İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK OKULUNDAKİ DİNLEME BECERİSİ DERSLERİNİN DİNLEME -ANLAMA STRATEJİLERİ KULLANIM SIKLIĞI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ

97270

THE EFFECTS OF PREP LISTENING CLASSES ON THE FREQUENCY OF LISTENING COMPREHENSION STRATEGY USE

Funda Gerçek

(Yüksek Lisans Tezi)

Eskişehir 2000

THE EFFECT OF PREP LISTENING CLASSES ON THE FREQUENCY OF LISTENING COMPREHENSION STRATEGY USE

İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK OKULUNDAKİ DİNLEME BECERİSİ DERSLERİNİN DİNLEME-ANLAMA STRATEJİLERİ KULLANIMI SIKLIĞI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ

Funda Gerçek

THESIS OF MASTER OF ARTS
Advisor: Yrd. Doç. Dr Handan Kopkallı-Yavuz

97270

Eskişehir
Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü
Mart 2000

T.C. YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM KURULU
DOKÜMANTASYON MERKEZİ

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ÖZÜ

İNGİLİZCE HAZIRLIK OKULUNDAKİ DİNLEME BECERİSİ DERSLERİNİN DİNLEME-ANLAMA STRATEJİLERİ KULLANIMI SIKLIĞI ÜZERİNDEKİ ETKİSİ

Funda Gerçek
İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı
Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Mart 2000
Danışman: Yrd. Doç. Dr Handan Kopkallı-Yavuz

İşitsel bir verinin ansal (zihinsel) algılanması süreci dinleme-anlama stratejisi olarak tanımlanabilir. Bu araştırma, hazırlık okulunda sürdürülen dinleme becerisi derslerinin dinleme-anlama stratejileri kullanımı sıklığına etkisini belirlemek amacıyla yapılmıştır. Dinleme becerisi derslerinin dinleme-anlama stratejileri kullanım sıklığı üzerinde olumlu ya da olumsuz etkisi olup olmadığını belirlemek için hazırlık okuluna bir yıl boyunca devam etmiş öğrenci grubu ile bu okula devam etmemiş öğrenci grubu arasında dinleme-anlama stratejilerinin sıklığı arasında fark olup olmadığı belirlenmeye çalışılmıştır.

Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Öğretmenliği Bölümündeki 139 birinci sınıf öğrencisi çalışmaya katılmıştır. Bu öğrenciler, Hazırlık Grubu ve Hazırlık almayan Grup olarak sınıflandırılmıştır. Hazırlık Grubunda 59, Hazırlık almayan Grupta da 80 öğrenci vardır. Veriler bu iki grup öğrenciden toplanmıştır. Her iki gruptaki öğrenciler literatürde yetkin dinleyiciler tarafından kullanıldığı saptanmış 13 dinleme-anlama stratejisini içeren bir Dinleme-Anlama Stratejileri Envanterine cevap vermiştir.

Hazırlık okulu dinleme becerisi dersleri ayrı bir yeti dersi olarak sürdürülmektedir. Dinleme becerisi dersleri öğrencilerin İngilizce işitmelerini anlamaya doğru geliştirmeyi amaçlamaktadır. Bu amaç dolaylı strateji eğitimi ile sürdürülmektedir

Dolaylı bir strateji eğitimi aldıkları için hazırlık okuluna devam etmiş öğrencilerin genel olarak dinleme-anlama stratejilerini hazırlık okuluna devam etmemiş öğrencilerden daha sık kullanmaları beklenmekteydi. Bununla birlikte bu çalışmanın sonuçları genel dinleme-anlama stratejilerin kullanım sıklığı ortalamalarının her iki grup için de benzer olduğunu ortaya koymuştur. Her iki grupta dinleme-anlama stratejilerini orta sıklıkta kullanmaktadır. Buna ek olarak, genel dinleme-anlama stratejileri kullanım sıklığında herhangi bir istatistiksel bağıntı olmadığı görülmüştür. Her iki grup öğrencilerin dinleme-anlama stratejilerinin tek tek kullanımı sıklığında bir fark olup olmadığı araştırılmış, grupların her bir strateji için kullanım sıklığı ortalamaları birbirleri ile karşılaştırılmış ve sonuçlar doğrultusunda yine gruplar arasında kullanım sıklığının birbirleriyle aynı olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır.

THESIS OF MASTERS OF ARTS
ABSTARACT

THE EFFECT OF PREP LISTENING CLASSES ON THE FREQUENCY OF LISTENING COMPREHENSION STRATEGY USE

Funda Gerçek
English Language Education Department
Anadolu University Social Sciences Institute, March 2000
Advisor: Asst. Prof. Handan Kopkallı-Yavuz

The mental processes that take place during an aural input are known as listening comprehension strategies. This study investigated the effect of prep listening classes on the frequency of listening comprehension strategy use. This study attempted to determine whether prep listening classes had positive effect on the frequency of using listening comprehension strategies. Therefore, the listening comprehension strategies used by students who went through a year long English preparatory program were compared with the frequency of listening comprehension strategies used by students who did not attend the English preparatory program.

139 first year students at Anadolu University Education Faculty English Language Teaching Department participated to this study. They were classified as the Prep Group and the Non-Prep Group. The Prep Group included 59 students who attended prep classes and the Non-Prep Group included 80 students who did not. Data gathered from the two groups. Two groups of students responded to a Listening Comprehension Strategy Inventory (LCSI) which enquired about 13 listening comprehension strategies efficient listeners use in the literature.

Listening comprehension courses at Preparatory School at Anadolu University have been conducted as a separate language learning skill. Listening comprehension courses aim to help students develop their listening ability from hearing to comprehending. This aim has been proceed as in implicit strategy training. When the two groups of students were compared in terms of the mean frequency of overall listening comprehension strategy use, the Prep Group students' mean frequency of overall listening comprehension strategy use was expected to be higher than the Non-

Prep Group students', because the Prep Group students had implicit listening comprehension strategy training. But the results of this study revealed that the mean frequency of overall strategy use is similar between the two groups. Both of the two groups of students use listening comprehension strategies moderately and there was no significant difference statistically in frequency of listening comprehension strategies between the two groups. To determine whether the two groups differed in terms of individual strategy use, the mean frequencies for each strategy was compared between the two groups. Results showed that both groups used the listening strategies equally frequently.

JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI

Funda GERÇEK'in "The Effects of Prep Listening Classes on The Frequency of Listening Comprehension Strategy Use (İngilizce Hazırlık Okulundaki Dinleme Becerisi Derslerinin Dinleme-Anlama Stratejileri Kullanımı Sıklığı Üzerindeki Etkisi)" başlıklı tezi **28 Haziran 2000** tarihinde, aşağıdaki jüri tarafından Lisansüstü Eğitim Öğretim ve Sınav Yönetmeliğinin ilgili maddeleri uyarınca, **İngiliz Dili Eğitimi** Anabilim Dalında, yüksek lisans tezi olarak değerlendirilerek kabul edilmiştir.

			İmza
Üye (Tez Danışmanı)	:	Yrd.Doç.Dr.Handan KOPKALLI YAVUZ	.....
Üye	:	Prof.Dr.Zülal BALPINAR	.....
Üye	:	Doç.Dr.Ferhan ODABAŞI	.....

Prof.Dr.Enver ÖZKALP
Anadolu Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Müdürü

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to my advisor Asst. Prof. Handan Kopkallı-Yavuz, for her understanding, continuous encouragement, valuable criticism, and constructive suggestions all through the work.

I would also like to express my thanks to Prof. Zülal Balpınar and Assoc. Prof. Ferhan Odabaşı for their valuable encouragement, ideas and support.

I would also like to express my thanks to Asst. Prof Ayşen Gürcan-Namlu who helped me with the statistical analysis of the results.

I would also like to express my sincere thanks to my friends Nevin Tezer, Asst. Prof. Mine Dikdere, Neslihan Mutlu-Ekmekçi and Hülya İpek for their support and friendship. I am also grateful to Halil İpek who helped me overcome possible problems with computer.

My special thanks go to my sister Tülay Elbir, for her support and encouragement.

I would also like to thank the students who participated in this study.

ÖZGEÇMİŞ

Funda Gerçek

Yüksek Lisans

İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Anabilim Dalı

Eğitim

L.s. 1988	Anadolu Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi, Yabancı Diller Bölümü İngilizce Öğretmenliği
Lise 1984	Eskişehir, Cumhuriyet Lisesi, Tabi Bilimler Bölümü

İş

1994 - Okutman, Anadolu Üniversitesi, Yabancı Diller Okulu

Kişisel Bilgiler

Doğum yeri ve yılı: 23 Eylül 1967 Yabancı dil: İngilizce

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

ÖZ iii
ABSTRACT v
JÜRİ VE ENSTİTÜ ONAYI vii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS viii
ÖZGEÇMIŞ ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS x
LIST OF TABLES xii

1. INTRODUCTION
1.1 The Importance of Listening Among Other Skills 1
1.2 What Do Learners Do in Listening Comprehension? 2
1.3 Why Listening is a Problematic Skill in EFL? 3
1.4 Learning Strategies 4
1.5 Strategy Training 4
1.6 Research Question 5

2. REVİEW OF LITERATURE
2.1 Defining Learning Strategies 9
2.2 Classification of Learning Strategies 12
2.3 Research on Listening Strategies 13
2.4 Listening Strategies 18
2.5 Characterising Listening Ability 20
2.6 Contrasting Effective and Ineffective Listening Habits 21
2.7 Taxonomy of Listening Strategies 22
2.7.1 Metacognitive Listening Comprehension Strategies 22
2.7.2 Cognitive Listening Comprehension Strategies 23
2.7.3 Social Affective Listening Comprehension Strategies 24

3. METHODOLOGY
3.1 Subjects 26
3.2 Instruments 27
3.2.1 Linguistics Validity of LCSI 28
3.2.2 Construct Validity of LCSI 29
3.2.3 Reliability of LCSI 32
3.3 Procedure 34
3.4 Data Analysis 34

4. RESULTS
4.1 Frequencies of Overall Strategy Use **35**
4.2 Frequencies of Individual 20 Statements **37**
4.3 Summary **53**

5. DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS
5.1 Summary..... **60**
5.2 Discussion..... **60**
5.3 Conclusion..... **62**
5.4 Suggestions for Further Studies..... **64**

APPENDICES
Appendix A > İngilizce Dinleme Stratejileri Envanteri..... **66**
Appendix B > Revised Edition of LCSI..... **69**
Appendix C > İngilizce Dinleme Stratejileri Cevap Kağıdı **71**

