

Validation of 'Self-perception of ESL Learners' Listening Comprehension Problems and Metacognitive Listening Strategy Use' Questionnaire

Seyedehsima Sadatmir*, Wahid Nimehchisalem, Ain Nazdimah Abdullah

Department of English, Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia

Corresponding Author: Seyedehsima Sadatmir, E-mail: simastmr@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Article history

Received: August 17, 2018

Accepted: October 28, 2018

Published: December 28, 2018

Volume: 9 Issue: 6

Advance access: November 2018

Conflicts of interest: None

Funding: None

Key words:

ESL (English as a Second Language) Learners,

Metacognitive Listening Strategy use (MLSU),

Listening Comprehension Problems (LCP),

Metacognitive Listening Strategy Questionnaire (MLSQ),

Listening Comprehension Problem Questionnaire (LCPQ),

TESL (Teaching English as a Second Language) experts

ABSTRACT

According to the literature, listening comprehension problems mostly relate to the shortage of learners' metacognition in listening. Through reviewing the developed instruments on listening comprehension problems and metacognitive listening strategy use, some shortcomings can be detected in available instruments. This paper adapts the previous instruments and seeks to explore their shortcomings by adding supplementary sections and items to them. It also aims to validate the new instrument. The adapted questionnaires are Listening Comprehension Problems Questionnaire (LCPQ) and Metacognitive Listening Strategy Questionnaire (MLSQ). The adapted instrument is validated by a panel of experts ($n=3$) and a Field-Test ($n=28$). The changes are presented in this paper. Results show 9 items of LCPQ and 6 items of MLSQ have been revised by the experts. The modified questionnaires were tested for their internal reliability and the Cronbach's alpha values were greater than 0.7. According to the Field-Test's results, 2 items are added to LCPQ and 1 item is added to MLSQ. Moreover, 1 item of LCPQ and 1 item of MLSQ are changed by applying participant's comments. The developed instrument named 'Self-perception of LCP (Listening Comprehension Problems) and MLSU (Metacognitive Listening Strategy Use)' is predicted to be effective for researchers who are concerned with the same area in different contexts. The new instrument will help researchers to identify the perceived metacognitive listening strategy use and listening comprehension problems among ESL/EFL learners with different listening comprehension abilities. Future surveys would validate the effectiveness of the current instrument.

INTRODUCTION

Listening comprehension is a fundamental part of both L1 and L2 communication. As the number of research on different aspects of listening comprehension has increased, the need is revealed for developing the new instruments to do research on variety of aspects of it. The developed instrument reported in the current paper is aimed to detect metacognitive listening strategy use of ESL students with different listening comprehension proficiency levels and problems.

Problem Statement

Available instruments in the literature have some shortcomings to support researchers in investigating metacognitive listening strategies and listening comprehension problems. Firstly, most of the previous instruments are investigated

metacognitive listening strategies and listening comprehension problems separately. Secondly, previous researchers in the same area have considered all types of listening strategies, which are cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-effective and not just focused on metacognitive listening strategies. Moreover, testing the adapted or adopted questionnaires in a different context, reveal the strengths and weaknesses of the previous instruments. Consequently, the revised and validated instrument creates an effective background for next researchers.

Objectives

This paper is going to reply to the following questions; How do the experts in this area validate the instrument? What is the internal reliability of the two questionnaires? How clear do the respondents find the items?

Subsequently, the main aims and goals of this paper are;

- 1- To identify the experts' comments on the developed instrument.
- 2- To identify the respondents' attitudes toward the items of the questionnaires.

In this paper, two questionnaires namely LCPQ (Nowroozi, Tam, Nimehchisalem & Zareian, 2014) and MLSQ (Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, & Tafaghodtari, 2006) were adapted to develop the new instrument with adding some supplementary parts such as demographic section, comments columns for both questionnaires and open-ended questions (Appendix A).

LITERATURE REVIEW

This article discussed the instrument consists of two questionnaires; LCPQ and MLSQ that were developed according to the review of literature in similar researches in the field of listening. Some of these researches are Bacon (1992), Cohen, Oxford, and Chi (2005), Goh (2000), Hasan (2000), Liu (2002), Vandergrift (1997, 2003, 2007), Vandergrift et al. (2006) and Sara Noroozi et al. (2014). For the first questionnaire, LCPQ, the items were adapted from the research in the field of listening comprehension problems (Sara Noroozi et al., 2014) and, for the second questionnaire, MLSQ, the items were adapted from the research on metacognitive listening strategy use (Vandergrift et al., 2006). Adapting these two questionnaires provides the field of mutual investigating in the two main criteria. Also, previous research in validation of instruments in this area have not well covered variety of contexts.

