English II of the MEIF program during the semester February- August 2008. They belonged to different areas of study: 3 were studying Chemical Engineering, 2 Mechanical Engineering, 2 Computer Science Administration, 1 Business Administration, 1 Nursing, 1 Administration, and 1 Architecture. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 22 years; 2 were men and 9 were women. All of them had Spanish as their mother tongue and had studied English before in high school and other
language centers. The time that participants had devoted to study this language ranged from 1 to 10 years. In spite of this, nine of them had taken English I face-to-face classes, and the other two, the "examen de competencias" to get the required credits for this subject. Nine of the participants considered their level of English as "regular" while the other two, as "good". All of them manifested being very interested in becoming proficient in English because they needed the language for their future academic life.

To integrate this group, all students in two of my classes of English II of the MEIF program were invited to take part as participants, but only eleven of them were interested and volunteered. It is important to mention that when this training program started, the students had already taken their midterm and all of them had failed the listening section.

2. Instruments

Following Chamot and O'Malley (1990), Oxford (1990), Cohen (2003) and Reinders (2004) on the steps for preparing the training program (raise awareness, model the strategy, try out the strategy, evaluate the strategy, and encourage transfer of the strategy to new contexts), the data collection instruments used in this study were:

1. The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) Version for Speakers of Other Languages Learning English Version 7.0 by Oxford, (1989);
2. A background questionnaire designed by Oxford (1989);
3. A pre and post-test;
4. A questionnaire administered after the pre-test and after the post-test as well as at the end of each training session and finally,
5. The students' journals.
2.1 The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Oxford designed the SILL to gather information about the students' processes when learning a language. It is composed of fifty items divided into six parts, each one representing a different strategy as shown in the following table:

Table 4 Names of strategies and their classification by Oxford (1990)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Strategy covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Remembering more effectively</td>
<td>Memory strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Using all your mental processes</td>
<td>Cognitive strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Compensating and evaluating your learning</td>
<td>Compensation strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Organizing and evaluating your learning</td>
<td>Metacognitive strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Managing your emotions</td>
<td>Affective strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Learning with others</td>
<td>Social strategies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purpose of this study, the SILL was used as a diagnostic instrument before the training in order to obtain information about the students' use of metacognitive strategies when learning English (Part D of the SILL). It was also translated into Spanish for a better understanding by the participants (see Appendix 1).

First, one week before the training took place, students were asked to reflect on what they usually did to learn English (by this time the term "learning strategy" had not yet been mentioned to participants). Then, during one of the two hours that students of English II have as counselling hours, they were explained what a learning strategy was and all the participants shared what learning strategies they had used when learning a language. This activity was carried out in the classroom
and took very little time in order not to influence students' answers of the SILL. Next, the SILL was administered following the steps suggested by Oxford (1989): the worksheets were distributed and the instructions were read. The students were informed that the information obtained from the SILL was going to be confidential. Once they had finished answering the SILL, they calculated and interpreted their results by means of the criteria included at the end of the SILL called "Profile of Results on the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (see this Profile at the end of Appendix 1).

2.2 A background questionnaire

Students were also given a background questionnaire created by Oxford (1990) who suggests the use of this instrument in order for teachers to get extra information about students' personal features such as: age, mother tongue, proficiency in the language, interests for studying the language, previous experiences with the language, and so on. This questionnaire was also translated into Spanish (see Appendix 2) and was administered in another session right after the administration of the SILL. The purpose of using this questionnaire was just to obtain information that would help to know the students' profiles and to understand their answers or comments in context during the whole training.

2.3 The pre and post-test

Before and after the training sessions, a pre and post-test was administered. This test was exactly the same at both moments of the study. The instrument was designed following the guidelines specified in the booklet created by the Comisión de Evaluación y Seguimiento (CES) of the Universidad Veracruzana called 'Especificaciones con ejemplos para escribir reactivos para los exámenes estandarizados de la Experiencia Educativa Inglés II del Área de Formación...
The pre and post-test followed the agreed and validated guidelines by the CES, and also because it follows the same structure used for evaluating the listening comprehension section during the midterm and the final exam. It contained twenty items divided into three sections. Section one consists of six monologues (from 40 to 50 words: 30 seconds approximately). Items 1 to 6 are divided into two parts: a sentence with a blank and then two options (A or B) to complete ideas or information contained in the recorded text. Section two, on the other hand, is a conversation (from 170 to 190 words: 1 - 1.30 minutes). Items 7 to 13 are integrated by two parts: a sentence with a blank and then three options (A, B or C) to complete ideas or information contained in the recorded text. Finally, section three is a monologue (from 180 to 200 words: 1.30 -2 minutes). Items 14 to 20 consist of transference of information to complete a table (see Appendix 3). In the three sections, the items designed for each listening section are ordered according to the listening text so that students do not have to go back and forwards to find the answer. All the listening sections in the pre and post-test contained vocabulary items included in the glossary of the English II syllabus (see Appendix 4 for transcriptions). The recorded texts for listening were taken from the series "American Headway" (Books: Starter and 1, 2002), which is the book used in the English for conversation courses at the Language Center Córdoba.

In order to demonstrate the reliability of the test (Hatch and Lazaraton, 1991; Hernández Sampieri, 1998) I was first piloted on students of English II of the MEIF program and also an analysis of variance was done for each of the sections of the test. In the first section the variance was equal to 0.94728443; in the second section, 0.94055724 and in the third section, 0.97117517. The three results approximate 1; therefore, they are statistically reliable.
2.4 The questionnaire

Among the questionnaires that aim at encouraging learners to evaluate their own learning process there are those proposed by Chamot and Kupper (1989) and Arter and Spandle (1992). For the purpose of this study, both questionnaires were compared, their elements in common were selected, and finally the questions were adapted. The questionnaire was piloted on some English II students of the MEIF program whose language proficiency level was similar to that of the participants. Questions were intended to obtain data on aspects such as:

1. Students’ process of listening comprehension,
2. Students’ problems as well as the solutions they had for these problems when listening,
3. Students’ self-awareness of their weaknesses and strengths,
4. Students’ reactions and feelings when listening and
5. Students’ self-evaluation.

The questionnaire was administered in three different, but very significant moments: first, at the end of the pre-test (see Appendix 5), then, at the end of every training session (see Appendix 6), and finally, at the end of the post-test (see Appendix 7). At each of these moments some of the questions were slightly modified in structure, but their content was always related to the five previously listed aspects.