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... **72**

LIST OF TABLES AND FIGURES

FIGURE 2.1 Types of L2 Knowledge 10
TABLE 2.1 Definitions of Learning Strategies..... 11
FIGURE 2.2 Diagram of Strategy System: Overview..... 13
FIGURE 3.1 Factor Scree Plot Test for 20 Statements in LCSI 30
TABLE 3.1 Table of Distribution and Factor Loading of 20 Statements in LCSI..... 31
TABLE 3.2 Table of Eigenvalue, Variance and Cumulative Variance of 4 Factors..... 32
TABLE 3.3 Correlation Between Test / Retest for LCSI..... 33
FIGURE 4.1 The Histogram of the Overall Frequency Use of LCSI 35
TABLE 4.1 Percent of Listening Comprehension Strategy Use..... 36
TABLE 4.2 Mean Frequency of Listening Comprehension Strategy Use..... 36
TABLE 4.3 Maximum and Minimum Strategy Use 37
TABLE 4.4 The Mean Frequency of Statement 1 for Both Groups 38
TABLE 4.5 The Mean Frequency of Statement 2 for Both Groups 38
TABLE 4.6 The Mean Frequency of Statement 3 for Both Groups 39
TABLE 4.7 The Mean Frequency of Statement 4 for Both Groups 40
TABLE 4.8 The Mean Frequency of Statement 5 for Both Groups 40
TABLE 4.9 The Mean Frequency of Statement 6 for Both Groups 41
TABLE 4.10 The Mean Frequency of Statement 7 for Both Groups 42
TABLE 4.11 The Mean Frequency of Statement 8 for Both Groups 43
TABLE 4.12The Mean Frequency of Statement 9 for Both Groups 43
TABLE 4.13 The Mean Frequency of Statement 10 for Both Groups 44
TABLE 4.14 The Mean Frequency of Statement 11 for Both Groups 45
TABLE 4.15 The Mean Frequency of Statement 12 for Both Groups 46
TABLE 4.16 The Mean Frequency of Statement 13 for Both Groups 47
TABLE 4.17 The Mean Frequency of Statement 14 for Both Groups 47
TABLE 4.18 The Mean Frequency of Statement 15 for Both Groups 48

TABLE 4.19 The Mean Frequency of Statement 16 for Both Groups 49

TABLE 4.20 The Mean Frequency of Statement 17 for Both Groups 50

TABLE 4.21 The Mean Frequency of Statement 18 for Both Groups 51

TABLE 4.22 The Mean Frequency of Statement 19 for Both Groups 52

TABLE 4.23 The Mean Frequency of Statement 20 for Both Groups 52

TABLE 4.24 The Mean Frequencies of Individual Statements in LCSI 54

TABLE 4.25 The Mean Frequencies of Translation
(Statements 3 and 7) 55

TABLE 4.26 The Mean Frequencies of Real Time Assessment
(Statements 5 and 18) 56

TABLE 4.27 The Mean Frequencies of Note-Taking
(Statements 8, 11 and 20) 57

TABLE 4.28 The Mean Frequencies of Arranging and Planning for your Learning
(Statements 12 and 15) 58

TABLE 4.29 The Mean Frequencies of Comprehension Evaluation
(Statements 13 and 17)..... 59

1. INTRODUCTION

> "Until the last decade the ability to understand the spoken language was seen as a natural process of perception and expected to be gained naturally along with other skills. It seemed reasonable to assume that he would learn to understand the spoken language as he learned to speak it. Sadly, this apparently natural process does not seem to produce the desired results (Brown and Yule 1983 cited in Cinemre 1991)".

If Brown and Yule are correct in that the ability to understand spoken English does not occur naturally, then it appears obvious that listening ability should be taught.

1.1 The Importance of Listening Among Other Skills

Listening is an important skill for language learners because understanding spoken English is crucial in acquiring the spoken language and listening is used more than any other language skill in our daily life. We can expect to listen twice as much as we speak, four times more than we read and five times more than we write (Rivers, 1981, Wver,1972, cited in Murcia 1991:82).

Doff (1986: 198) states that "we cannot develop speaking skills unless we also develop listening skills, to have a successful conversation, students must understand what is said to them". He also points out that "listening to spoken English is an important way of acquiring the language -of 'picking up' structures and vocabulary".

Murcia (1991:82) states that "today, attention to listening in second language development is becoming an important topic of study in both theory and pedagogy, but much work remains to be done.

Rivers (1981:180) states that;

> "Language teachers must not forget that aural comprehension is an essential element of act of communication. Language teachers face increased options in the selection of methods and materials, parallel with the explosion of methodologies in the late 1970's. There has been a growing interest in considering the language learning task from the learners' point of view changing the focus of classrooms from a teacher-centred to a learner-centred one. In particular, there is a

> growing interest in defining how learners can manage their own learning and become more autonomous. As a result, there is now substantial body of research outlining learner behaviours and describing the thought processes they engender while learning a foreign language".

As pointed out by many researchers, there is a growing interest in and concern for listening research and training due to the central role listening plays in ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learning. Unfortunately, there is still very little agreement about what listening entails and how it operates.

1.2 What Do Learners Do in Listening Comprehension?

In language learning, according to Chaistain (1971) first, the learners perceive a certain segment of language and discriminate among what they consider to be important linguistic aspects of the language. Second, they comprehend the distinction involved and begin to formulate their own language system. Third, based on their hypothesis about the language, they develop a personal competence. Fourth, once they have competence, they begin to use performance skills. Fifth, as they activate their performance skills, they make adjustments, moving their language competence into line with that of the language they perceive around them. Sixth, the performance skills consist of both receptive and productive skills which are put into operation before productive skills.

Past experience of language teachers clearly indicates that not all second language learners acquire a listening proficiency level necessary to function in a second-language communicative situation. Students need practice in listening to the second language communicative contexts so they can tune their ears to the rhythm and sounds of the language. They need to be made aware of the many aspects of vocalic communication. In addition to this, one of the most important tasks required of language teachers in promoting the acquisition of listening skills is to help students develop long attention spans and good listening habits (Chaistain, 1971).

Based on the sequence of operations Chaistain describes, audio-lingual proponents have advocated what they see as the natural sequence in learning a foreign

language: listening, reading, speaking, and writing. Once receptive skills have been established by means of listening and reading, speaking and writing can be undertaken and developed toward communicative fluency. Listening and reading provide the means of acquiring additional vocabulary and new language structure. Therefore teachers need to be most careful that the students have the means before he asks them to continue in language learning toward speaking and writing. Without making the first step, they will be unable to take the second because as Chaistain (1971) argues unless they have the ability to decode an incoming message, they certainly cannot be expect to encode an ongoing one.

1.3 Why Listening is a Problematic Skill in EFL?

Turkish people try to learn a language, especially English, for a lot of reasons. Language students, whether they are attending private language courses or language training programmes in schools, often complain about common language problems. Some say they do not understand what they hear and to what they listen. Listening is one of the skills about which they mostly complain. In foreign or second language teaching and learning situations, listening comprehension has been considered as one of the problematic skills. The reasons why listening is problematic may be its complexity, the learners' fear and the difficulty of determining what to improve (Chaistain, 1971). Anderson and Lynch (1988) and Underwood (1998) also agree that, listening is a complex process and the teaching of this process is as complex as the listening process itself (cited in Yılmaz 1998:2).

Chaistain (1979) listed some reasons for the difficulty of listening comprehension. According to Chaistain, first, one must be able to discriminate between the significant sound and intonation patterns of the language. Second, one must be able to perceive an oral message, third, keep the communication in mind while it is being processed, and finally understand the contained message. According to Chaistain (1979,82) "these four components of listening comprehension are in ascending order of difficulty". However, these four components are not independent of each other. Achievement in each component is required. Evaluation of each component is

necessary in order to avoid partial learning which will result in incomplete or inadequate comprehension.

There might be many different reasons for the problems the students meet in listening in a foreign language. But the nature of the complaints bring to mind the possibility that "some of the students lack adequate knowledge about how they can learn more effectively (Goh:1997:368)". Thus, students may not know how to study and how to develop their listening skill in a foreign language learning efficiently.

1.4 Learning Strategies

Parallel with the explosion of methodologies in the late 1970s and early 1980s in which language teachers faced increased options in the selection of methods and materials, there has been a growing interest in considering the language learning task from the learners' point of view and changing the focus of classroom from a teacher-centred to a learner-centred one. In particular there is a growing interest in defining how learners can manage their own learning and become more autonomous. As a consequence, there is now a substantial body of research outlining learner behaviours and describing the thought processes that directly contribute to learning are called learning strategies. Learning strategies are defined by Oxford (1990:8) as "the specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable and more transferable to new situations".

Research and theory in second language learning theory strongly suggest that good language learners use a variety of strategies to assist them in gaining a command of new language skills. Less competent learners on the other hand, should be able to improve their skills through training in strategies used by more successful language learners. With successful training, less competent learners should be able to apply strategies to the acquisition of a variety of different language skills and transfer the strategies to similar language tasks.

1.5 Strategy Training

Studies in strategies have shown that effective foreign or second language learners use a variety of strategies for both receptive and productive tasks while less

successful learners use strategies less frequently. Since less successful learners have a smaller repertoire of strategies, they are not often able to choose appropriate strategies for learning tasks (Chamot and Kupper, 1989).

This problem, however, can be resolved through strategy training, which helps learners to gain awareness of learning strategies that can contribute to their learning. Chamot (1988) claims that learners that can be trained to apply appropriate strategies to language learning task. Chamot and Kupper (1989) point out that training in learning strategies can increase the ability of learners to learn a foreign language. That is to say, strategy training can be an effective way of raising awareness of learning strategies and promoting learning a language (Oxford, 1990).

Oxford (1990) identified and described three types of strategy training methods: 1.awarness training, 2.one-time strategy training, and 3.long term strategy training. Awareness training may overlap with the other two training models, since in the other two training models, students are trained to actually use the strategies with language learning tasks, in addition to raise awareness of learning strategies.

1.6 Research Question

Good language teaching is viewed as something that results from using a given method or as something that results from a teacher modifying teaching behaviours to match some set of rules and princibles. However, what the teacher does is only the one side of the coin. The other side concerns the learners, what they do to achieve successful learning, i.e. learner strategies.

Studies in learning strategies have mostly focused on reading, writing and speaking of EFL/ESL learners. Learning strategies in listening skills have been widely ignored by researchers.

Listening, reading, writing and speaking are seen as components of a language as a whole in the language teaching arena. Listening comprehension is as important as any of the others, perhaps more so. The phonological aspect of the language is acquired by listening and oral communication is impossible without a listening ability. Listening serves as the basis for the development of speaking.

As listening comprehension is a mental process a number of questions need to be answered. What knowledge and beliefs do learners have about learning to listen in second or foreign language? Are learners aware of their mental process during listening? How can we find out what learners know? The number of questions can be increased in the research area. Furthermore, there has been much discussion about the important role listening plays in the development of learners' second/ foreign language (Libeng 1985 cited in Goh 1997:361).

Vogely (1995:41) claims that "although our knowledge about listening comprehension and language learning strategies has increased in the past decade a gap still exist between research theory and classroom reality. We still need research that document empirically the relationship between what theory says and what learners actually know and more importantly do. More specifically information is needed on the skills and strategies learners actually bring or do not bring to the Listening Comprehension Task".

Earlier studies on listening strategies consisted largely of lists of features that good listeners were assumed to possess. Then, these lists were improved from interviews with successful listener strategies. Afterwards, students were given training in the use of particular strategies in order to determine if they would be more effective as language learners. Results supported the notion that learners can be taught to use more effective listening strategies (O'Malley et al, 1985b).