The first adapted questionnaire (LCPQ) was based on cognitive listening theory of Anderson (1995). According to this theory, the process of listening comprehension includes three phases: perception, parsing, and utilization. In the perception phase, listeners' attention is on the text, segment the phonemes from the stream of speech, and store them in their working memory. In the parsing phase, listeners match the new information which is now in their working memory with the stored linguistic knowledge in their long-term memory to produce expressive mental representations. Lastly, in the utilization phase, listeners connect the information have kept in the perception phase and parsing phase to their schemata to comprehend what they have just heard (Anderson, 1995). According to Goh (2000), listening comprehension problems define as the problems that may arise at one of these three phases.

Metacognitive strategies applied in this research are according to Vandergrift's (1997) listening strategies' taxonomy. In his organization, metacognitive strategies have been classified into three focal groups: planning, monitoring and evaluation. These main classifications are further organized into nine sub-categories. For planning strategy, the sub-categories are advance organization, selective attention, self-management and directed attention. The sub-categories for monitoring strategies are comprehension monitoring, double-check monitoring, and problem solving. Evaluation strategy is divided into two sub-categories: performance evaluation and strategy evaluation. Following Goh (2000)'s

recommendation, each of the sub-categories of metacognitive strategies can be operationalized in numerous ways called 'tactics'. In total, there are 34 metacognitive listening tactics used in this investigation. Theory of Anderson (1995) along with taxonomy of Vandergrift (1997) provided the theoretical base of the current developmental research.

SETTING THE RULES FOR DEVELOPING THE INSTRUMENT

Questionnaire is one of the most beneficial instruments that can aware learners from their listening process (Hassan, 2000; Liu, 2002; Mareschal, 2007). Questionnaire has the benefit of "quickly providing information on a wide variety of language learning variables" (Dörnyei, 2003)). The same goes for listening comprehension problems and metacognitive listening strategies. Setting a number of rules is essential before constructing any questionnaire, to make sure about practicality of the outcome.

Items of the two questionnaires (LCPQ and MLSQ) were constructed based on the determined rules according to the literature in the field of listening comprehension (Field, 2008), listening comprehension problems (Field, 2004; Goh, 2000; Hasan, 2000; Liu, 2002; Nowrouzi, Tam, Zarein, & Nimehchisalem, 2015), listening strategies (Berne, 2004; Macaro, Graham, & Vanderplank, 2007; Vandergrift, 2007), metacognitive listening strategies (Hauck, 2005; Vandergrift, Gog, Mareschal & Tafaghodtari, 2006; Goh & Taib, 2006; Goh, 2008 Yang, 2009; Coscun, 2010; Malik, 2011), and the associated literature of methodologies in the field of the second language teaching and learning (Dörnyei, 2007; Dörnyei, 2003; Mackey & Gass, 2005; McKay, 2006). These rules were listed below:

1. Clarity: The items and instructions should be as clear as possible. The examples were provided next to the vague items or difficult terms.
2. Economy: Questionnaires should be as brief as possible. "Long questionnaires can be counterproductive" recommended by Dörnyei (2003).
3. Appropriate layout: According to Dörnyei (2003), the space economical font should be 11-point Times New Roman the response options should be placed next to the questions not below them.
4. Construct Validity: The items and/or domains of an instrument should be relied on the relevant and established theory. The listening comprehension problem items were developed based on Anderson's cognitive listening theory (1995), which was also followed by Goh (2000). Moreover, the metacognitive listening strategy items were according to Vandergrift's listening strategy taxonomy (1997, 2003).
5. Internal reliability: This can be enhanced by removing unclear terms and/or items and by not using questions, which raise more than one issue.
6. Ease of interpretation and tabulation of the responses: A Likert scale should be used when the participants should rate the frequency of facing a particular listening comprehension problem on the scale of 1 (Never) to 5 (Always) or using a specific metacognitive listen-

ing strategy on the scale of 1 (Strongly disagree) to 7 (Strongly agree).

Relying on these rules, the researcher expected to originate a practical instrument with the high validity and reliability.

METHODOLOGY

Qualitative method was used in validating this instrument. After adding the supplementary sections based on the adaptation or adoption of other items from the existing related instruments, the instrument was validated through the expert judgments. 5 TESL experts judged on the content validity, redundancy, readability and clarity of the items after receiving the first draft of the instrument via e-mail. 3 out of 5 experts validated the instruments. Subsequently, the refined instrument was piloted in a Field- Test.