It is valuable to mention that the questionnaire was designed in Spanish for two main reasons: the first has to do with the fact that most of the students’ level of English is very basic, and the second and more important for the purpose of this study is related to the necessity of making students feel free and at ease to express themselves in the way they desired.
2.5 The students' journals

This instrument had two purposes (Cohen, 1998):

1. For the facilitator, to monitor students' progress during the training and,
2. For the students, to raise awareness of the process they followed when listening, as well as to notice their weaknesses and strengths.

At the end of every session students were suggested that they should do further practice at home, at a self access center or in any other place they could, and do this as many times as they considered necessary. Every time that the students did a listening activity outside the classroom, they were asked to answer the end-of-session questionnaire and reported their listening activities as a personal record of their thoughts, feelings, achievements, problems and impressions. In addition to this, the participants were guided on what type of information to include and how to write it in their journals (see Appendix 8). This information was read only by the facilitator and the students were informed of that.

3. Overview of treatment: the training program

One of the options that MEIF students have to pass English I and II is by taking face-to-face classes. For the English II course, students are required to attend 4 hours of class and 2 hours of counseling sessions per week. This training program was carried out during these sessions assigned for counseling, that is to say, a specific time was set aside in order for students to focus explicitly on the learning strategies. The program took place once a week (Thursdays from 6:15-7:30 p.m.) in a classroom at the Language Center Córdoba for a period of six weeks, right after the students' midterm and until the end of the academic semester. For the purpose of this study, the following section is divided into three parts: pre-training, while-training and post-training.
3.1 Pre-training

In order to organize the training program and make some decisions, some literature related to this study was reviewed. As suggested by Reinders (2004) and Oxford (1990), first, the objectives of the training program were evaluated:

1. What are the students' needs?
2. What do students already know and use?
3. What do you I have time for?
4. When to teach strategies: integrated or separate?
5. How to teach strategies?
6. What are some of the practicalities to anticipate?

Then, the participants were prepared by explaining them the purpose of the training program, focusing on how, when and why to use metacognitive strategies, and also what their benefits are when learning a language (Carrell, 1996; Cohen, 1998; Ellis & Sinclair, 1989; Reinders, 2004). Next, with the help of the SILL (Oxford, 1989) as a diagnostic instrument, some data about the students' needs were obtained, and a careful selection of what metacognitive strategies to present in the training program was made based on two orientations: what most of the authors consider as metacognitive strategies (see Chapter 1), and according to the facilitator's own experience as a language teacher at the MEIF program. Thus, the strategies selected were: predicting, paying attention, planning for a language task, self-monitoring and self-evaluation. The previous selection of the strategies to be taught was also reinforced by the results of the pre-test and the students' answers to the end-of-pre-test and the end-of-session questionnaires.
3.2 While-training

Every week a new metacognitive strategy was presented and learners were suggested that they should practice it during the rest of the week outside the classroom. During the first session, students were trained in the use of "predicting"; on the second day, they were presented the strategy called "paying attention"; on the third day, a review of the two previous strategies was done; on the fourth day, students learned the strategy named "planning for a language task"; on the fifth session, learners studied the strategies "self-monitoring" and "self-evaluating"; finally, on the last day, students reviewed all the strategies. A special time was reserved for the post-test at the end of the training program.

Training sessions always consisted of the listening of two audiotexts (dialogues and/or monologues) with the following stages: 1. Raising awareness; 2. Modeling the strategy; 3. Trying out the strategy; 4. Evaluating the strategy; 5. Encouraging the strategy transfer to new contexts (Reinders, 2004; Chen, 2005; Oxford, 1990; Cohen, 1998). Each session, steps 1, 2, 3 and 4 were done for the first listening exercise, whereas in the second listening activity, only steps 3, 4 and 5 were followed. After the presentation of each strategy, students were asked to name the strategy practiced with their own words. This had two purposes: one was to make it easier for students to remember the strategy in the future, and the other, to involve students in the process of making decisions during the training (Oxford, 1990). Pair work and group discussion were also promoted in each session before and after the listening exercises. When analyzing the first strategy of predicting, students were encouraged to use prediction by reading titles and questions in the exercise, using background knowledge, writing a list of words and practicing their pronunciation. For the second strategy of paying attention, students practiced what they had learned in the previous session and were asked to use directed and selective attention by focusing on key words and eliminating unnecessary information. For the strategy of planning for a language task, students put into practice the two previous strategies and were taught to describe the task, focus on
its requirements, and check their linguistic resources. Finally, for the strategies of self-monitoring and self-evaluation, students continued to practice the previously studied strategies and learned to detect their strengths and their weaknesses in order to make decisions about improving their language learning. Students also evaluated themselves and reflected on their progress, if any.

In addition, students answered the end-of-session questionnaire (see Appendix 6) when every session was concluded with the purpose of raising awareness of the process they had followed when listening; what they had learned; the problems that they had faced when listening; their strengths; their feelings, and their progress. They were also suggested that they should register their journals and continue practicing outside the classroom (See Appendix 8).

### 3.3 Post-training

At the end of the training, once having obtained the post-test results, the participants were asked to meet again in the classroom and were informed about their results separately. Students' answers to the questionnaires and journals were also reread and analyzed as a whole. Next, these data were organized in categories related to the purposes and objectives of this study, and finally, they were compared with the results obtained before the training program took place.

For a better illustration and understanding, the stages of the methodology section are summarized in the following chart:
Table 6  Stages and their objectives of the methodology section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Objective(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Administering the Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) Version for Speakers of Other Languages Learning English Version 7.0 by Oxford, (1989);</td>
<td>a. To diagnose the use of metacognitive strategies by the participants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2. Administering a background questionnaire designed by Oxford (1989); | a. To know the participants’ profiles as language learners.  
b. To better understand the participants’ answers and comments in context during the training program. |
| 3. Administering the pre-test | a. To diagnose the participants’ level of listening comprehension based on the expectations from the syllabus of English I, but also on the contents of the syllabus of English II (MEIF). |
|   | Administering an end-of-pre-test questionnaire. | a. To identify the use of some metacognitive strategies.  
b. To obtain data about:  
1. The process followed when listening.  
2. The problems faced when listening and their solutions.  
3. Feelings when taking the test.  
4. Students' perceptions of their level of listening comprehension. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training program.</td>
<td>a. To train students on the use of five metacognitive strategies: predicting, paying attention, planning for a language task, self-monitoring and self-evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | Administering an end-of-session questionnaire. | a. To obtain data about:  
1. The process followed when listening.  
2. The problems faced when listening and their solutions.  
3. Feelings when taking the test. |
| 6. |   |   |
4. Students' perceptions of their level of listening comprehension.
   b. To identify the participants' needs and thus, select the metacognitive strategies to be taught during the training program.