> "Strategies training was successfully demonstrated in a natural teaching environment with second language listening and speaking tasks. This indicates that classroom instruction on learning strategies with integrative language skills can facilitate learning (O'Malley et al 1985b: 577)".

Because listening is an important skill in the language teaching arena, the lack of research on how learners acquire listening ability, and to determine the effect of implicit strategy training in listening courses, more studies concerning listening strategies are needed. This study is conducted to determine the effect of prep listening classes on the frequency of listening comprehension strategy use. The reason of conducting this study was to compare the frequency of listening comprehension strategy use between Turkish

EFL students who attended Preparatory School at Anadolu University and students who did not. Students who attended prep classes a group of students who were exposed to implicit strategy training in their listening courses as a separate skill for a year in their language education. Thus the two groups of students were chosen as the participants of this study, because the Prep Group students were learners who completed a successful period of implicit strategy training and the Non-Prep Group students who were not expose to either explicit or implicit strategy training.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Communication involves at least two people, a speaker and a listener. The speaker creates a meaningful message and the listener recreates that message. In other words , the speaker sends the message - what s/he intends to say and the listener tries to understand what the speaker means by decoding the message during the communication. Rivers (1981:151) states that "in speaking, people put ideas into words talking about perceptions, feelings and intentions they want other people to grasp. In listening, they turn words into ideas, trying to reconstruct the perceptions, feelings and intentions. So speaking and listening are the tools people use in more global activities. They are actually very complex activities". Of course, there are many factors which influence communication. Misunderstanding or recreation of the message insufficiently by the listener or comprehending the message incorrectly can be possible in one's native language as well as in a foreign language.

Nonetheless, in foreign or second language teaching and learning situations, listening comprehension has been considered to be one of the most problematic skills. There are several reasons for this. First, it is what we understand by the notion of 'a successful listener'. "The successful listener should listen carefully to the language input, construct a sympathetic view of what the speaker is trying to say and respond co-operatively (Brown, 1986:287)". In other words, "the listener is required to synthesise, interpret and analyse the information heard (Dunkel, 1991:444). The second reason why listening skill is problematic is its complexity. Dunkel (1991:441) states that "L2 listeners can suffer the effect of a negative listening self-concept if they feel inadequate to the task of understanding English spoken by native speakers and this lack of confidence may influence their listening comprehension in adverse ways". Preiss and Wheeless (1989:72) (cited in Dunkel (1991)) support this view by stating that language learners are not effective listeners because of "the fear of misinterpreting inadequately processing and/or not being able to adjust psychologically to messages sent by others".

In teaching listening comprehension in a foreign language, teachers can help students improve their listening skill from hearing to comprehending. Dunkel (1991:445) points out that "teachers can help the research area in L2 by making their students available subjects for experimental research and by conducting action research in their classrooms. By working hand in hand, teachers and researchers can expand the L2 research base and guarantee that research impacts on practise and vice versa".

Listeners arrange a lot of mental processes in an effort to comprehend the information from the speaker or from the oral texts. Mental processes that are activated in order to understand new information or to keep new information are referred to as learning strategies. Chamot and Kupper (1989:13) define learning strategies as "techniques which students use to comprehend, store and remember new information and skills. What a student thinks and how a student acts in order to learn comprise the nonobservable and observable aspects of learning strategies".

Although the focus of this study is on listening comprehension strategies, first research on general learning strategies behaviours, and thought processes that contribute directly to learning will be discussed as listening comprehension strategies stemmed from learning strategies.

2.1 Defining Learning Strategies

Since the focus of the study is the investigation of listening comprehension strategies, it will be helpful to clarify the general mental processes in foreign language learning. Incoming L2 knowledge is subjected to a set of mental processes before it is stored in long term memory by learners. A general framework these mental processes is given by Ellis (1985: 165) in Figure 2.1.

Figure 2.1.

Types of L2 Knowledge (Adapted from Ellis 1985)

According to Ellis (1985:164) learners have two types of knowledge: declarative and procedural. Declarative knowledge is 'knowing that'; it consists of internalised rules and memorised items of language. They are acquired and stored in long-term memory and made available to use when needed. Procedural knowledge is 'knowing how'; it consists of strategies and procedures used by the learners to process L2 data for acquisition and use.

Ellis (1985:164-165) divides procedural knowledge into two components, social and cognitive. The social component includes behavioural learning strategies that L2 learners perform in a face to face communication or in contact with L2 texts. The cognitive component is the mental processes involved in automizing and internalising L2 knowledge, and in using L2 knowledge in conjunction with other knowledge sources to communicate in the target language. Thus, the cognitive processes are using and learning the target language. Learning processes are self-directed behaviours relating to the accumulation of L2 rules, automizing them and relating them to already existing ones, thus putting them in practice. Learners thus will build a sound bridge between learning and using; learning and using encompass a two way movement, from learning to using and using to learning.

In order to understand what the use of learning strategies mean, it is essential to define what language learning strategies are. Different researchers have defined learning strategies differently. However the definition of learning strategies show similarities as do behaviours and techniques that contribute to language learning.

Table 2.1

Definitions of Learning Strategies (from Ellis 1994)

Source	Definition
Stern (1983)	*'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 behaviours'.*
Weinstein and Mayer (1986)	*'Learning strategies are the behaviours and thoughts that learner engages in during learning that are intended to influence the learner's encoding process'*
Chamot (1987)	*'Learning strategies are techniques, approaches or deliberate actions that students take in in order to facilitate the learning, recall of both linguistic and content area information'*
Rubin (1987)	*'Learning strategies are strategies which contribute to the development of the language system which the learner construct and affect learning directly'*
Oxford (1989)	*'Language learning strategies are behaviours or actions which learners use to make language learning more successful, self-directed and enjoyable'.*

2.2 Classifications of Learning Strategies

Research on learning strategies has taken many different categorisations forms. Different classifications are suggested in the literature. The categorisation of learning strategies developed by Oxford (1990) is more detailed than the others. Furthermore, it links individual strategies and strategy groups systematically with each of the four language skills; listening reading, writing and speaking. In addition, it can be said that Oxford's classification incorporates all the points identified by other researchers. Therefore, Oxford's classification seems to be the most appropriate classification as it provides a very detailed description of each individual strategy and exemplifies applications for each language learning skill (Cohen 1990 cited in Baysal 1997:12). And it is for this reason that, Oxford's classification is widely used as an instrument to define learners' learning behaviour, for instance in Strategy Inventory for Language Learning (SILL) in research on Language Learning (Cohen,1990, Oxford, Lavine and Crookal, 1998, Ellis 1994, Chamot et al, 1993 cited in Baysal 1997:13).

In Oxford's (1990:37) classification of learning strategies, there are two classes of direct and indirect strategies. Direct strategies consist of 'strategies that directly involve the target language' and that they 'require mental processing of the language'. Indirect strategies 'provide indirect support for language learning through focusing, planning, evaluating, seeking opportunities, controlling anxiety, increasing co-operation and empathy and other means' (1990:151). The subcategories of direct and indirect strategies are presented in Figure 2.2.

In Oxford's taxonomy of strategies, Direct strategies are divided into three subcategories which are Memory, Cognitive and Compensation strategies. Memory strategies are used for storage of information. Cognitive strategies are also called mental strategies, they involve active manipulation of the learning task, and they contribute to learning directly. Compensation strategies help learners to overcome knowledge gaps to continue communication. Indirect strategies are also divided into three subcategories; Metacognitive, Affective and Social Strategies. Strategies which help learners regulate their learning are called Metacognitive strategies. Affective strategies are related to the

learner's emotional requirement such as confidence. Social strategies, on the other hand, lead to interaction with the target language.

Figure 2.2

Diagram of Strategy System: Overview (from Oxford:1990: 16)

The field of language learning strategies research in EFL and ESL is now an important domain of classroom research and differs substantially from previous research in classroom research. Research on language learning strategies seeks to identify the strategies employed by successful learners and then teach those strategies to unsuccessful learners in order to improve their language learning capacities.

2.3 Research on Listening Strategies

The question why it is important for teachers and researchers to understand what learners know about listening, has been raised by many researchers. There are at least three reasons. "First, there is evidence to believe that what learners know about their learning can directly influence the process and even the outcome of their learning (Palmer and Goets 1988, cited in Goh 1997:361). For instance, learners' perceptions of learning strategies will influence the kinds of strategy that they choose (Nisbet and Shucksmith 1986, cited in Goh 1997:361). Secondly, as Wenden (1987) has noted, by taking their awareness and perceptions, into consideration we can get a better picture of the cognitive complexities that differentiate good and poor learners. She cites research showing that unsuccessful learners are generally less aware of effective ways

of approaching learning tasks. Finally, compared with other skills there are fewer insights about the process of listening and the way it is learnt. Furthermore, there has been much discussion about the important role listening plays in the development of learner's second/foreign language (Long 1985 cited in Goh 1997:361)".

Studies on listening strategies of successful language learners have identified a number of cognitive and metacognitive strategies that the second/ foreign language listeners use (De Flips 1980; Laviosa 1991a and 1991b; Murphy 1985; O'Malley, Chamot,and Küpper 1989; Rost and Ross 1991; Vandergrift 1992). Thompson and Rubin (1996:332) list the cognitive strategies "employed in listening are elaborating, inferencing, predicting. Metacognitive operations used by successful language learners include open and flexible use of strategies (Murphy, 1985) and self monitoring (O'Malley, Chamot and Küpper, 1989)".

Research in second/foreign language listening has revealed that effective use of strategies depends on many factors, for example proficiency level, task definition and background knowledge (Rubin, 1994 cited in Thompson and Rubin, 1996:332).

Bacon (1992:400) states that "only a few studies have examined learner strategies in relation to listening". Murphy (1985, 1987, cited in Bacon, 1992) distinguished twelve broad categories of strategies employed by ESL students. He identified differences in frequencies and sequential patterns of strategies that more proficient versus less proficient listeners employed.

Since listening comprehension is a mentally active process in language learning O'Malley et al (1989) focused on the mental processes second language learners use in listening comprehension, the strategies they use in different phases of comprehension and differences in strategy use between students chosen by their teachers as effective and ineffective listeners. Criteria for being an effective listener were determined in advance collectively by the teachers with assistance from the researchers. Effectiveness consisted of attentiveness in class, ability and willingness to comprehend the general meaning of a difficult listening passage, ability to follow directions without asking for clarification, and ability to respond appropriately in a conversation, and ability and willingness to guess the meaning of unfamiliar words and phrases. Application of these criteria resulted in the selection of eight effective and three ineffective listeners

(O'Malley and et all 1989). But the results of the study were based on only five effective listeners who attended successive sessions and three ineffective listeners. Subjects listened to a taped academic lectures with imposed pauses. During each pause, subjects had to relate how they made sense, what was unclear and what images occurred to them. The data was collected in think-aloud procedure in Spanish or English. Results showed that listeners used different strategies at the different phases of the listening task. During the perceptual stage, effective listeners were aware of and tried to deal with attention problems. On the contrary, ineffective listeners were not aware of their inattention and stopped listening when they encountered on unknown word or phrase. During the parsing stage, effective listeners used more top-down strategies than bottom-up strategies. Effective listeners inferred the meanings of new words which were important for the comprehension of the oral text by using the context of the sentence or paragraph in which the unfamiliar word appeared (O'Malley, 1989: 429). In the utilization stage, effective listeners related what they have heard to both their personal experiences and their knowledge of the world. Significant differences between effective and ineffective listeners were found in self-monitoring, elaboration and inferencing.