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were applied to check the instrument. Both questionnaires were checked for some aims. Firstly, to receive the feedback in terms of difficulty of the items, clarity of the instructions, and duration of responding (Creswell, 2008). Secondly, to

notice the possible problems the participants face while filling out the questionnaires (Liu, 2002) and consequently to adapt and improve the items of the questionnaires (Dörnyei, 2003).

The Field-Test participants were randomly selected from ESL students ($n = 28$, $F = 15$, $M = 13$). The students were informed that all the data would be remained confidential. They were also asked to sign a consent form before distributing the questionnaires. Averagely, it took them almost 20 minutes to fill out. Participants were requested to double-check their responses in the questionnaires. Rate of the responses was 100% in this survey.

RESULTS

Three TESL experts evaluated the instrument and provided sort of effective comments. Through qualitative interpreting of data received from the experts, Tables 1, 2 and 3 summarize the amendments made to the first draft of the instrument according to the experts' comments.

Appendix A shows the developing instrument including the revised versions of LCPQ and MLSQ.

Table 1. Experts comments on LCPQ

Item's number	Original item	Experts' comment	Revised
2	There are too many words I cannot catch.	Better to use simple and common language. We need to try to speak the natural language and find synonym for polysyllabic constructions that is easy to pronounce by the respondents.	There are too many words I cannot understand.
7	Local speakers are easier to understand than native speakers.	Replace it with non-native speakers of English.	Non-native speakers of English are easier to understand than native speakers.
8	I do Not catch the beginning of the text.	Same comment as item 2.	I do Not understand the beginning of the text.
11	I am slow to recall the meaning of words that sound familiar.	Same comment as item 2.	I am slow to recall the meaning of words that seem to be familiar.
12	I mistake one word for another similar-sounding one.	Better to provide an example.	I mistake one word for another similar-sounding one. i.e., found & fund.
14	I cannot recognize so many sounds and words I hear.	It would be good if you could not to use negative constructions. Item that contains a negative construction are deceptive and responding to them can be problematic. To avoid any possible problem, the best solution is to totally avoid of using negative constructions. The best way is to exchange the negative verbs/adjectives to the ones with the opposite meaning.	It is hard to recognize so many sounds and words I hear.
16	I miss the next part of the material while thinking about the meaning.	Better to say next question or the rest of the passage	I miss the next part of the passage while thinking about the meaning.
18	I cannot remember words or phrases I have just heard.	Same comment as item 14.	It is hard to remember words or phrases I have just heard.
29	I find it difficult to get the details of the input.	This is a technical for ELT practitioners. Use listening passage instead, don't confuse the participants	I find it difficult to get the details of the listening passage.

Table 2. Experts comments on MLSQ

Item's number	Original item	Experts' comment	Revised
6	I listen for familiar content words.	Are you sure they are familiar with this term "content words" is a kind of technical term.	I listen for familiar content words. (words that have meaning, i.e. nouns, main verbs, adjectives & adverbs)
7	I listen to the key words.	Are you aware of the difference between listen to and listen for or you're using the interchangeably?	I listen for the key words.
12	When I have trouble understanding, I tell myself that I'll manage and do fine.	Use full form of the word	When I have trouble understanding, I tell myself that I will manage and do fine.
13	I focus harder on the text when I have trouble understanding.	Is this the listening passage or the corresponding reading text and questions?	I focus harder on the listening passage when I have trouble understanding.
19	As I listen, I note down when something is unclear, ambiguous or not known to me, and then I formulate a plan for resolving these problems.	Lengthy and complicated. Simplify it	As I listen, I note down when something is unclear and plan for resolving these problems.
33	I ask myself how well I accomplish my goals once I'm finished.	What goal? Is it anything other than answering the questions in a test? Elaborate on this	I ask myself how well I answer the questions once I am finished.

Table 3. Experts' comments on supplementary sections

Section/question	Original	Experts' comment	Revised
A/8	Do you use English as? • L1 • L2 • FL	Participants might not know what L1/ L2 and FL stand for.	Do you use English as? • Mother tongue/First language • Second language • Foreign language
A/9	What is your listening band score? MUET/IELTS...../ TOFEL.....	How do you know the participants have taken a proficiency test?	Have you ever taken an English proficiency test? o No. o Yes. My listening band score is: MUET/IELTS...../ TOFEL.....