7. Collecting students' journals.
   a. To monitor students' progress when doing a free listening comprehension activity.
   b. To make students raise awareness of the process they followed when listening, as well as to notice their weaknesses and strengths.

8. Administering a post-test.
   a. To compare results before and after the training program.

   a. To compare results before and after the training program.
4. Data analysis

The results of the pre-test were given a grade from one to ten as customary in the Mexican grading system. Then, they were compared with the results of the post-test to measure students’ performance statistically at both stages. The students’ answers to the questionnaires were analyzed in order to identify the strategies that students used before and after the training program, students’ feelings when doing listening activities as well as their problems during a listening activity and the actions they took in order to overcome these inconveniences. Similarly, students’ journals were analyzed in order to identify the impact of this strategy training program, not only expressed in terms of numbers, but also in terms of “feeling-good improvements”.
CHAPTER THREE: Findings and Discussion

This training program arose after a couple of years of having observed, in my own experience as an English teacher, how frustrated and discouraged MEIF students felt when doing listening exercises, and especially when failing the listening section during the midterm and final examinations. This chapter reports the findings in three sections, each corresponding to the moment that the data were collected: before, during and at the end of the training program. Results are presented in both quantitative and qualitative forms. The quantitative results refer to the grades that students obtained during the pre and post-test, whereas the qualitative ones are related to the students' answers and their comments in the questionnaires and journals. The results obtained are categorized according to the objectives of each instrument at each stage of the study (see p. 38-40). Finally, students' commentaries were not translated into English in order to better maintain the original intention of the participants' words. In addition, students' names were changed for ethical reasons.

1. Findings before the training program

For this stage of the study, three instruments were used: the SILL, the pre-test and an end-of-pre-test questionnaire. The first instrument used was the SILL by Oxford (1989). Even thought, it measures the use of six types of language learning strategies (memory strategies in part A, cognitive strategies in part B, compensation strategies in part C, metacognitive strategies in part D, affective strategies in part E and social strategies in part F) it was used only to diagnose the use of metacognitive strategies (part D) by the participants. At the end of its administration, students calculated and interpreted their results by means of the criteria called "Key to understanding your average" that Oxford (1990) includes at the end of the SILL (See Appendix 1). The results obtained are shown in the following table:
Table 7  Students’ results of their use of metacognitive strategies (part D of the SILL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s fake name</th>
<th>Student’s result of their use of metacognitive strategies (scale from 1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camila</td>
<td>2: low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>3: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla</td>
<td>2.8: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucio</td>
<td>3.1: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalia</td>
<td>3.6: high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>2.3: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelia</td>
<td>2.1: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td>3.6: high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulina</td>
<td>2.3: medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>1.7: low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazmin</td>
<td>2: low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results obtained with the SILL revealed that, of the eleven participants, only two were high on the use of metacognitive strategies, whereas, six were medium and three were low. These data were key elements to begin to train the participants on metacognitive strategies.

The second instrument used was the pre-test. It was administered to the eleven students as a point of departure for this study in order to identify the participants’ level of listening comprehension based on the expectations from the syllabus of English I of the MEIF program, but also on the contents of the syllabus of English II.
of the MEIF program. The following table shows students' performance on this test in a scale from 1 to 10, as already mentioned in the section of data analysis.

Table 8  Students' performance on the pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student's fake name</th>
<th>Student's result of the pre-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camila</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucio</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalia</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulina</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazmin</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.227</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a quantitative point of view, the previous results indicate that students' general point average on the test was poor.

The third instrument used in this stage of the study was an end-of-pre-test questionnaire which aimed at obtaining some evidence about the use of
metacognitive strategies when doing listening activities. The questionnaire focused on the following aspects:

1. The process that participants followed when answering the listening exercises of the test,
2. The participants' problems when answering the listening exercises of the test,
3. The participants' feelings when taking the test and finally,
4. The participants' self-evaluation of their level of listening comprehension.

In regards to the first aspect of the questionnaire, the process that participants followed to answer the listening exercises of the test, the most recurrent answers to the questionnaire were: "No apliqué ningún procedimiento para contestar el examen", "Identifiqué algunas palabras"; "Sólo contesté conforme iba escuchando". This evidence shows that the participants' use of strategies for answering listening exercises was limited or it may be that the students were not aware of the use of some strategies when listening.

The second aspect of the questionnaire, the participants' problems when answering the listening exercises of the test, dealt with unknown words and lack of concentration. Some of the participants' comments were: "Había tantas palabras que no conozco que no logré entender las conversaciones", "Me fue muy dificil entender los diálogos, pues no me sé todas las palabras", "La voz del que habla es muy dificil de entender", "Hablaban muy rápido y no logré concentrarme", "Pierdo el hilo al tratar de entender palabra por palabra, entonces no puedo contestar casi nada". This evidence is supported by Underwook (1989) and McDonought and Shaw (1993) about the different factors that make listening comprehension difficult which are: the voice of the speakers, the speed of the recording, the lack of vocabulary and the difficulty to concentrate, among others.

For the third aspect of the questionnaire, the feelings that students experienced when taking the pre-test, most of them said: "Me sentí perdida e insegura", "Me
sentí nervioso, pero a la vez frustrado al no entender mucho”, “Me sentí confundida y con muchas dudas”. In short, the participants' answers revealed that most of them felt nervous, confused and insecure when taking the test.

As for the last aspect of the questionnaire: students' self-evaluation, their answers were classified in four categories (excellent, good, regular and bad). Results indicate that, out of the eleven students, seven of them self-evaluated their performance as regular, while, the other four as poor. Thus, none of the participants self-evaluated as good or excellent.