Leaver ((58) reported in Oxford and Crookal, 1989) compared listening strategies of adults and children. He found that children used more global strategies focusing on the global meaning through context and verbs, in contrast adults used more analytical strategies (p. 408).

Bacon (1992) examined the relationship between gender and comprehension, processing strategies and cognitive and affective responses in foreign language listening. Fifty students in the first course beyond the arts and sciences FL requirement at a large Midwestern university served as the subjects of the study. She formulated four research questions. The first question was if men and women will differ in their level of comprehension of authentic text. The second one was if men and women will differ in kinds and incidence of strategies that they report when listening to authentic input. The third one was if men and women will differ in their level of confidence or affective response after listening to authentic text and the fourth question was if the passage type order of presentation interacts with gender. The results of her study

showed that no significant differences existed between the level of comprehension of men and women in the kinds and incidence of cognitive strategies that they use when listening to authentic input. No significant interaction was found between gender, order and passage type.

Bacon (1991,cited in Bacon 1992: 401) investigated strategies and affective reactions of students while listening to radio broadcasts in Spanish. She found that men are significantly more confident of their comprehension, felt better and relied on more on English and bottom-up processing strategies than did women. However, men and women did not differ significantly in their level of comprehension.

Bacon and Finneman (1990, cited in Vogely,1995:43) examined the relationship of self reported strategies, motives and attitudes of a group learners with their anticipated reactions to authentic oral and written input. The results demonstrated that the learners' beliefs and attitudes revealed their reactions to the listening component of the foreign language curriculum and could determine their potential success or failure. That is, if a student not really interested in listening to a FL, then the potential level of comprehension is more likely to be impaired.

Vogely (1995:53) investigated perceived strategy use during performance on three authentic listening comprehension tasks. She found that in the area of effectiveness and confidence, the top-down strategies received the strongest reaction, and the bottom-up strategies were more readily accessed than the top-down strategies. One of her research questions was 'What do learners believe makes a 'good' listener and how do learners evaluate themselves as listeners?' The students' responses to the question was as follows. A good listener understands gist 90%, recognise word 88%, uses background knowledge 80%, focuses on details 65%, pronunciation 65%, and guesses the meaning of words 50%. Vogely (1995:46) states that "all of the subjects seemed to know what makes a good listener but they differed in the evaluation of their own strategy use". According to Vogely, learners' own definition of a 'good' listener had a strong interaction with how the learners feel about themselves when listening to a given text. If the learner feels good about her/ himself when listening, then s/he is self confident. Self-confidence was rated as one of three major factors affecting listening comprehension ability of successful students (Fujita 1984, cited in Vogely 1995:47)

Vogely states that "in order to be 'good' listeners, the learners must feel 'good' about themselves". Therefore she points out that this kind of evidence supports the importance of addressing the affective domain of the listening process and indicates the need to focus on teaching indirect as well as direct Listening Learning strategies as defined by Oxford (1990 as cited in Vogely 1995:47).

Fullilove and Tsui (1998) investigated the processing skills used by skilled and less-skilled readers/listeners. According to their study, less-skilled listeners needed to use their pre-existing knowledge to interpret the text and create plausible expectations. This has been referred to as bottom-up or text based processing (Carrel 1983, 1988, Carrel and Eisterhold 1983, Rost 1990 cited in Fullilove). Skilled listeners used a knowledge- based interactive mode of text processing whereas less-skilled listeners attended mostly to local details (p.435). Fullilove and Tsui used global and local question types to identify the skilled listeners to less-skilled ones. 'Global' questions required candidates to understand the text, get the gist of the text as a whole and draw a conclusion or inferences. 'Local' questions required candidates to pick out only the specific details. Skilled readers/listeners who engaged in top-down processing were better than the ones who engaged in bottom-up processing (Tsui and Fullilove 1998:432). As a result bottom-up processing was more important than top-down processing in discriminating the listening performance of L2 learners on test items.

Bacon (1992: 3) defines the two cognitive processing strategies in listening - top-down and bottom-up strategies - as follows. "Top-down strategies emanate from the learners background knowledge of schemata, discourse and other real world knowledge. Listeners meet a task with certain expectations, they test hypotheses and infer from the context. Bottom-up strategies are text based and linear in nature. Listeners attempt to build meaning inductively from the evidence that is presented in the text".

Goh (1998) studied the strategies high-ability listeners and low-ability listeners used and found that what distinguished less-ability listeners was not the lack of appropriate strategies but inability to choose the right strategy for the task. Both groups used more cognitive strategies than metacognitive ones, but the low-ability listeners were particularly poor at it.

The weaker listeners in his study appeared to be more concerned with trying to guess the meaning of words thus missed the other parts of the text. As Steve Tauroza (1997, personal communication cited in Goh; 1998:142) has noted, "this is a case of the high-ability listeners probably seeing the glass as half -full when the low -ability listeners regard it as half -empty. In other words, the better listeners were prepared to work with what they had understood, where as the low-ability ones worried about what they had missed. The ability to cope with problems during listening is another feature that further distinguishes the groups".

According to Goh's study profiles of high- and low-ability listeners were as follows: High-ability listeners were able to use a wide range of strategies. They also engaged in top-down process. This is seen in the presence of strategies like inferencing, elaboration, prediction, contextualization and to some extend reconstruction. Nevertheless, they also tried to process input in a bottom-up manner by using fixation. One outstanding characteristics of this group of listeners was their ability to use the whole range of metacognitive strategies - planning, monitoring, evaluating- to manage their listening. In particular, they were able to cope well with difficulty during listening. The low-ability listeners were able to apply only a few useful listening strategies. They also lacked using metacognitive strategies in all three areas of planning, monitoring and evaluating. Although they had a tendency to get fixated at difficult parts, they also made extensive use of two top-down strategies. These were inferencing and elaboration, which were used to fill in the gaps in their understanding and embellish interpretation.

Goh's (1998) study on listening comprehension strategy types and definitions were taken as the basis for data collection on Turkish EFL students strategy use. Based on Goh's research, the listening comprehension strategies and their definitions are given in section 2.4.

2.4 Listening Strategies

a) Cognitive Strategies

1. Inferencing: listeners fill in missing information such as meanings of unfamiliar words and parts of a text while listening using context, key words,

knowledge about the world, knowledge about English and speaker's body language and visual aids.

2. Elaboration: listeners relate new information to existing knowledge to produce a more complete interpretation. It also refers to the process by which listeners embellish an interpretation with details to make it more meaningful for them.
3. Prediction: enables listeners to anticipate the next part of a text by predicting the contents from the title or topic before listening or anticipating details in the next part while listening.
4. Contextualisation: refers to the attempts to relate new information to a wider context or situation in order to produce an acceptable general interpretation of it.
5. Fixation: refers to paying close attention to a small part of the spoken text in order to understand it.
6. Reconstruction: involves using words from the text and sometimes background knowledge to construct the meaning of the original input.

b) Metacognitive Listening Strategies:

1. Directed attention : is concentrating on the input and avoiding distraction, by maintaining concentration as much as possible, listen closely to every word and continue listening in spite of problems.
2. Comprehension monitoring: is the process of checking and confirming how well one understands the input during listening by making use of both external and internal resources which include information in the text, visual element, context and prior knowledge.
3. Real-time assessment of input: is necessary for achieving their comprehension goals during listening. This strategy involves determining the potential value of unfamiliar words and noticing problems during listening and deciding what to do about them.
4. Comprehension evaluation: is determining the accuracy and completeness of listeners' comprehension. It can be done any time after an individual has

finished and arrived at some tentative interpretation. The purpose is to check to what extend the understanding is acceptable.

5. Selective attention: means paying attention to specific aspects of the input by listening for gist, listening for familiar or key words noticing the way information is structured, listening for repetition, paying attention to meaning in groups of words and heeding intonation .

2.5 Characterising Listening Ability

According to Rost (1990:186-187) evaluation of learners' listening ability are presented in a framework as follows;

Competent Listener is

*able to understand all styles of speech that are intelligible to well educated native listeners in the target community and able to seek clarification smoothly when speech is unintelligible;

*able to understand abstract concept expressed orally;

*able to note areas where own knowledge is lacking to achieve an acceptable understanding and to note where speaker is vague or inconsistent;

*able to understand and display appropriate listener responses in a wide range of social and specialised contexts in the target culture setting;

*able to adapt an appropriate risk strategy to respond to task demands.

Rost (1990: 156) points out that "conscious strategies to bring more of a language event into focus are the means by which listeners maximise their performance. Through strategy use, learners can understand as much as possible and respond as appropriately as possible given their current capacity in the L2".

On the basis of Rosts' evaluation and in the light of Goh's profiles for high- and low-ability listeners, effective and ineffective listening habits of learners are extracted and presented in the next section.

2.6 Contrasting Effective and Ineffective Listening Habits

To be effective listeners, students need a more specific focus than just attending to what is said. The following contrasts effective and ineffective listening habits of learners at different phases of a listening task.

Pre-listening

Effective listeners

*build their background knowledge on the subject before listening

*have a specific purpose for listening and attempt to ascertain speaker's purpose

*tune in and attend

*minimise distractions

Ineffective Listeners

*start listening without thinking about subject

*have no specific purpose for listening and have not considered speaker's purpose

*do not focus attention

*create or are influenced by distractions.

During listening

Effective Listeners

*give complete attention to listening task and demonstrate interest

*search for meaning

*constantly check their understanding of message by making connections, making and confirming predictions, making inferences, evaluating and reflecting

*know whether close or cursory listening is required; adjust their listening behaviour accordingly

*are flexible notemakers -outlining, mapping, categorising- who sift and sort, often adding information of their own.

*take fewer, more meaningful notes

*distinguish message from speaker's appearance

*consider the context and 'colour' of words

Ineffective listeners

*do not give necessary attention to listening task

*tune out from that which they find uninteresting

*do not monitor understanding or use comprehension strategies

*do not distinguish whether close or cursory listening is required

*are rigid note takers with few note taking strategies

*try to get every word down or do not take notes at all

*judge the message by the speaker's appearance or delivery

*accept words at face value

After listening

Effective Listeners

*without judgement until comprehension of message is complete

*will follow up a presentation by reviewing notes, categorising ideas, clarifying, reflecting and acting upon the message

Ineffective Listeners

*jump to conclusions without reflection or action

*are content just to receive message without reflection or action

2.7 Taxonomy of Listening Strategies

The research carried out by O'Malley et al (1989) on listening comprehension strategy types was taken as the bases for listening strategy types and definitions. The types, definitions and main categories of listening comprehension strategies used in this study are given below.