Asking questions about the questionnaires from the participants provided some significant information. As a result, some changes have been applied regarding to clarity of the existing items and adding some missing items. Qualitative analyzing of the data collected from the Field-Test, Table 4 below has shown some participants' comments on the instrument (Appendix A):

As can be seen in Table 4, two items were added to LCPQ. Based on the listening comprehension domains (perception, parsing, utilization), the adding items were placed at the beginning of the LCPQ (LCPQ1 and LCPQ2), so that they were related to the first domain (perception). Relying on the cognitive listening process (Anderson, 1995), listeners' attention in the perception phase is on the text segments, the phonemes and storing them in the short-term memory. Accordingly, the added items are; LCPQ1: I hear speech sounds but not clear English words, and LCPQ2: There are so many words I cannot understand. In addition, one item was also added to another questionnaire (MLSQ). Based on the meta-cognitive listening strategy domains (planning, monitoring

and evaluation) the adding item was placed (MLSQ30), so that it was related to the second domain (monitoring). Based on the taxonomy of listening strategies (Vandergrift, 1997), and corresponding definitions (Vandergrift, 1997; Goh, 1998; Mareschal, 2002), the listeners check, verify, or correct their comprehension in a listening task. More specifically, this item is placed in the sub-category of 'problem-solving' in which the listeners use the general idea of the text to guess the meanings of ambiguous words. Accordingly, the added item is; MLSQ30: I use the general idea of the text to help me guess the meaning of the words that I do not understand. Therefore, the final number of items was changed from 31 to 33 items for LCPQ and from 34 to 35 items for MLSQ. Moreover, according to the participants' comments some changes have been applied to LCPQ1 (LCPQ3 in the final version) and MLSQ2 in order to not be confusing.

Other participants have not reported any other problems in their listening comprehension besides the problems mentioned in the questionnaire. Also, they have reported no other listening strategies while doing a listening task. In addition, they

Table 4. Participants' comments on items/sections

Other listening comprehension problems (Included items)	Using other listening strategies (Included items)	Items/sections	Changed/added item
Having difficulty in pronunciation (LCPQ4) – Having difficulty with understanding new words (LCPQ13)	Using prior knowledge in the topic of discussion (MLSQ27 & MLSQ28)	Section C: was too time taking - Having difficulty with recalling the techniques that I have applied in listening tests	---
Getting confused by the environment	---	---	The environment situation effects on my comprehension.
Having difficulty in speech rate (LCPQ3)	---	---	---
---	---	LCPQ1: Substituting speech sounds' clarity by the 'accent' – might be confusing	I have difficulty with the accent of the speaker.
Having difficulty with the speech rate and pronunciation (LCPQ3 & LCPQ4)	---	---	---
---	Focusing on keywords and understanding the rest according to them	---	I understand the sentences by focusing on keywords.
Having difficulty with clarity of the speaker (LCPQ28)	Guessing the answers before starting to listen (MLSQ2) – Guessing the words' meaning based on the rest of the sentence (MLSQ1)	Section C- MLSQ2: I have a goal in my mind as I listen.	I guess the answers before and while listening.
Having difficulty with the Pronunciation (LCPQ4)	---	---	---
Having difficulty with the speech rate and pronunciation (LCPQ3 & LCPQ4)	---	---	---
Understanding the first minutes and getting confused after that (LCPQ16 & Converse item with LCPQ8)	Closing the eyes for concentration	---	---
Having stress	---	---	Usually stress overcomes me during a listening test.

have not reported any difficulties in understanding any of the items of these questionnaires. Meanwhile all the participants were agreed with the sufficiency of the number of options provided for their responses. Appendix B is the last version of the developed instrument after applying all changes.

Following the steps, internal reliability was tested for both LCPQ and MLSQ. Using IBM SPSS, Cronbach alpha was $0.884 > 0.7$ for LCPQ and $0.865 > 0.7$ for MLSQ. According to George & Mallery (2003), values greater than 0.7 are reliable.

CONCLUSION

In this paper an instrument was developed and validated, including two questionnaires to identify the perceived metacognitive listening strategy use of ESL learners with different listening comprehension problems. The available theories, the previous questionnaires, and the correlated liter-

ature were reviewed to construct the items of this instrument. The instrument was validated by the panel of TESL experts to identify their most effective comments on it. In addition, the instrument was tested among a group of respondents to reflect their attitudes toward the different parts of the instrument and also different items of the questionnaires. The most repetitive and logical feedbacks caused some changes in the items of the questionnaires.

The methodological implication is predicted for instrument developers in language studies. Moreover, the developmental procedure and the ground rules can be followed in parallel studies aim at developing similar instruments. This instrument may also be useful for the researchers in the area of ESL listening comprehension in order to testing ESL learners' perceived metacognitive listening strategies and listening comprehension problems in the diverse learning contexts. Applying some modifications, the instrument can also be applicable in EFL learning context.