To summarize, the results obtained at this stage of the study with the three instruments (the SILL, the pre-test and the end-of-pre-test questionnaire) support each other and are evidence that indicate a need for training students on the use of some metacognitive strategies in order to help them to improve their performance on listening comprehension and at the same time, to raise awareness of the use of learning strategies for this area. Thus, the collected evidence showed that this kind of situation had significant repercussions not only at the academic level of the students, but also and most importantly from a humanistic perspective, at the affective domain because the lack of success faced by students may lead to frustration and decrease of interest as Stevick, 1976,1980 emphasizes in Tudor,1996.

2. Findings during the training program

At this stage of the study, I made use of two instruments: the end-of-session questionnaire and the students' journals.

The first instrument, the questionnaire, was used to obtain data about:

1. The process that participants followed when answering the listening exercises during each training session,
2. The participants’ problems when answering the listening exercises during each training session and the solutions that the students found for these,

3. The participants’ strengths when doing listening exercises during each training session,

4. The participants’ feelings when doing listening activities during each training session and finally,

5. The participants’ self-evaluation of their level of listening comprehension before and after each training session.

These previous aspects are the same as in the end-of-pre-test questionnaire, however one aspect was added and it was related with the participants’ strengths.

The second instrument was the students’ journals which were used with the specific purpose of monitoring students’ progress and extra-practice of the strategies learned.

The evidence collected at this point of the study is presented in this section in five categories which are related to the five objectives of the questionnaire.

In regards to the first aspect, the process followed by participants when listening, some of the students’ commentaries were: “Ahora, antes de contestar un ejercicio de listening, leo las preguntas y trato de pensar qué podría venir en el dialogo así como aplicar mis conocimientos respecto a lo que yo sé de ese tema”, “Leo los títulos y pienso en información posible que pueda escuchar”, “Pienso en el vocabulario que tal vez venga en la conversación”, “Trato de identificar palabras clave”, “Intento concentrarme sin ver las preguntas”, “De acuerdo a lo que se me pide, trato de pensar si tengo que concentrarme en palabras específicas como fechas, nombres, o en información general.” This group of commentaries shows that the participants began to be aware of the strategies that they needed to use and how to use them in order to improve their listening skills.
The second aspect was related to the problems that students faced when doing listening activities and how they overcame them. At the beginning of the training program, some of the most recurrent comments were: “Me bloqueo al tratar de comprender todo el listening”, “Me estanco al no encontrar lógica entre las palabras”, “Me falta vocabulario para poder entender mejor” and “Había palabras que no entendía.” This shows, from what it may be deduced, that the participants’ main problems were two: their lack of vocabulary and their lack of concentration. Progressively, as the training program was taking place the previous comments about their difficulties when listening, changed as they expressed so through comments such as: “Cuando no conozco una palabra le trato de dar sentido al escuchar las demás que le anteceden o le siguen”, “Si no entiendo trato de escuchar lo que sigue para poder captar la idea.”

Students started to become more aware of the strategies that they could use in order to tackle their listening problems. Now, instead of only complaining about their listening problems, they were looking for ways to overcome them. “Mi problema al no entender cuando escucho es que me falta vocabulario” and “Quiero encontrar maneras de memorizar vocabulario” is evidence of a change of attitude and awareness.

In relation to the third aspect, the participants’ strengths when doing listening activities, some of their commentaries were: “Estoy aprendiendo a autoanalizarme y checar cómo he avanzado en mi aprendizaje”, “Voy comprendiendo de mis errores y aciertos” , “Con estas técnicas he logrado ver mis avances”, “Me estoy dando cuenta de que el estar utilizando estas estrategias me ha ayudado a solucionar los problemas con los que antes me enfrentaba”. This kind of evidence shows that the students, not only became aware of their difficulties, but also they were able to monitor and analyze their progress during the training program.

The fourth aspect dealt with the students’ feelings and reactions when doing a listening activity. At the beginning of the training program students’ comments were
of this nature: “Me sentí un poco angustiada y decepcionada porque no entendí mucho” and “No logré completar el ejercicio y eso me desilusiona.” However, as they followed with the training program as well as practicing by their own (at home, at the self access center, for instance), students’ feelings about the usefulness of the strategies were expressed as follows: “Me siento contenta al comprender la mayor parte de los ejercicios”, “Me siento muy bien, creo que voy progresando”, “El poder realizar los ejercicios me motiva y me da más confianza al presentar mi examen final”, “Me siento más segura, confiada y satisfecha de mi trabajo”, “Me sentí más tranquila al escuchar pues sí pude ir comprendiendo más que en las sesiones anteriores. Estoy feliz.” It can be perceived that students’ feelings changed during the training in a positive way. The use of expressions such as “more secure”, “happier”, “satisfied”, “more motivated”, and “encouraged” shows how students’ feelings were changing into more positive ones.

Finally, the last aspect was related to the participants’ self-evaluation. At this point of the program, students started using the categories “good” and “excellent to evaluate themselves. Thus, students’ self-evaluation ranked from bad to excellent.

3. Findings after the training program

For this last stage of the study, two instruments were used: the post-test and the end-of-post-test questionnaire. In this section, the results obtained with both instruments have been compared with those obtained at the beginning of the training program.

In regards to the post-test, it was exactly the same as the pre-test. This instrument was administered in a special session at the end of the training program and the results obtained are the following:
Table 9  Students' performance on the post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student's fake name</th>
<th>Student's result of the post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camila</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsa</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucio</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magdalia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelia</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulina</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosa</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yazmin</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graphic 1 depicts a comparative panorama between the students' results in the pre-test and those in the post-test.
As it can be noticed in Table 9 and Graphic 1, all the students showed some improvement in their listening comprehension with the use of the strategies learned during the training program.

In addition to the post-test, the second instrument used, in this stage of the study, was the end-of-post-test questionnaire. The evidence obtained has been compared with that at the beginning of the study and is related to the same aspects previously mentioned: the participants' process when listening, the participants' problems and the solutions that they gave to these, the participants' strengths, the participants' feelings when listening and, finally the participants' self-evaluation.