2.7.1 Metacognitive Listening Comprehension Strategies:

1.Directed attention is the elimination of irrelevant parts of the language and focusing on a particular parts of the language which learners decide in advance to attend to in a learning task and to ignore all irrelevant distracters.

2.Selective attention is deciding in advance to attend to specific aspects of language input or situational details that will cue retention of language input.

3. Self-management has been described as understanding the conditions that help learn and arranging for the presence of those conditions.

4.Self-monitoring is described as a key process that consists of maintaining awareness of the task demands and information content. Selective attention and directed attention are the types of metacognitive strategies that support monitoring.

5.Self-evaluation and self reinforcement are based on learners' judgement themselves such as arranging rewards for oneself which a task is successfully completed and making judgements upon their own success in learning activities (O'Malley, et al 1985b).

2.7.2 Cognitive Listening Comprehension Strategies:

1. **Repetition** is the imitation of the language model including overt practice and silent rehearsal.
2. **Directed Physical Response** is relating new information to physical action as with directives. Some Learners prefer to imitate the physical actions that takes place in a learning task. They indicate and listen simultaneously and learn better while some prefer only listening to them without imitation of the actions.
3. **Translation** is using the first language as a basis for understanding and /or producing the second language.
4. **Grouping** is reordering or reclassifying and perhaps labelling the material to be learned based on common attributes. Grouping may be done among linguistically similar items to learn better.
5. **Note taking** is writing down the main ideas, important points and outline, or a summary of information presented orally or writing.
6. **Deduction** is defined as consciously applying rules to produce or understand the second language.
7. **Imagery** is relating new information to visual concepts in memory via familiar, easily retrievable visualisations, phrases or locations.
8. **Auditory Representation** deals with the retention of sounds for words, phrases or longer language sequences.
9. **Key Word** is the process of remembering a new word in the target language by identifying a familiar word in the first language that sounds like or otherwise resembles the new word or generating easily recalled images of some relationship between the new word.

10. **Contextualization** is placing a new word in a meaningful language sequence.
11. **Elaboration** can be defined as relating new information to other concepts in memory.
12. **Transfer** is using previously acquired linguistic and conceptual knowledge to facilitate a new language learning task.
13. **Inferencing** is using available information to guess meanings of new items, predict outcomes, or fill in missing information.
14. **Question for clarification** can be defined as asking a teacher or a native speaker for repetition, paraphrasing, explanation or examples.
15. **Resourcing** is using target language reference materials.

2.7.3 Social Affective Listening Comprehension Strategies.

This type of strategies involve individual or group activities in listening. The main type is coopeartion which deals with the understanding of verbal messages depending on the people around the listener.

Listening comprehension is not a passive skill in foreign language learning as it was thought to be the late 1970s. On the contrary, it is an active construction process whereby listeners take in raw speech, isolate, and identify constituent of surface structure and build propositions appropriate each. As they build each propositions, they add it too the interpretation they have formed of the sentence so far, and the propositions taken together constitute the final interpretation (Henner-Stanchina, 1982 cited in Cinemre 1991:28).

Although it has been known that listening skill has been considered the core of language learning in EFL and ESL , even if it is one of the problematic skills because of its complexity in the language teaching and learning arena and theory we have an idea of some cognitive differences that distinguish the good listeners from the weaker ones. It is difficult to determine if it is wide flexible use of strategies that made good listeners more competent second or foreign language listeners, or whether they are able to use strategies because they have higher language proficiency and language background. This

study did not trace individual learners' development so it is impossible to answer some of these questions but the aim of this study is to reveal whether there is a positive effect on the strategy application of students who were exposed to listening strategies when they attended Anadolu University prep classes.

3. METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine whether there is a difference in the frequency of listening comprehension strategies used by those students who attended Preparatory School at Anadolu University and those who did not.

In this chapter, subjects, the instrument and the data collection procedure are discussed.

3.1.Subjects

A total of 173 monolingual students attending Faculty of Education English Language Teaching Department at Anadolu University, Eskişehir participated in the study. 34 of these students were eliminated because either they did not complete the personal information part at the beginning of the LSCI answer sheet properly, or did not give a response to one or more statements on the answer sheet of LCSI, or marked more than one response for one or more statements. Thus a total of 139 students' responses to the LCSI were analysed. These students were divided into 2 groups based on whether they attended Preparatory School at Anadolu University or not. 59 of the 139 students attended Preparatory School and the remaining 80 did not.

Students entering Anadolu University English Teaching Department are required to take an English Placement Test. Students who score 70 or above on the placement test are then required to take a standard proficiency test and a separate writing and speaking examinations. Based on the average score of these three examinations, students are either exempt from or placed in the Prep School. The minimum score for exemption is 70 (out of 100). Thus students who scored 70 or more on the placement test administered in the Fall of 1999-2000 Academic Year became 1st year students of English Teaching Department.

Students who scored below 70 (out of 100) on the placement test administered in the 1998-1999 academic year, were required to go through one-year Preparatory School. These students were placed in prep classes based on the scores

they had received on the placement test. After one term - 16 weeks of 20 hours/ week of English instruction - they were given a placement test again and were replaced in prep classes based on their new scores. Thus students who attended Prep classes had completed a period of 32 weeks, 20 hours/ week of English instruction. These students have received instruction on the four skills separately, (listening -2 hours a week), speaking, writing, reading and grammar in addition to the core course in which all skills are integrated. At the end of the year, students were given a standard proficiency test and a separate writing and speaking examinations. If the average score of these three examinations was at least 70 (out of 100), they started their education in the English Teaching Department in the Fall of 1999 - 2000 Academic year.

Thus, two groups of students were formed, Prep Group (those who completed one year of Prep school) and Non-Prep Group (those who were exempt from Prep school). Both groups of students were first year students at the English Teaching Department of Education Faculty in the 1999-2000 academic year.

3.2.Instruments

As there were no published standardised inventory of listening comprehension strategies, a Listening Strategy Inventory (LCSI) was formed for this study. In forming the inventory, the following steps were taken. First empirical studies investigating what learners do as they are listening were scanned. Goh's (1998) study of *"How ESL Learners With Different Listening Abilities Use Comprehension Strategies And Tactics"* was taken as a basis for this inventory. In his study Goh determined the strategies high-and low- ability listeners use. In the formation of this inventory, the strategies used by high-ability listeners were taken, then transformed into statements. In forming the statements appropriate for an inventory with a Likert scale, Rosts' (1990) Evaluation of Learner's Listening Ability description, O'Malley et al (1985b) Student Interview Guide, Oxford's (1990) Language Learning Strategies were consulted.

The inventory consisted of 28 statements, one of which was an open ended question where subjects were asked to add if they use a strategy or strategies not mentioned in the inventory while listening to English. Thus the inventory consisted of

27 statements each of which were evaluated based on a Likert scale ranging from 1 ("never or almost never") to 5 ("always almost true of me"). (See Appendix A).

Can (personal communication, 1999) suggested that in forming an inventory approximately half of the statements should be positive and half of the statements should be negative. Thus 15 of the statements were positive statements, such as "I try to guess the meaning of an unknown word in a listening passage from the context" and 12 of the statements were negative statements such as "I do not take any notes at all while I am listening". The frequency of use for positive statements were expected to be in higher ranges while the frequency of use of for negative statements were expected to be in the lower ranges for high-ability listeners.

The inventory was in Turkish - the native language of the participants. The reason for choosing the native language was to eliminate the possibility of students' not being to able to understand the statements. As the reason was to determine the frequency of listening comprehension strategies used by Turkish EFL learners and not to determine how proficient students are in English or if there is a relationship between types of listening comprehension strategies and proficiency level the inventory was designed in the students' native language.

The 27 statements were randomised. Thus, there was no any particular order of the statements.

As this Listening Comprehension Strategy Inventory was not used previously, the validity and the reliability of the inventory was needed to be computed. Thus the following steps were done to determine the validity and the reliability of the inventory.

3.2.1. Linguistics Validity of LCSI

Hatch and Farhady (1982:243) state that "the validity of the results of any research project depends in a real way, on the appropriateness of the instrument or test items used to measure the variable". They also note that a good test should have reliability, validity and practicality. Reliability and validity are crucial for a test because they are used to measure variables. Practicality on the other hand is not a crucial statistical requirement although desirable.

To determine the linguistics validity of LCSI, 5 students attending Anadolu University Intensive English Programme at different language proficiency levels were consulted. This consultation was in the form of individual interview with each student. During this process each student was asked to read the LCSI carefully. They were instructed to either take notes first and/or comment orally on each statement directly to the researcher. Each statement was discussed in terms of language use, grammatical points, punctuation, content and sentence structure. Revisions were made based on these students' suggestions and the modified version was given to a larger group of students.

22 upper-intermediate group students (aged 17-20) continuing Intensive English Preparatory School in the 1999 -2000 academic year fall term, were asked to comment on the statements in terms of language use, grammatical points, punctuation, content and sentence structure. Again, revisions were made based on these students' comments. The modified version was then given to 12 teachers of listening comprehension. The teachers were native Turkish speakers. Each of the 12 teachers had been teaching listening comprehension skill for at least one year or the most ten years.

The comments of the students and teachers can be summarised as follows. Both groups - students and teachers agreed that the statements which were coded negatively to provide the reliability of the inventory may cause difficulty in understanding. Further, some of the statements which were coded negatively and positively appeared close to each other as a result of the randomisation. Thus the order of those statements enquiring about the same strategy but in different coding was changed so that they were further apart. Punctuation marks, grammatical and spelling mistakes were also corrected.

3.2.2 Construct Validity of LCSI.

To determine the construct validity and reliability of the LCSI Factor Analysis, as suggested by Hatch and Farhady (1982:243),was performed to the 27 statements in the inventory. SPSS (Statistical Package Social Sciences) 7.1. was used for all the statistical analyses in this study.

When Factor Analysis was performed on the 27 statements the number of the statements decreased to 20 since Factor Analysis yields "information on the factors

underlying in the inventory by examining the common variance among items" (Hatch and Farhady, p.255). The statements numbered 4, 5,9,11,14,20 and 21 were eliminated because they appeared under more than one factor and/or because their eigenvalues was less than .3 (see Appendix B). To determine the factors in LCSI Varimax Factor Matrix was done. Varimax Factor Matrix showed that there are heavily loading on 6 factors. "Factor loading is the proportion of total variance contributed by each factor (Hatch and Farhady 1982:256)". Based on this matrix, the statements 4, 5, 9, 11, 14, 20 and 21 were unreliable because these statements did not have any statistical value. Thus a total of 6 factors were constructed with a 56.3 communality as a result of the Factor Analysis.