Moreover, the results of this study can be beneficial for language instructors. The instructors can use the items of this instrument as an effective checklist to identify the metacognitive listening strategy use of learners with different listening comprehension problems or to understand which metacognitive listening strategies the more skilled learners use that differentiate them from less skilled ones. A concluding implication of this survey is that metacognitive listening strategy use and listening comprehension problems should not be separated in doing research. Combining the two questionnaires in one instrument means that learners' metacognitive listening strategies should not be approached in the isolation from their listening problems. Using quantitative methods, further surveys' results would validate the effectiveness of the current instrument.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, J. R. (1995). *Cognitive psychology and its implications* (2nd ed.) New York: Freeman.
- Bacon, S. M. (1992). The relationship between gender, comprehension, processing strategies, and cognitive and affective response in foreign language listening. *Modern Language Journal*, 76(2), 160-177.
- Berne, J. E. (2004). Listening comprehension strategies: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(4), 521-533.
- Cohen, A. D., Oxford, R. L., & Chi, J. C. (2005). *Maximizing study abroad: Language strategy use inventory*. University of Minnesota: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition.
- Coskun, A. (2010). The effect of metacognitive listening strategy training on the listening performance of beginner students. *Novitas-Royal (Research on youth and language)*, 4(1), 35-50.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (3rd ed.). NJ: Pearson Education International.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research methods in applied linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dörnyei, Z. (2003). *Questionnaires in second language research: Construction, administration and processing*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Field, J. (2008). Bricks or mortar: Which parts of the input does a second language listener rely on? *TESOL Quarterly*, 42, 411-432.
- Goh, C. M. (2000). A cognitive perspective on language listening comprehension problems. *System*, 28(1), 55-75.
- Goh, C. M. & Taib, Y. (2006). Metacognitive instruction in listening for young learners. *ELT Journal*, 60, 222-232.
- Goh, C. M. (2008). Metacognitive Instruction for Second Language Listening Development: Theory, Practice and Research Implications. *Regional Language Centre Journal*, 39(2), 188 - 213.
- Hasan, A. (2000). Learners' perceptions of listening comprehension problems. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 13(2), 137-153.
- Hauck, M. (2005). Metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive strategies and CALL. In J. Egbert and G. Petrie (eds.), *CALL research perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 65-86.
- Liu, N. F. (2002). *Processing problems in L2 listening comprehension of university students in Hong Kong*. (Doctoral dissertation, Hong Kong Polytechnic University).
- Macaro, E., Graham, S. & Vanderplank, R. (2007). A review of listening strategies; Focus on sources of knowledge and on success. In Cohen, A. D. & Macaro, E. (eds.), *Language Learner Strategies: 30 years of research and practice*. Oxford University Press, 165-185.
- Malik, F. A. (FPP 2011 24). Effects of metacognitive listening strategy training on listening comprehension and strategy use of ESL learners. *University Putra Malaysia*.
- Mackey, A. & Gass. S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and design*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Mareschal, C. (2007). *Student perceptions of a self-regulatory approach to second language listening comprehension development*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Ottawa).
- McKay, S. L. (2006). *Researching second language classroom*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- (2004). An insight into listeners' problems: Too much bottom-up or too much top-down? *System*, 32(3), 363-377.
- Nowrouzi, S., Tam, S. S., Zareian, G., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2015). Iranian EFL students' listening comprehension problems. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(2), 263-269.
- Nowrouzi, S., Tam, S. S., Zareian, G., & Nimehchisalem, V. (2014). Self-perceived Listening Comprehension Strategies Used by Iranian EFL Students. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(6), 35-41.
- Vandergrift, L. (1997). The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(3), 387-409.
- Vandergrift, L. (2003). Orchestrating strategy use: Toward a model of the skilled second language listener. *Language Learning*, 53(3), 463-496.
- Vandergrift, L. (2007). Recent developments in second and foreign language listening comprehension research. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 191-210.
- Vandergrift, L., Goh, C., Mareschal, C. J., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2006). The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire: Development and validation. *Language learning*, 56(3), 431-462.
- Yang, C. (2009). A study of metacognitive strategies employed by English listeners. *International Education Studies*, 2(4), 134-139.

APPENDIX

Appendix A

Self- perception of LCP (Listening Comprehension Problems) and MLSU (Metacognitive Listening Strategy Use)

Dear Participant,

For my thesis, I am examining students’ self-perception of their listening comprehension problems and metacognitive listening strategy use. You are cordially invited to participate in this research by completing the attached questionnaires. The following questionnaires will require approximately 20 minutes to complete.

If you choose to participate in this research, please answer the questions as honestly as possible. Thank you for taking the time to assist me in my educational endeavors.