Firstly, for the process that the students followed for answering the listening exercises in the post-test, most of their comments were of this kind: "Para contestar el examen, primero leí todas las preguntas antes de escuchar la información, luego traté de adivinar cuál sería el posible vocabulario a escuchar así como cuál sería la respuesta posible, posteriormente, escuché con atención y traté de detectar las palabras clave, al final, verifiqué mis respuestas." From this type of answer it can be understood that the students used some of the strategies
In short, the feelings that the students experienced after the post-test are related to their sense of improvement or progress which may lead to satisfaction, happiness and motivation. This evidence supports Moskowitz (1978) and Stevick's (1976,1980) contributions from psychology to language education about the importance of feeling at ease with oneself when learning takes place from a humanistic point of view.

Finally, in regards to the participants' self-evaluation, a difference could be noticed between the way they perceived their performance before and after the training sessions. From the four categories that they had to select for self-evaluating (Excellent, Good, Regular, Bad), out of the eleven students, eight considered their performance as good, whereas, three evaluated themselves as excellent. As it can be noted, this time the categories "regular" and "bad" were not considered by the students.

To sum up, based on the collected evidence, I can say that two main aspects emerge from this study in order to answer my two research questions:

1. Does a training program on metacognitive strategies help MEIF students of English II improve their listening comprehension? and

2. What is the impact of using metacognitive strategies on the students?

With reference to the first question, in spite of the fact that the students' degree of progress was different in all the cases, after being trained on the use of five metacognitive strategies, students' performance on listening comprehension improved. In regards to the second question, results revealed that the fact of acquiring metacognitive strategies produced an impact on the students' affective domain.
There seems to be a tied connection between the progress students showed during and after the training and the feelings they experienced. In other words, as a consequence of their progress, students’ showed feelings such as satisfaction, happiness, self-confidence and encouragement, that is to say, success. In addition to this, students revealed feeling more motivated to continue finding ways in order to facilitate their own learning; in short, I would dare to say that they started to experience a more independent and responsible learning as cited by Dickinson (1987) and Holec (1985 in Hedge: 2000, 85). Finally, students’ comments, such as: “Me siento muy a gusto ya que esto que aprendi en este curso me va a seguir sirviendo no sólo en esta clase, sino en otras materias e incluso en mi vida diaria” showed their encouragement to transfer what they learned in the listening comprehension area, not only to other features of language learning, but also to other subjects and what is more, to their daily lives.
Conclusion and Further Research

This chapter includes a summary of the main findings of this study; some implications of these findings, and finally, some limitations and suggestions for further research.

The objectives of this study were first, to explore the effectiveness of a training program on metacognitive strategies for listening comprehension with eleven students of English II at the MEIF program of the Universidad Veracruzana, and then, to discover the impact of this type of instruction on students. As the pre-test and post-test results as well as students’ answers to the questionnaires and journals revealed, training students in a explicit way on strategies, such as predicting, paying attention, planning for a language task, self-monitoring and self-evaluation seems to have contributed not only to the improvement of students’ listening comprehension skill, but also to the students’ self-confidence, motivation, and their attitude towards language learning as emphasized by Moskowitz (1978), Stevick (1976,1980) and Brown (1994). The collected evidence is supported by what other studies have revealed on the usefulness of strategy instruction (see Dickinson, 1987; Holec, 1985; Carrell, 1996; Cohen, 1998; Ellis and Sinclair, 1989; Chamot and O’Malley, 1990; Oxford, 1990).

The findings of this study have implications for both students and teachers. As for students, the use of metacognitive strategies becomes a process of continuous self-analysis and self-awareness in order to achieve learner’s autonomy in the language area, and also in other areas of education and I would dare to say, in their personal lives. In regards to teachers, being informed about the effectiveness of providing students with tools to face language learning in a more independent way, promoting the use of these metacognitive strategies as well as including them in the language classroom may be some of our most important objectives as language instructors and as educators. For this reason, before teaching our students the use of the metacognitive strategies, teachers and prospective
teachers should be trained in this area, as suggested by Oxford (1990) and Chamot and O’Malley (1990).

This study had some limitations. One of them was that it was carried out with only eleven students out of the one hundred and eighty three that integrate the English II population at the Language Center Córdoba in the semester February-August 2008. The evidence presented here may differ from other contexts and other characteristics of the participants; that is why generalizations cannot be made. Besides, the training program consisted of only six sessions and this may have not been enough. Another limitation may be the questionnaire which, even though it was based on those by Chamot and Kupper (1989) and Arter and Spandle (1992) some of the questions were adapted by me and the structure may have not been quite adequate. For instance, in the question where students had to evaluate themselves (see Appendices 5, 6 and 7) for the category “bad”, I should have considered the term “not satisfactory” which represents a more neutral posture. Similarly, external variables for the administration of both pre-test and post-test, such as the weather, the conditions of the classroom, background noises and the participants’ moods and feelings, just to mention some, may have interfered.

As for the future, with more research it would be interesting to identify if the students’ improvement on listening skills was determined by the use of strategies or because of more exposure to listening and if so, how much exposure they had or they would have needed. Additionally, this study suggests that more research is needed on other variables possibly affecting the use of language learning strategies, such as cultural background and students’ beliefs of the nature of language and language learning, learning habits and styles.

Finally, I would like to say that, as for me, I also experienced feelings of satisfaction and success. The fact of obtaining positive results from the training program was also an engine of motivation in order to continue finding ways to help my students to overcome their difficulties. As language teachers we are also educators who
have in our hands the challenging task of providing our students with useful tools
for life, as the Chinese proverb states: "Give a man a fish and you have fed him for
today; teach a man to fish and you have fed him for a lifetime."
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Versión para hablantes de otros idiomas que aprenden inglés

Instrucciones.

Este formato del “Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)” es para estudiantes de inglés como segunda lengua o como lengua extranjera. En él encontrarás enunciados acerca del aprendizaje del inglés. Por favor lee cada enunciado. En la hoja de respuestas escribe la respuesta (1,2,3,4, o 5) que diga QUE TAN CERTERO ES EL ENUNCIADO PARA TI.

1. Nunca o casi nunca cierto en mí.
2. Usualmente no cierto en mí.
3. De alguna manera cierto en mí.
4. Usualmente cierto en mí.
5. Siempre o casi siempre cierto en mí.

NUNCA O CASI NUNCA CIERTO EN MÍ significa que el enunciado es muy raro en mí.

USUALMENTE NO CIERTO EN MÍ significa que el enunciado es verdadero menos de la mitad del tiempo.

DE ALGUNA MANERA CIERTO EN MÍ significa que el enunciado es verdadero en mí aproximadamente la mitad del tiempo.