Following Kline (1994) and Child's (1979)'s suggestion, Namlu (1997:446) states that the number of factors constructed as a result of Factor Analysis can be decreased by doing a Scree Plot Test. Scree Plot Test yields a curve which shows the distribution of factors (on the x axis) by eigenvalues (on the y axis) as can be seen in Figure 3.1. The number of factors that need to be considered is determined by a sudden change in the shape of the curve. The Scree Plot Test performed on the 20 statements of LCSI, shows that there is a sharp fall up to factor 4, the curve being smoother after factor 4. Thus the number of factors under which the statements to be rotated is 4.

Figure 3.1

Factor Scree Plot Test for 20 Statements in LCSI

The Varimax Rotated Factor Matrix was done to determine the distribution of the 20 statements through four factors. The results of this analysis showed that a statement can occur in the inventory if its factor load is less than .3. If a given statement appeared under more than one factor, then the factor load of that statement must be more than .1 when its factor load is compared with the other factors in which it could appear.

The distribution of the 20 statements based on the four factors and the factor loading of each statement in this analysis are shown in table 3.1. The minus (-) and plus (+) signs next to each statement number indicate its coding either as a positive or a negative statement.

Table 3.1

Table of Distribution and Factor Loading of 20 statements in LCSI

Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
- 1 (.37)	+ 2 (.59)	- 3 (.82)	+12 (.78)
+6 (.40)	-7 (.68)	- 8 (.49)	- 16 (.72)
+13 (.42)	+ 25 (.69)	+ 10 (.77)	
+15 (.63)	- 26 (.56)		
- 17 (.51)	- 27 (.52)		
+18 (.68)			
- 19 (.58)			
+22 (.52)			
+ 23 (.67)			
+ 24 (.68)			
Total 10	Total 5	Total 3	Total 2

As seen in Table 3.1, there were 10 statements under factor 1, 5 statements under factor 2, 3 statements under factor 3, and 2 statements under factor 4. The variance components of 4 factors are shown in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

Table of Eigenvalue, Variance and Cumulative Variance of 4 Factors

	Eigenvalue	%Variance	%Cumulative Variance
Factor 1	4.1	19.5	19.5
Factor 2	2.52	12.0	31.5
Factor 3	1.48	7.1	38.6
Factor 4	1.34	6.4	45.0

As seen in Table 3.2, the Cumulative Variance for four factors was 45%. Since the cumulative variance was above 40%, the construct validity of LCSI is acceptable (Kline 1994 cited in Namlu 1997: 448).

3.2.3 Reliability of LCSI

To estimate the test reliability of LCSI, an internal consistency test in which Cronbach's α coefficient was calculated. The Cronbach's α is expected to be 60 or above for any inventory in educational field (Namlu personal communication, 2000). Cronbach's α for each factor as well as that of four factors combined was equal to or greater than 60.

The Item Total Correlation estimation showed that the values of α for each of the four factors were as follows; for factor 1 α=.75, (n= 10); for factor 2 α=.60,(n=5); for factor 3 α=.62, (n = 3) and for factor 4 α=.69, (n=2). The overall α value (four factors combined) was 72. Thus the internal consistency of LCSI for this study is considered to be reliable since α=72 (>60) and item-total correlation for four factors was above 60.

One of the basic methods for estimating reliability of any test is a retest. To determine the reliability of the LCSI the retest method was also used. Hatch and

Farhady (1982: 246) state that "when we correlate test-retest scores we are interested in stability of results over time . Reliability is obtained by administering the same test to the same students again and computing the correlation between the two administrations. The correlation coefficient is the reliability coefficient".

A retest of LCSI was administered 2 weeks after the first test, to determine the consistency of the scores. At least a 2 week interval is necessary for subjects not to remember their responses to the inventory. Data for retest was collected from 85 students but only 47 of them could be used to calculate the correlation between test and retest. 38 of the students' retests were eliminated either because there was no or more than one response for statement(s), or because the personal information part was not completed.

To determine the correlation of test/ retest scores Pearson Correlation analysis was used. The correlation between test and retest of LCSI was 76%. The mean of the 47 students' scores of the first test was 63.1. The mean of the same 47 students' scores of the was 63.3. The correlation between test/retest must be .65 or above for an inventory to be considered reliable. As seen in Table 3.3, the correlation between test/retest of LCSI was .76; considerably higher than what is expected. Thus LCSI can be considered reliable.

Table 3.3.

Correlation Between Test/ Retest for LCSI

Pearson Correlation	Test	Retest	M	N	Sd.	Significant Level
Prep group	1.000	.758	6.31	47	4.5	n.s.
Non-prep Group	.758	1.000	63.2	47	4.8	t=.000

In conclusion then, the results of the several statistical analyse show that this inventory can be considered to be reliable and valid. However, because the number of subjects was limited in this study, the validity and reliability of the LCSI may need to be re-investigated with an increased number of subjects.

3.3.Procedure

All data were collected during the last week of the Fall 1999 -2000 academic year. Students were informed that a listening comprehension strategy inventory was designed to identify their listening comprehension strategies. As the LCSI was given to students at the end of their speaking classes, they were told that their responses would not effect their speaking course grades. They were asked to be as sincerely as possible when giving their responses to each statement. There was no time limit for the completion of LCSI. As there were different speaking classes, and as these speaking classes were at different times within a week, the collecting of data was completed in one week.

The same inventory was given again as a retest 2 weeks after the initial administration.

3.4 Data Analysis

To determine whether there is a difference in the frequency of listening comprehension strategy use between students who attended Anadolu University Preparatory School and the ones who did not, a two tailed independent t-test was performed.

The two-tailed independent t-test was done on the overall and individual strategies between the two group of students.

4. RESULTS

4.1 Frequencies of Overall Strategy Use

To determine the frequency of listening comprehension strategy use by Turkish EFL students, LCSI was administered to two different groups. The LCSI consisted of 20 statements with a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 5. Following is the Key for Likert scale :

Key for Likert Scale

1.0 to 1.4 : Never or almost never used.

1.5 to2.4 : Generally not used.

2.5 to 3.4 : Sometimes used.

3.5 to 4.4 : Generally used.

4.5 to 5.0 : Always or almost always used.

Since the LCSI was designed with a Likert scale ranging from 1 to, the highest possible score for a given student is 100 % (20 statements x 5, (always or almost always used)), and the lowest possible score was 20% (20 statements x 1 (never or almost never used)). In this study, the highest score was 93 and the lowest score was 44 across subjects. The overall mean was 69% (see Figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1

The Histogram of the Overall Frequency Use of LCSI.

When the mean percentage of strategy use between students who attended Prep school (Prep Group) and students who did not attend Prep-school (Non-Prep Group) is compared, the mean percentage showed that the Prep group use Listening Strategies 68.5% of the time while the Non-Prep Group use these strategies 70.1% of the time (see Table 4.1). As no significant difference was found between the two groups, it can be said that both groups use listening comprehension strategies equally frequently (t=-1.1, p<.26).

Table 4.1

Percent of Listening Comprehension Strategy Use

	N	Mean (%)	Mean Difference	Sd	t-Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	59	68.5 %	1.7	8.4	t= -1.1 p < .26 (ns)
Non Prep Group	80	70.1 %		8.9	
TOTAL	139	69.0 %			

When the strategy use frequencies of the two groups are compared, the mean frequencies suggest that both groups use listening comprehension strategies in the medium range (mean 3.47). As seen in Table 4.2, the mean frequency of use is 3.42 for the Prep Group and 3.50 for the Non-Prep Group.

Table 4.2

Mean Frequency of Listening Comprehension Strategy Use

Subjects	N	Mean	Sd.	t Value and Significant Level
Prep Group	59	3.42	.42	t= -1.1
Non-prep Group	80	3.50	.44	n.s
Total	**139**	**3.47**	**.43**	p<.26

Although the overall mean frequency was in the medium range for both groups, the maximum and minimum frequencies were also computed to determine whether the frequency distribution was similar across the two groups. The maximum frequency use was 4.45 for the Prep Group, and 4.65 for the Non-Prep Group. The minimum frequency use was 2.20 for the Prep Group, and 2.50 for the Non-Prep Group. Like the mean frequencies of the two groups, the frequency distribution was also similar for both groups.

Table 4.3

Maximum and Minimum Strategy Use

Subjects	N	Maximum Strategy Use	Minimum Strategy Use
Prep Group	50	4.45	2.20
Non -prep Group	89	4.65	2.50

4.2 Frequencies of the Individual 20 Statements

The mean frequencies and the frequency distribution of maximum and minimum strategy use were similar for the two groups. However, the mean frequencies may mask the differences in the frequencies of individual strategy use across the two groups. Therefore the frequencies of individual strategy use are calculated for each group.

The first statement in LCSI was coded negatively. It asked if the students tune out if they find the listening text uninteresting. It focused on identifying the listening comprehension strategy *elaboration*. Elaboration can be defined as "relating new information to other concepts in memory (O'Malley, et al, 1985b)". Elaboration also "refers to the process by which listeners embellish an interpretation with details to make it more meaningful to them (Goh 1998:134)".

The mean frequency of statement 1 for the Prep Group was 2.7, and for the Non-Prep Group mean frequency was 2.9 with a difference of 0.2. As seen in Table

4.4, the use of this strategy did not vary significantly by the two groups (t=-1.0, p=.16). Based on the key for Likert Scale, both groups sometimes use the elaboration strategy.

Table 4.4

The Mean Frequency of Statement 1 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and significance level
Prep Group	59	2.7	0.2	t= -1.0 p=.16
Non Prep Group	80	2.9		(n.s)

The second statement was coded positively in LCSI. It asked if the students try to guess the meaning of a word in a listening passage from the context. In other words, if they consider the context and "colour of the words" or accept the words at face value while listening. This statement referred to a top-down strategy called *Inferencing.* Inferencing refers to using available information to guess the meaning of new items, predict out comes or fill- in the missing information.

The mean frequencies of statement 2 were the same for the Prep Group and for the Non Prep Group; 3.7. As seen in Table 4.5,and as expected, t-test result revealed no significant difference between the two groups (t=-.2, p=.3). Based on the key for Likert scale, both groups generally use inferencing strategy since they fall in the "generally used" range.

Table 4.5

The Mean Frequency of Statement 2 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	59	3.7	0	t =.-2 p = .3
Non Prep Group	80	3.7		(n.s)

The third statement was coded negatively. It asked if students translate the listening passage into Turkish. It refers to the cognitive strategy *translation*. "Translation is using the first language as a base for understanding and/ or producing the second language (O'Malley et al, 1985b)".

The mean frequency of statement 3 was 2.9 for the Prep Group, and 3.2 for the Non-Prep Group, with a mean difference of 0.3. Although the Non -Prep Group's mean was slightly higher than that of Prep Group's, the difference was not significant (t=-1.5, p=-02, see Table 4.5). Based on the key for Likert scale, both groups sometimes use the translation strategy.

Table 4.6

The Mean Frequency of Statement 3 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	T Value and Significant Level
Prep Group	59	2.9	0.3	t= -1.5 p= -02 (n.s.)
Non -Prep Group	80	3.2		

The fourth statement was coded positively. It asked if students try to predict the content of the listening activity by reading its title, looking at the graph(s) or picture(s) (visual aids) to activate existing knowledge before they start listening. This is a cognitive listening comprehension strategy called *prediction*. "Prediction can be defined as a strategy that enables listeners to anticipate the subsequent part of a text such as a word, phrase or an idea. It is a strategy to predict the content from the title or the topic (Goh, 1998:134)".