At the end of this questionnaire (section D), you will be requested to provide feedback on the questionnaire itself and its items.

Sincerely,

Seyedehsima Sadatmir

PhD Candidate of English language

Department of English

FBMK

UPM

Section A

Personal Information

1. Name:
2. Contact number:
3. Email Address:
4. Age: ...years old
5. What is your gender?
 - Female
 - Male
6. What is your ethnicity?
 - Malay
 - Chinese
 - Indian
 - Others, please specify:.....
7. What is your field of study?
8. Do you use English as?
 - Mother tongue/First language
 - Second language
 - c Foreign language
- 9- Have you ever taken an English proficiency test?
 - No
 - Yes, my listening band score is:
 - MUET/IELTS...../TOFEL.....

Section B

Listening Comprehension Problems Questionnaire (LCPQ), (Adapted from Sara Noroozi, Tam Shu Sim, Vahid Nimechisalem, & Gholamreza Zareian, 2014)

Instructions: Please indicate your opinion about each statement by checking the box that describes your listening comprehension problem (1, 2, 3, 4 or 5). If you have any comments about any of the items, please write it down in the comment column. When you are answering the following questions, think of listening comprehension test situations such as IELTS listening section. While listening to English, have you ever experienced the following problems?

1 Never (0%)	2 Rarely (20%)	3 Sometimes (50%)	4 Usually (80%)	5 Always (100%)		
No	Item	Scale			Your comment about each item	
1	I hear speech sounds but NOT clear English words.	1	2	3	4	5
2	There are so many words I CANNOT understand.	1	2	3	4	5

3	The people on the recording speak quickly.	1	2	3	4	5
4	The speaker's pronunciation is UNCLEAR.	1	2	3	4	5
5	The speaker is NOT loud enough.	1	2	3	4	5
6	The speaker does NOT pause long enough.	1	2	3	4	5
7	Non-native speakers of English are easier to understand than native speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I do NOT understand the beginning of the text.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I get easily distracted from the main idea.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I know the meaning of a word when I see the word but NOT when I hear it.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I am slow to recall the meaning of words that seem to be familiar.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I mistake one word for another similar-sounding one, such as found & fund.	1	2	3	4	5
13	There are so many unfamiliar words or expressions.	1	2	3	4	5
14	It is hard to recognize so many sounds and words I hear.	1	2	3	4	5
15	I miss the beginning of texts.	1	2	3	4	5
16	I miss the next part of the passage while thinking about the meaning.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I find it difficult to really concentrate on listening.	1	2	3	4	5
18	It is hard to remember words or phrases I have just heard.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I do NOT understand the meaning of sentences.	1	2	3	4	5
20	I do NOT know how to divide the long sentence into several parts.	1	2	3	4	5
21	I find it difficult to guess the meaning of unfamiliar vocabulary accurately.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I find it difficult to remember sentences I have just heard.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I find it difficult to follow unfamiliar topics or concepts.	1	2	3	4	5
24	I find it difficult to follow a lot of new information in a short time.	1	2	3	4	5
25	I do NOT understand subsequent parts of input because of earlier problems.	1	2	3	4	5
26	I understand words but NOT the intended message.	1	2	3	4	5
27	I find it difficult to get the overall organization or structure.	1	2	3	4	5
28	I get confused with the key ideas in the message.	1	2	3	4	5
29	I find it difficult to get the details of the listening passage	1	2	3	4	5
30	I find it difficult to get the connections among ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
31	I find it difficult to get the main ideas of what I hear.	1	2	3	4	5

32- Besides these problems mentioned in the questionnaire, do you have any other problems in listening comprehension in English? Please provide your answer in the space below:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Section C

Metacognitive Listening Strategy Questionnaire (MLSQ), (Adapted from Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal & Tafaghodtari, 2006)

Instructions: The following statements are about listening comprehension of English. Please circle the response after reading each statement (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7) that indicates to which extent you agree or disagree with the statement.