USUALMENTE CIERTO EN MÍ significa que el enunciado es verdadero más de la mitad del tiempo.

SIEMPRE O CASI SIEMPRE CIERTO EN MÍ significa que el enunciado es verdadero en mi casi siempre.

Contesta en términos de qué tan bien refleja el enunciado tu situación. No contestes como crees tú que debería ser, o lo que otras personas hacen. No hay respuestas correctas a los enunciados. Pon tus respuestas en la hoja de respuestas. Por favor no contestes los reactivos. Responde tan rápido como puedas prestando atención. Este ejercicio toma alrededor de 20-30 minutos en ser contestado. Si tienes alguna pregunta, informa al maestro inmediatamente.

(Versión 7.0 (EFL/ESL) R.L.Oxford, 1989)
Ejemplo

1. Nunca o casi nunca cierto en mí.
2. Usualmente no cierto en mí.
3. De alguna manera cierto en mí.
4. Usualmente cierto en mí.
5. Siempre o casi siempre cierto en mí.

Lee el reactivo y escoge una respuesta (del al 5 como se indica arriba) y escríbela en el espacio después del reactivo.

Busco activamente oportunidades para hablar con hablantes nativos del inglés.

Acabas de completar un reactivo como ejemplo. Contesta el resto de los reactivos en tu hoja de respuestas. (Worksheet)

Parte A

1. Relaciono lo que ya sé con lo nuevo que aprendo en inglés.
2. Uso las palabras en inglés nuevas en un enunciado para así poder recordarlas.
3. Relaciono el sonido de una palabra nueva en inglés y una imagen o fotografía de la palabra para ayudarme a recordar la palabra.
4. Recuerdo una palabra nueva en inglés al hacer una imagen mental de una situación en la que se llegue a usar la palabra.
5. Uso rimas para recordar nuevas palabras en inglés.
6. Uso tarjetas con imágenes para recordar nuevas palabras en inglés.
7. Físicamente actúo las nuevas palabras en inglés.
8. A menudo reviso las lecciones de inglés.
9. Recuerdo las nuevas palabras o frases en inglés al recordar su localización en la página, en el pizarrón o en una señal en la calle.

Parte B

10. Digo o escribo las nuevas palabras en inglés varias veces.
11. Trato de hablar como un hablante nativo del inglés.
12. Practico los sonidos del inglés.
13. Uso las palabras del inglés que sé de varias maneras.
15. Veo programas en inglés o voy al cine a ver películas en inglés.
16. Leo en inglés por placer.
17. Escribo notas, mensajes, cartas o reportes en inglés.
18. Primero leo de manera rápida un texto en inglés y luego regreso a él y lo leo cuidadosamente.
19. Busco palabras en mi propio idioma que son similares a las nuevas palabras en inglés.
20. Trato de encontrar patrones en inglés.
21. Encuentro el significado de una palabra en inglés al dividirla en partes que conozco.
22. Trato de no traducir palabra por palabra.
23. Hago resúmenes de información que oigo o leo en inglés.

Parte C

24. Para entender palabras desconocidas, trato de adivinar.
25. Cuando no puedo decir una palabra durante una conversación, hago gestos.
26. Invento nuevas palabras si no sé la palabra correcta en inglés.
27. Leo en inglés sin necesidad de buscar cada palabra.
28. Trato de adivinar lo que la otra persona dirá en inglés.
29. Si no sé una palabra en inglés, uso otra palabra o frase que signifique lo mismo.

Parte D

30. Trato de encontrar tantas oportunidades como me sea posible para usar mi inglés.
31. Me doy cuenta de mis errores en inglés y uso es información para mejorar.
32. Pongo atención cuando alguien está hablando en inglés.
33. Trato de averiguar cómo ser un mejor estudiante de inglés.
34. Planeo mi tiempo para así tener suficiente tiempo de estudiar inglés.
35. Busco personas con las que pueda hablar en inglés.
37. Tengo objetivos claros para mejorar mis habilidades en inglés.
38. Reflexiono acerca de mi progreso en el aprendizaje del inglés.

Parte E

39. Trato de relajarme cuando siento miedo al usar el inglés.
40. Me animo a hablar inglés aún cuando tengo miedo de cometer errores.
41. Me premio cuando hago bien las cosas en inglés.
42. Me doy cuenta si estoy tenso o nervioso cuando estoy estudiando o usando el inglés.
43. Escribo mis sentimientos en un diario del aprendizaje del idioma.
44. Le comento a alguien más como me siento cuando estoy aprendiendo inglés.

Parte F

45. Si no entiendo algo en inglés, le pido a la otra persona que hable más despacio o lo repita.
46. Le pido a hablantes en inglés que me corrijan cuando hablo.
47. Practico el inglés con otros estudiantes.
48. Le pido ayuda a hablantes del inglés.
49. Hago preguntas en inglés.
50. Trato de aprender acerca de la cultura de los hablantes del inglés.
Hoja de respuestas y puntaje del Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

1. Los recuadros están enumerados para cada reactivo en el SILL.
2. Escribe tu respuesta para cada reactivo (es decir, escribe 1, 2, 3, 4 ó 5) en cada uno de los recuadros.
3. Suma cada columna, pon el resultado en la línea marcada como SUMA.
4. Divide entre el número debajo de la palabra SUMA para obtener el promedio de cada columna. Redondea este promedio al decimal próximo.
5. Obtén tu puntaje total. Para hacer esto suma todas las SUMA para las diferentes partes del SILL. Luego divide entre 50.
6. Cuando hayas terminado, tu maestro te dirá el perfil de tus resultados. Copia tus promedios (para cada parte y para el total del SILL) de la hoja de respuestas al del perfil.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parte A</th>
<th>Parte B</th>
<th>Parte C</th>
<th>Parte D</th>
<th>Parte E</th>
<th>Parte F</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>SUMA Parte A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>SUMA Parte B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>SUMA Parte C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>SUMA Parte D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>SUMA Parte E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>SUMA Parte F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUMA</th>
<th>SUMA</th>
<th>SUMA</th>
<th>SUMA</th>
<th>SUMA</th>
<th>SUMA</th>
<th>SUMA</th>
<th>SUMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/9=</td>
<td>/14=</td>
<td>/6=</td>
<td>/9=</td>
<td>/6=</td>
<td>/6=</td>
<td>/50=</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perfil de resultados del Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL)

Recibirás este perfil después de que hayas completado tu hoja de respuestas. Este perfil te mostrará tus resultados en el SILL. Estos resultados te dirán el tipo de estrategias que usas en el aprendizaje de inglés. No hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas.