The mean frequency for this strategy was 4.0 for the Prep Group and 3.9 for the Non Prep Group, with a mean difference of 0.1. As seen in Table 4.7,

difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (t=.5, p=.41). Both groups generally use the prediction strategy.

Table 4.7

The Mean Frequency of Statement 4 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	T Value and Significant Level
Prep Group	59	4.0	0.1	t= .5 p= .4 (n.s.)
Non -Prep Group	80	3.9		

Statement number 5 was coded negatively. It asked if students give up listening when they hear a word, a phrase or a pattern they do not know. It refers to real time assessment strategy.

The mean frequency of Prep Group was 4.0 and that of Non- Prep Group was 4.2, with a mean difference of 0.2. As seen in Table 4.8, there was no significant difference between the two groups (t=-1.4, p=-0.2). Based on the key for Likert scale, both groups generally use the real time assessment strategy.

Table 4.8

The Mean Frequency of Statement 5 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	T Value and Significant Level
Prep Group	59	4.0	0.2	t=- 1.4 p= -0.2 (n.s.)
Non -Prep Group	80	4.2		

Statement number 6 was coded negatively. It asked if students are worried about and afraid of not understanding the information given in the listening passage. This is an affective strategy called *listening to your body* (Oxford 1990). Affective Strategies in general refer to emotions, attitudes, motivation, and values. Listening to your body can be defined as paying attention to signals given by the body. These signals can be negative, reflecting stress, tension, worry, fear and anger or they may be positive (Oxford 1990:144).

The mean frequency of statement 6 was 2.8 for the Prep Group and 3.0 for the Non-Prep Group, with a mean difference of 0.2. As seen in Table 4.9, there was no significant difference between the two groups (t=-.9, p=.23). Based on the key for Likert Scale, both groups sometimes use this strategy, since they fall in "sometimes used" range.

Table 4.9

The mean Frequency of Statement 6 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	T Value and Significant Level
Prep Group	59	2.8	0.2	t= -9 p= -23 (n.s.)
Non -Prep Group	80	3.0		

Statement 7 refers to the cognitive strategy *translation* and coded positively. Statement 7 asked whether students try to comprehend the concepts in a listening task in the target language rather than by translating them.

The mean frequency for statement 7 was 3.4 for the Prep Group and 3.3 for the Non-Prep Group, with a mean difference of 0.1. As seen in Table 4.10, there was no significant difference between the two groups (t=.3, p=23). Based on the key for Likert

scale, both groups sometimes use translation strategy. The means are similar for both statements 3 and 7 for both groups.

Table 4.10

The Mean Frequency of Statement 7 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	T Value and Significant Level
Prep Group	59	3.4	0.1	t= .3 p= 23 (n.s.)
Non -Prep Group	80	3.3		

Statement 8 was coded positively. It asked whether students take notes which are meaningful for them while listening. Note-taking is an example of a more general cognitive strategy identified in the literature as transformation (O'Malley et al, 1985b:565). The focus of note taking should be on understanding, not writing, thus a very important strategy for listening (Oxford 1990:86).

The mean frequency of statement 8 was 3.6 for the Prep Group and 3.2 for the Non-Prep Group, with a 0.4 mean difference. As seen in Table 4.11, this difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (t= 2.3, p =.8). Although the mean difference was only 0.4, the mean frequencies of statement 8 for the two groups fell in different ranges. Based on the key for the Likert scale, the Prep Group generally use this strategy while the Non-Prep Group sometimes use it. However, since the difference was not significant, it can be said that both groups use note taking strategy equally frequently.

Table 4.11

The Mean Frequency of Statement 8 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	3.6	0.4	t=2.3 p=.8 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	3.2		

Statement number 9 was coded positively. It asked whether students continue to listen (rather than giving up listening) when they realise they have stopped listening. It refers to the metacognitive strategy directed attention.

The mean frequency for statement 9 was 4.1 for the Prep Group and 4.3 for the Non-Prep Group, with a mean difference of 0.2. As seen in Table 4.12, this difference is not significant (t=-7, p=.16). Based on the key for Likert scale, both groups generally use this strategy.

Table 4.12

The Mean Frequency of Statement 9 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	4.1	0.2	t=-7 p=.16 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	4.3		

The statement number 10 was coded positively. It asked if students check their understanding of the message by making connections, making and confirming predictions, making inferences, evaluating and reflecting while listening. It is a cognitive listening comprehension strategy called *reconstruction.* Reconstruction is defined by Goh (1998:136) as "involving the use of words from the text and sometimes background knowledge to construct meaning of the original input. The product that is constructed from combining the words heard in utterance is not limited to just 'a sentence or a larger language sequence', instead it can be in the form of a mental representation of what is heard or even mental images. Reconstruction is a complex activity and appears to involve both top-down and bottom up process".

The mean frequency of statement 10 was 3.3 for the Prep Group and 3.7 for the Non- Prep Group, with a mean difference of 0.4. As seen in Table 4.13, this difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (t=-2.1, p=.-02). Based on the Key for Likert scale, the Prep Group use this strategy sometimes, the Non-Prep Group use it generally.

Table 4.13

The Mean Frequency of Statement 10 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	3.3	0.4	t=-2.1 p=.-02 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	3.7		

Statement number 11 refers to note taking strategy, similar to statement 8. Statement 11 was coded negatively. It asked whether students take notes at all while

listening. *Note taking* is a cognitive strategy. Oxford (1990:86) states that "it is a very important strategy for listening".

The mean frequency for statement 11was 3.8 for the Prep Group and 3.4 for the Non-Prep Group, with a mean difference of 0.4. As seen in Table 4.14, this difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (t=2.0, p=.7). Based on the key for Likert scale, the Prep Group students generally use this strategy and the Non-Prep Group students sometimes use it. Although the two groups were in different strategy range, t-test results revealed that there was no significant difference between the two groups.

Table 4.14

The mean Frequency of Statement 11 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	3.8	0.4	t=2.0 p=.7 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	3.4		

Statement 12 was coded negatively. It asked if students do any preparation for the listening task. This statement refers a metacognitive strategy *arranging and planning for your learning.* This strategy helps learners to organise and plan so as to get the most out of language learning.

The mean frequency for statement 12 was 2.7 for the Prep Group and 3.3 for the Non-Prep Group, with a mean difference of 0.5. As seen in Table 4.15, this difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (t=-2.5, p=-.1). Both groups sometimes use this strategy, based on the key for Likert scale since they were both in "sometimes used" range.

Table 4.15

The Mean Frequency of Statement 12 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	2.7	0.5	t=-2.5 p=-.1 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	3.3		

Statement 13 was coded positively. It asked if the students follow up a presentation by reviewing notes, categorising ideas, clarifying, reflecting and acting upon the message after listening. This statement was included to determine how frequently Turkish EFL listeners use this metacognitive listening comprehension strategy called *comprehension evaluation.* Goh (1998:138) states that " comprehension evaluation can be done at any time after an individual has finished listening and arrived at some tentative interpretation. The purpose is to check to what extend the understanding is acceptable".

The mean frequency for statement 13 was 3.3 for the Prep Group and 3.6 for the Non-Prep Group, with a mean difference of 0.3. Based on the key for Likert scale, the Prep Group students use this strategy sometimes and the Non-Prep Group use this strategy generally. Although these two groups were in different strategy use range, as seen in the Table 4.16, t-test results revealed no significant difference between the two groups (t=-1.7, p=-02).

Table 4.16

The Mean Frequency of Statement 13 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	3.3	0.3	t=-1.7 p=-02 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	3.6		

Statement 14 was coded negatively. It asked whether students ask the meaning of any unknown words, structure or idea that occurs in the listening task. It is a social-affective strategy called *asking for clarification.* Oxford (1990) states that asking for clarification can be defined as asking a teacher or a native speaker for repetition, paraphrasing, explanation or examples.

The mean frequency was 3.0 for the Prep Group and 3.2 for the Non-Prep Group, with a mean difference of 0.2. As seen in Table 4.17, this difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (t=.-7, p=.2). Based on the key for Likert scale, both groups sometimes use this strategy.

Table 4.17

The Mean Frequency of Statement 14 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	3.0	0.2	t=.-7 p=.2 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	3.2		

Statement 15 was coded positively. It asked if students seek resources on the topic of an upcoming listening text to understand the text better while listening. This refers to the *planning for a language task* strategy within arranging and planning your learning which is classified as a metacognitive strategy. P*lanning for a language task* can be defined as planning for the language elements and functions necessary for an anticipated language task or situation (Oxford 1990:139).

The mean frequency of statement 15 was 2.8 for the Prep Group, 2.9 for the Non-Prep Group, with a mean difference of 0.1. As seen in Table 4.18, this difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (t=-.1, p=.3). Based on the key for Likert scale, both groups sometimes used this strategy.

Table 4.18

The Mean Frequency of Statement 15 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	2.9	0.1	t=.-1 p=.3 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	2.8		

Statement 16 was coded positively. It asked whether students discuss, with their teachers or classmates, how much they have understood from a listening text and the reasons of not understanding. This statement refers to *comprehension monitoring* strategy defined by Goh. Goh (1998:137) states that "comprehension monitoring is the process of checking and confirming how well one understands the input during listening. The correctness and completeness of what is understood is the basic aspects of the comprehension monitoring strategy".

The mean frequency for the Prep Group and the Non-Prep Group were the same; 3.2 for both groups. There is no significant difference between these two groups (t=.0, p=.3), as seen in Table 4.19. Both groups sometimes use this strategy, based on the key for Likert scale.

Table 4.19

The Mean Frequency of Statement 16 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	3.2	0	t=.0 p=.3 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	3.2		

Statement 17 was coded positively. It asked whether students evaluate themselves in terms of listening proficiency and how successful or unsuccessful they are in listening comprehension. It refers to a metacognitive strategy called *comprehension evaluation.* Goh (1998:138) defines this strategy as "comprehension evaluation is determining the accuracy and completeness of their comprehension. The purpose is to check to what extend the understanding is acceptable". He also states that this strategy gauges the correctness of what is understood. It can be done at any time after a listening activity has been completed by an individual.

The mean frequencies of the Prep Group and the Non-Prep Group was equal; 3.8 for both groups. There is no significant difference between these two groups (t=.3, p=.3),as seen in Table 4.20, Both groups generally use this strategy based on the key for Likert scale.

Table 4.20

The Mean Frequency of Statement 17 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	3.8	0	t=.3 p=.3 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	3.8		

Statement 18 was coded positively. It asked if students continue to listen even when they encounter a word, phrase or language structure they do not know. It refers to *real time assessment* strategy defined by Goh. Goh (1998: 137) states that "Real time assessment of input enables the listeners to decide whether a particular part of the input necessary for achieving their comprehension goals. It is a monitoring strategy because it involves noticing problems during listening and deciding what to do about them. It can help learner redirect attention to the task at hand not to be fixated".