	1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Slightly disagree	4 Neutral	5 Partly agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly agree	
No	Item						Scale	Your comment about each item
1	Before I start to listen, I have a plan in my head for how I am going to listen.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
2	I have a goal in mind as I listen.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
3	Before I listen, I think of similar texts that I may have listened to.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
4	When I begin listening in English, I think about how well I want to understand them.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
5	I listen selectively according to the purpose of listening.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
6	I listen for familiar content words. (words that have meaning, i.e., nouns, main verbs, adjectives & adverbs)						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
7	I listen for the key words.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
8	I pay attention to the intonation features (tones and pauses) of the texts.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
9	I pay attention to how information is organized in the texts.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
10	When I listen, I focus on what I hear in the texts.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
11	When I listen, I try to relax.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
12	When I have trouble understanding, I tell myself that I will manage and do fine.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
13	I focus harder on the listening passage when I have trouble understanding.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
14	When my mind distracts, I recover my concentration right away.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
15	I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
16	When I have difficulty understanding what I hear, I give up and stop listening.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
17	When I don't understand something, I keep on listening and hope for clarification further on.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
18	As I listen, I periodically ask myself if I'm satisfied with my level of comprehension.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
19	As I listen, I note down when something is unclear and plan for resolving these problems.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
20	As I listen, I have a good idea when I do understand something and when I do NOT understand.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
21	I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
22	When I hear something I do NOT understand, I immediately decide whether I should spend time trying to understand it.						1 2 3 4 5 6 7	

23	When I have a chance to listen to a text a second time, I usually know where I need to pay more attention to understand it better.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24	When there are parts I did NOT understand in a text, I think back to them at the end of the listening.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25	After listening, I check my interpretation to confirm how much I have understood.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26	I use the words I understand to guess the meaning of the words I do NOT understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27	As I listen, I compare what I understand with what I know about the topic.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28	I use my experience and knowledge to help me understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29	As I listen, I quickly adjust my interpretation if I realize that it is NOT correct.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30	I use the general idea of the text to help me guess the meaning of the words that I do NOT understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31	When I guess the meaning of the word, I think back to everything else that I have heard, to see if my guess makes sense.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32	I know how well I did once I finish a listening task.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33	I ask myself how well I answer the questions once I am finished.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34	After listening, I think back to how I listened, and about what I might do differently next time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

35- Besides these strategies stated in the questionnaire above, do you use any other listening strategies while doing a listening task in English? Please provide your answer in the space below:

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

Section D

Feedback on the Questionnaires

Please answer the following questions based on your experience in answering the above questionnaires.

1- Did you have any difficulties in understanding any of the items of these questionnaires? If so, please state which items. Please provide your reasons.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

2- Did you find any of the items hard to understand?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

3- Was the number of options provided for your responses sufficient?

.....
.....
.....

THE END

Thank you for your support.

Appendix B

Dear Participant,

For my thesis, I am examining students' self-perception of their listening comprehension problems and metacognitive listening strategy use. You are cordially invited to participate in this research by completing the attached questionnaires. The following questionnaires will require approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

If you choose to participate in this research, please answer the questions as honestly as possible. Thank you for taking the time to assist me in my educational endeavors.

Sincerely,

Seyedehsima Sadatmir

PhD Candidate of English language

Department of English

FBMK

UPM

Section A

Personal Information

- 1. Name:
- 2. Contact number:
- 3. Email Address:
- 4. Age: ...years old
- 5. What is your gender?
 - a Female
 - c Male
- 6. What is your ethnicity?
 - a Malay
 - b Chinese
 - c Indian
 - d Others, please specify:.....
- 7. What is your field of study?
- 8. What semester are you in?.....
- 9. Do you use English as?
 - a Mother tongue/First language
 - b Second language
 - c Foreign language
- 10- Have you ever taken an English proficiency test?
 - a No
 - b Yes, my listening band score is:
 - 1 MUET/IELTS...../TOFEL.....

Section B

Listening Comprehension Problems (LCPQ), (Adapted from Noroozi et al., 2014)

Instructions: Please indicate your opinion about each statement by checking the box that describes your listening comprehension problem (1, 2, 3, 4 or 5). When you are answering the following questions, think of listening comprehension test situations such as IELTS listening section. While listening to English, have you ever experienced the following problems?

1 Never (0%)	2 Rarely (20 %)	3 Sometimes (50%)	4 Usually (80%)	5 Always (100%)			
No	Item				Scale		
1	I easily get confused by the environment.				1	2	3 4 5
2	Usually stress overcomes me during a listening test.				1	2	3 4 5