Para completar este perfil, transfiere tus promedios para cada parte del SILL, y tu promedio total. Estos promedios se encuentran en la hoja de respuestas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTE</th>
<th>TIPO DE ESTRATEGIAS</th>
<th>SU PROMEDIO EN ESTA PARTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Recordar efectivamente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Usar todos sus procesos mentales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Compensar el aprendizaje que hace falta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Recordar y evaluar su aprendizaje</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Manejar sus emociones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Aprender con otros</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PROMEDIO TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SILL PROFILE OF RESULTS

**Key to understanding your averages**

**HIGH**  
Always or almost always used 4.5-5.0
Usually used 3.5-4.4

**MEDIUM**  
Sometimes used 2.5-3.4

**LOW**  
Generally not used 1.5-2.4
Never or almost never used 1.0-1.4
Appendix 2: Background questionnaire by Oxford (1990)

1. Nombre ____________________________ 2. Fecha: ________

3. Edad ___ 4. Sexo ___ 5. Lengua materna ____________________________

6. Idioma que hablas en tu casa ____________________________

7. Idioma que estás aprendiendo (o has aprendido recientemente). Cita un idioma únicamente.
_____________________________

8. ¿Cuánto tiempo has estado estudiando el idioma mencionado en el no. 7? ________

9. ¿Cómo calificas tu desempeño en general en el idioma mencionado en el no. 7 en comparación con el desempeño de otros estudiantes de tu clase? (Encierra una opción)
   Excelente  Bueno  Regular  Deficiente

10. ¿Cómo calificas tu desempeño en general en el idioma mencionado en el no. 7 en comparación con el desempeño de hablantes nativos de este idioma? (Encierra una opción)
    Excelente  Bueno  Regular  Deficiente

11. ¿Qué tan importante es para ti lograr un buen desempeño en el idioma mencionado en el no. 7? (Encierra una opción)
    Muy importante  Importante  No tan importante
12. ¿Por qué deseas aprender el idioma mencionado en el no. 7?
   (Selecciona todas Opciones que apliquen)

   ______ estoy interesado en el idioma
   ______ estoy interesado en la cultura
   ______ tengo amigos que hablan el idioma
   ______ requiero tomar un curso de idiomas para graduarme
   ______ lo necesito para mi carrera futura
   ______ lo necesito para viajar
   ______ otros:

   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

13. ¿Disfrutas aprendiendo el idioma? (Encierra una opción) Sí  No

14. ¿Qué otros idiomas has estudiado?

   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________

15. ¿Cuál ha sido tu mejor experiencia al aprender un idioma?

   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________
LISTENING: PART 1 (6 points)

INSTRUCTIONS: In this part you are going to hear some short conversations. You will hear each conversation three times. For each number, read the question or sentence, and select the correct option that correctly answers the question or correctly completes the sentence. Mark the correct option (A or B) on your answer sheet with an X.

"THE INTERNET"

Example:

0. Carmen talks about ________.
   A. computers       B. internet
   Correct answer: b

1. Carmen ________ uses the internet.
   A. sometimes       B. always

2. Anela likes chatting with her brother in _____________.
   A. the evening     B. the morning

3. Tito is probably a _________________.
   A. musician        B. singer

4. Liam is interested in having information about _____________.
   A. his country     B. his last name

5. Tommy can only use the internet _________________.
   A. all the time    B. for 60 minutes.

6. April uses ________________ to buy food.
   A. her son's computer  B. the supermarket
LISTENING: PART 2  (7 points)

INSTRUCTIONS: Listen to the following conversation between Yuko and Vince. You will hear the conversation three times. For numbers 7-13, read the question or sentence, and select the option that correctly answers the question or completes the sentence. Mark the correct option (A, B or C) on your answer sheet with an X.

“LOVE IN A BOTTLE: YUKO AND VINCE”

Example:

Yuko was walking on the ___________. Correct answer: b
a. street  b. beach  c. field

7. Yuko stopped because she saw ___________.
   a. a paper  b. the sea  c. a bottle

8. The letter was from ___________.
   a. a man  b. a woman  c. a girl

9. Yuko answered the letter.
   a. yes  b. no  c. doesn’t say

10. Vince thought Yuko was ___________.
    a. pretty  b. ugly  c. sociable

11. Vince and Yuko started to ___________ each other.
    a. e-mail  b. see  c. call

12. Finally, Yuko _________ to Vince’s hometown.
    a. traveled  b. wrote  c. stayed

13. Now, they are _____________.
    a. friends  b. married  c. unhappy
LISTENING: PART 3  (7 points)

INSTRUCTIONS: Listen to the following monologue. You will hear the monologue three times. After listening to the monologue, complete the table below (numbers 14-20) with the correct word (s) or number(s) for each line. Write the missing information in the space provided on your answer sheet. You will have a total of one minute to write your answers.

"SYDNEY"

Example:

0. A city mentioned in this monologue: Sydney.

14. Season not recommended visiting Sydney: ____________________.

15. Price of a room in a cheap hotel per nigh: ____________________.

16. Two places to visit in the harbor: ____________________.

17. Two activities people can do in Sydney: ____________________.

18. Two types of food people can eat in Sydney: ____________________.

19. One type of food Australian like very much: ____________________.

20. The best way to see Sydney is by: ____________________.
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Appendix 4: Tapescripts

LISTENING: PART 1

T 11.9 Listen to the people
Carmen
I use the Internet a lot. Every day, I think. It helps me with my homework. It helps me with everything. Yesterday I did an English test. It was quite difficult.

Anela
My brother's in Taiwan. I can't call Taiwan, it's very expensive - so Paul (That's my brother) and I- we "talk" in chat rooms on the Internet. We talk late, at about 11 o'clock in the evening - well, it's evening here, but it's 8 o'clock in the morning in Taiwan.

Tito
I play the guitar and I can find lot of songs on the Internet. Last week I got the words and music for "Can't buy me love," you know, by the Beatles. I can play it now. I use the Internet on weekends because it's cheap then.

Liam
Well, my family's name is Conelly and I want to write about my family, so every day I chat with people from all over the world - Canada, South Africa, Australia- people who have the name Conelly. They send me information about their families. It's really interesting.

Tommy
I play games. And I go to chat rooms. And I visit web sites for my favorite groups and basketball players. I want to be on the web all the time, but my mom says I can't. She says I can only use it after school for an hour, and then I stop.

April
I go shopping on the Internet. Every Friday I go to my son's house and I use his computer. It's fantastic - the supermarket brings all my food to my home!

Taken from American Headway Starter (2002)

LISTENING PART 2

T 8.6 Love in a bottle: Yuko and Vince
Y = Yuko V = Vince
Y I love the sea. I like walking on the beach. One day, it was five years ago now, I was on the beach and I stood on something. It was a bottle, a green bottle. I could see something inside - some paper.
So I broke the bottle, it was a letter but ...
V ... You couldn't read it ...
Y No, I couldn't. You see it was in English and I couldn't speak English then.
V You can speak it very well now...
Y No, not really... but anyway. I asked a friend to translate the letter for me. We couldn't believe it.
A man in Alaska wanted a wife, but the letter was ten years old.
V And I still wasn't married!
Y But I didn't know that. Anyway for a joke, my friend and I wrote a letter and sent a photo...
V And now, I couldn't believe it. I got this letter and a photo. She was beautiful. I wrote back immediately and we wrote every week for six months... and we spoke on the phone and ...
Y ... and finally I flew to Anchorage, way up north in Alaska, and we met face to face. I was very shy but it was good, very good and now ...
V ... now, we have 3 children. We have a house by the sea...
Y We're very happy. You see, we both love the sea!

Taken from American Headway 1(2002)
LISTENING PART 3

T 8.8 Sydney
How to have a good time in... Sydney

Sydney has everything you want in a city. It's beautiful, it has old and new buildings, there are fantastic beaches, and the food is delicious.

When to go
The best times to visit are the spring and fall. In the summer it is very hot.

Where to stay
There are cheap hotels in King's Cross. A room is about $50 a night. There are international hotels in the center. Here a room is about $150 a night.

What to do
Sydney has theaters and movie theaters, and of course, the Opera House. The best stores are on Pitt Street.
Go to the harbor. There are beaches, walks, parks, cafes, and of course, the wonderful bridge.
Sydney has the famous Bondi Beach. People go swimming, surfing, windsurfing, and sailing.
For nightlife, there are a lot of clubs on Oxford Street.

What to eat
There are restaurants from every country -Italian, Turkish, Lebanese, Japanese, Thai, Chinese, and Vietnamese. Australians eat a lot of seafood- it's very fresh!

How to travel
There are fast trains and slow buses. The best way to see Sydney is by ferry.

Taken from American Headway Starter (2002)
Appendix 5: End-of- pre-test questionnaire

Nombre:________________________________________________________________________
Fecha:________________________ Edad:_____ Carrera:________________________

CUESTIONARIO

El siguiente cuestionario se realizó con la finalidad de recavar información para diseñar un curso sobre las estrategias de aprendizaje que utilizas cuando escuchas en inglés. Te agradezco de antemano tu apoyo y te reitero que cualquier información aquí mencionada se mantendrá bajo estricta confidencialidad sin mencionar tu nombre. Muchísimas gracias.

1. En términos generales, ¿Cuál fue el procedimiento que seguí para realizar el test?

2. ¿Con qué problemas me enfrenté al realizar el test?

3. ¿Cómo me sentí al realizar el test?

4. ¿Cómo autoevaluaría mi desempeño en el test? (Encierra una sola opción)

   Excelente      bueno      regular      malo

Adaptado de Chamot and Kupper (1989) and Arter and Spandle (1992)
Mayo, 08 RSHD
Appendix 6: End-of-session questionnaire

Nombre: ____________________________ e-mail: __________________________
Fecha: ____________________________ teléfono: __________________________

1. ¿Qué aprendí en esta actividad?

2. ¿Cuál fue el proceso que seguí para llevar a cabo esta actividad?

3. ¿Con qué problemas me enfrenté?

4. ¿Qué puedo hacer para superar estas dificultades?

5. ¿Qué pude lograr en esta actividad? ¿Cuáles fueron mis aciertos y fortalezas?

6. ¿Cómo me sentí?

7. ¿Cómo evaluaría mi desempeño al inicio de la sesión? Encierre una opción.
   - Excelente
   - Bueno
   - Regular
   - Malo

8. ¿Cómo evaluaría mi desempeño al final de la sesión? Encierre una opción.
   - Excelente
   - Bueno
   - Regular
   - Malo

Adaptado de Charmot and Kupper (1989) and Arter and Spandle (1992)
Mayo, 08 RSHD
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Appendix 7: End-of-post-test questionnaire

Nombre: ____________________________ e-mail: ____________________________ teléfono: ____________________________

fecha: ____________________________

1. ¿Qué aprendí en este pequeño curso?

2. ¿Con qué problemas me enfrenté?

3. ¿Qué puedo hacer para superar estas dificultades de ahora en adelante?

4. ¿Qué pude lograr en este curso? ¿Cuáles fueron mis aciertos y fortalezas?

5. ¿Cómo me sentí?

6. ¿Cómo evaluaría mi desempeño al inicio de este curso? Encierre una opción.
   Excelente   Bueno   Regular   Malo

7. ¿Cómo evaluaría mi desempeño al final de este curso? Encierre una opción.
   Excelente   Bueno   Regular   Malo

Adaptado de Charmot and Kupper (1989) and Arter and Spandle (1992)

Mayo, 08 RSHD
EJEMPLO:

María Conzatti
21 de octubre de 2007
7.00-8:30 p.m.
Película: El campo de los sueños, Kevin Costner

Renté una película. Empecé a verla mientras estaba cenando. Ya había visto la película anteriormente pero me gustó tanto que decidí volver a verla. Esta vez pensé más acerca de mi aprendizaje del inglés y traté de no leer los subtítulos. Después de que terminé de verla la volví a poner mientras estaba limpiando mi cuarto. Me gusta escuchar a la niñita de la película pues es muy fácil de entender lo que dice.

RECUERDA:  "El éxito que se logra en la vida depende de perder el miedo a caer." Anónimo.