3	I have difficulty with the accent of the speaker.	1	2	3	4	5
4	There are so many words I CANNOT understand.	1	2	3	4	5
5	The people on the recording speak quickly.	1	2	3	4	5
6	The speaker's pronunciation is UNCLEAR.	1	2	3	4	5
7	The speaker is NOT loud enough.	1	2	3	4	5
8	The speaker does NOT pause long enough.	1	2	3	4	5
9	Non-native speakers of English are easier to understand than native speakers.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I do NOT understand the beginning of the text.	1	2	3	4	5
11	I get easily distracted from the main idea.	1	2	3	4	5
12	I know the meaning of a word when I see the word but NOT when I hear it.	1	2	3	4	5
13	I am slow to recall the meaning of words that seem to be familiar.	1	2	3	4	5
14	I mistake one word for another similar-sounding one, such as found & fund.	1	2	3	4	5
15	There are so many unfamiliar words or expressions.	1	2	3	4	5
16	It is hard to recognize so many sounds and words I hear.	1	2	3	4	5
17	I miss the beginning of texts.	1	2	3	4	5
18	I miss the next part of the passage while thinking about the meaning.	1	2	3	4	5
19	I find it difficult to really concentrate on listening.	1	2	3	4	5
20	It is hard to remember words or phrases I have just heard.	1	2	3	4	5
21	I do NOT understand the meaning of sentences.	1	2	3	4	5
22	I do NOT know how to divide the long sentence into several parts.	1	2	3	4	5
23	I find it difficult to guess the meaning of unfamiliar vocabulary accurately.	1	2	3	4	5
24	I find it difficult to remember sentences I have just heard.	1	2	3	4	5
25	I find it difficult to follow unfamiliar topics or concepts.	1	2	3	4	5
26	I find it difficult to follow a lot of new information in a short time.	1	2	3	4	5
27	I do NOT understand subsequent parts of input because of earlier problems.	1	2	3	4	5
28	I understand words but NOT the intended message.	1	2	3	4	5
29	I find it difficult to get the overall organization or structure.	1	2	3	4	5
30	I get confused with the key ideas in the message.	1	2	3	4	5
31	I find it difficult to get the details of the listening passage.	1	2	3	4	5
32	I find it difficult to get the connections among ideas.	1	2	3	4	5
33	I find it difficult to get the main ideas of what I hear.	1	2	3	4	5

34- Besides these problems mentioned in the questionnaire, do you have any other problems in listening comprehension in English? Please provide your answer in the space below:

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Section C

Metacognitive Listening Strategy Use Questionnaire (MLSQ), (Adapted from Vandergrift et al., 2006)

Instructions: The following statements are about listening comprehension of English. Please circle the response after reading each statement (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7) that indicates to which extent you agree or disagree with the statement.

1 Strongly disagree	2 Disagree	3 Slightly disagree	4 Neutral	5 Partly agree	6 Agree	7 Strongly agree
No	Item	Scale				
1	Before I start to listen, I have a plan in my head for how I am going to listen.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
2	I guess the answers before and while listening.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
3	Before I listen, I think of similar texts that I may have listened to.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
4	When I begin listening in English, I think about how well I want to understand them.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
5	I listen selectively according to the purpose of listening.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
6	I listen for familiar content words. (words that have meaning, i.e., nouns, main verbs, adjectives & adverbs)	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
7	I listen for the key words.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
8	I pay attention to the intonation features (tones and pauses) of the texts.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
9	I pay attention to how information is organized in the texts.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
10	When I listen, I focus on what I hear in the texts.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
11	When I listen, I try to relax.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
12	When I have trouble understanding, I tell myself that I will manage and do fine.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
13	I focus harder on the listening passage when I have trouble understanding.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
14	When my mind distracts, I recover my concentration right away.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
15	I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
16	When I have difficulty understanding what I hear, I give up and stop listening.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7
17	When I don't understand something, I keep on listening and hope for clarification further on.	1	2	3	4	5 6 7

18	As I listen, I periodically ask myself if I'm satisfied with my level of comprehension.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19	As I listen, I note down when something is unclear and plan for resolving these problems.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20	As I listen, I have a good idea when I do understand something and when I do NOT understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21	I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22	When I hear something I do NOT understand, I immediately decide whether I should spend time trying to understand it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23	When I have a chance to listen to a text a second time, I usually know where I need to pay more attention to understand it better.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24	When there are parts I did NOT understand in a text, I think back to them at the end of the listening.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25	After listening, I check my interpretation to confirm how much I have understood.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26	I use the words I understand to guess the meaning of the words I do NOT understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27	As I listen, I compare what I understand with what I know about the topic.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28	I use my experience and knowledge to help me understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29	As I listen, I quickly adjust my interpretation if I realize that it is NOT correct.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30	I understand the sentences by focusing on keywords.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31	I use the general idea of the text to help me guess the meaning of the words that I do NOT understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32	When I guess the meaning of the word, I think back to everything else that I have heard, to see if my guess makes sense.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33	I know how well I did once I finish a listening task.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34	I ask myself how well I answer the questions once I am finished.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35	After listening, I think back to how I listened, and about what I might do differently next time.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

36- Besides these strategies stated in the questionnaire above, do you use any other listening strategies while doing a listening task in English? Please provide your answer in the space below:

THE END

Thank you for your support.