The mean frequencies of both the Prep Group and the Non-Prep Group was 3.4, with no mean difference between these two groups. As seen in the Table 4.21, there was no significant difference between the two groups (t=-0.27, p=.4). Based on the key for Likert scale, both of the groups sometimes use this strategy.

Table 4.21

The Mean Frequency of Statement 18 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	3.4	0	t=-0.27 p=.4 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	3.4		

Statement number 19 was coded negatively. It asked whether students, stop listening once they have been distracted. It is a metacognitive strategy called *directed attention.* Directed attention can be defined as concentrating on the input and avoiding distraction. Thus the listener maintains concentration as much as possible, listen closely to every word and continue in spite of problems (Goh, 1998: 136)

The mean frequency of the Prep Group was 3.5 and that of the Non-Prep Group was 3.3, with a mean difference of 0.2. As seen in Table 4.22, this difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (t=.7, p=.4). Based on the key for Likert scale, the Prep Group use this strategy generally and the Non-Prep Group sometimes use the same strategy. Since the mean frequency difference between the two groups was not significant statistically, it can be said that both groups use this strategy equally frequently.

Table 4.22

The Mean Frequency of Statement 19 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	3.5	0.2	t=.7 p=.4 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	3.3		

Statement 20 was coded negatively. It asked if students try to write every word while taking notes during listening.

The mean frequency of statement 20 was 3.3 for the Prep Group and 3.8 for the Non-Prep Group, with a 0.5 mean difference. As seen in Table 4.23, this difference between the two groups was not statistically significant (t=-2.3, p=,-02). The Prep Group use this strategy sometimes while the Non-Prep Group use this strategy generally, based on the key for Likert scale. Although the ranges are different for the two groups, there was no significant difference between these two groups according to t-test results. Thus, both groups use this strategy equally frequently.

Table 4.23

The Mean Frequency of Statement 20 for Both Groups

Subjects	N	Mean	Mean Difference	t Value and Significance Level
Prep Group	50	3.3	0.5	t=-2.3 p=-02 (ns)
Non Prep Group	89	3.8		

4.3 Summary

The purpose of the present study was to determine whether there was a difference in the frequency of listening comprehension strategy use between 1st year students who attended prep classes at Anadolu University, and those who did not.

The mean percentage of strategy use between the Prep Group (68.5 %) and that of the Non-Prep Group (70.1 %) was compared and no significant difference was found between the two groups ($t=-1.1$, $p<.26$). Thus, it can be said that both groups use listening comprehension strategies equally frequently.

The strategy use frequencies of the two groups was compared and the mean frequencies suggest that both groups use listening comprehension strategies in the medium range (mean frequency was 3.42 for the Prep Group and 3.50 for the Non-Prep Group). Thus both groups of students employed listening comprehension strategies only sometimes. The frequency distribution of maximum and minimum strategy use of the two groups was also similar for both groups.

To determine whether there were differences in the frequencies of individual listening strategy use between the two groups the frequencies of individual strategy use were calculated for each group. The t-test result indicated that the frequencies of individual strategy use did not vary significantly across the two groups. The frequencies of each strategy for the two groups is summarised in Table 4.24.

Table 4.24

Mean Frequencies of Individual Statements in LCSI for Both Groups

Strategy Names	Statement No	Frequency Mean of Prep Group	Frequency Mean of Non-Prep Group	Significance
Elaboration	1	2.7	2.9	n.s
Inferencing	2	3.7	3.7	n.s
Translation	3 and7	2.9 / 3.4	3.2 /3.3	n.s
Prediction	4	4.0	3.9	n.s
Real Time Assessment	5 and18	4.0 /3.4	4.2 / 3.4	n.s
Listening to Your Body	6	2.8	3.0	n.s
Note-taking	8,11 and 20	3.6/ 3.8 /3.3	3.2/3.4/ 3.8	n.s
Directed Attention	9 and 19	4.1 /3.5	4.3 / 3.3	n.s
Reconstruction	10	3.3	3.7	n.s
Arranging/ Planning for your Learning	12 and 15	2.7 / 2.8	3.3 / 2.9	n.s
Comprehension Evaluation	13 and 17	3.3 / 3.8	3.6 /3.8	n.s
Asking for Clarification	14	3.0	3.2	n.s
Comprehension Monitoring	16	3.2	3.2	n.s

As seen in Table 4.24, there were 13 strategies, 20 statements. 7 of the statements were paraphrases of other statements referring to the same strategy. These paraphrases were included in the inventory as fillers to test the consistency of the subjects' responses. The frequencies of the statements referring to the same strategy are discussed below.

Statement 3 and Statement 7 both referred to the same listening comprehension strategy *translation.* Statement 3 was coded negatively (I translate the listening text into Turkish to understand better), whereas Statement 7 was coded positively (I try to

comprehend the concepts in a listening task in the target language rather than by translating them). The mean frequencies of the two groups for both statements 3 and 7 are given in Table 4.25.

Table 4.25

The Mean Frequencies of Translation (Statements 3 and 7)

Translation Strategy	Prep Group Frequency Mean	Non-Prep Group Frequency Mean	Significance Level and t Value
Statement No3 Translate	4.0	3.9	ns t=-1.5 p=-02
Statement No 7 Do not Translate	3.4	3.3	ns t=.3 p=23

The mean frequencies of Statement 3 are in the 'generally used' range for both groups, suggesting that students in both groups translate the listening text into Turkish to aid their comprehension.

The mean frequencies of Statement 7, on the other hand, are in the 'sometimes used' range for both groups. As this statement was coded negatively, the mean frequencies suggest that both groups only 'sometimes' try to understand the listening text without translating it into Turkish.

Thus the comparison of the mean frequencies of the two statements for the two groups suggest that both groups of students translate the listening text into Turkish more often than not.

Statements 5 and 18 referred to *real time assessment* strategy. Statement 5 was coded negatively (I gave up listening when I hear a word, a phrase or a pattern I do not know). Whereas Statement 18 was coded positively (I continue to listen even when I hear a word, a phrase or a pattern I do not know). The mean frequencies of the two groups for both the statements 5 and 18 are given in Table 4.26.

Table 4.26

The Mean Frequencies of Real Time Assessment of Input (Statements 5 and 18)

Translation Strategy	Prep Group Frequency Mean	Non-Prep Group Frequency Mean	Significance Level and t Value
Statement No5 Stop Listening	4.0	4.2	ns t=1.4 p=-02
Statement No 18 Continue Listening	3.4	3.3	ns t=-0,27 p=.4

The mean frequencies of Statement 5 are in the 'generally used' range for both groups, suggesting that students in both groups stop listening when they hear a word, a phrase or a pattern they do not know.

The mean frequencies of statement 18 are, on the other hand, in the 'sometimes used' range for both groups. As this statement was coded positively the mean frequencies suggest that both groups only 'sometimes' try to continue to listen even when they encounter a word, a phrase or a pattern they do not know.

Thus the mean frequencies of the two statements for the two groups suggest that both groups of students stop listening when they encounter a language structure more often than not.

Statements 8,11, and 20 referred to the same strategy *note-taking*. Statement 8 was coded positively (I take notes which are meaningful for me while listening). Whereas statement 11 (I do not take notes while listening) and Statement 20 (I try to write every word while taking notes during listening) were coded negatively.

The mean frequencies of the two groups for the three statements 8,11 and 20 are given in Table 4.27.

Table 4.27

The Mean Frequencies of Note-Taking (Statements 8,11 and 20)

Note -Taking Strategy	Prep Group Frequency Mean	Non-Prep Group Frequency Mean	Significance Level and t Value
Statement No:8 Take notes	3.6	3.2	ns t=2.3 p=.8
Statement No:11 Do not take notes	3.8	3.4	ns t=-2.1 p=.02
Statement No: 20 Write every word	3.3	3.8	ns t=-2.3 p=-02

The mean frequencies of statement 8 are in the 'generally used' range for the Prep Group and in the 'sometimes used' range for the Non-Prep Group. As the difference of the mean frequencies was not significant, it suggests that both groups take meaningful notes while they are listening to an English text.

The mean frequencies of statement 11 are, on the other hand, in the 'generally used range' for the Prep Group and in the 'sometimes used' range for the Non-Prep Group. As this statement was coded negatively, the mean frequencies suggest that both groups only 'sometimes' try to take notes. But the reverse was true for the statement 20 for both groups. As this statement was also coded negatively, the mean frequencies suggest that both groups 'sometimes' try to write every word they hear while listening.

Thus, the comparison of the mean frequencies of the three statements for the two groups show that both groups of students take notes, do not take notes, and try to write every word while taking notes suggesting that they do not really know how to take notes while listening.

Statements 12 and 15 both referred to the same listening comprehension strategy *arranging and planning for your learning.* Statement 12 was coded negatively (I do not do any preparation for a listening task), whereas Statement 15 was coded positively (I seek resources on the topic of an upcoming listening text to understand the

text better while listening). The mean frequencies of the two groups for both Statements 12 and 15 are given in Table 4.28.

Table 4.28

The Mean Frequencies of Arranging and Planning for Your Learning (Statements 12 and 15)

Arranging and Planning for your Learning	Prep Group Frequency Mean	Non-prep Group Frequency Mean	Significance Level and t Value
Statement No: 12 Do not any preparation	2.7	3.3	ns t=-2.5 p=-.1
Statement 15 Seek for resources	2.8	2.9	ns t=-1 p=.3

The mean frequencies of Statement 12 are in the 'sometimes used' range for both groups, suggesting that students in both groups sometimes do preparation for the listening task. The mean frequencies of Statement 15 are also in the 'sometimes used' range for both groups. As this statement was coded positively, the mean frequencies suggest that both groups only 'sometimes' seek resources on the topic of an upcoming listening text to understand better while listening.

Thus the comparison of the mean frequencies of the two statements for the two groups suggest that both groups of students do some preparation and seek resources for a listening task to understand better.

Statements 13 and 17 both referred to the same listening comprehension strategy *comprehension evaluation.* Both statements were coded positively. Statement 13 stated that (I evaluate my understanding of a presentation by reviewing notes, categorising ideas, reflecting and acting upon message after listening). Statement 17 stated that (I rate myself as successful or unsuccessful in listening by how much of the listening task I understand). The mean frequencies of the two groups for both statements (13 and 17) are given in Table 4.29.

Table 4.29

The Mean Frequencies of Comprehension Evaluation (Statements 13 and 17) for Both Groups

Comprehension Evaluation Strategy	Prep Group Frequency Mean	Non-prep group Frequency Mean	Significance Level and t Value
Statement No:13 Evaluation of message	3.3	3.6	ns t=-2.5 p=-.1
Statement No: 17 Evaluation of listener	3.8	3.8	ns t=.3 p=.3

The mean frequencies of Statement 13 are in the 'sometimes used' range for the Prep group and in the 'generally used' range for the Non-Prep Group, suggesting that students in both groups determine the accuracy and completeness of their understanding of a listening task by reviewing notes, clarifying, reflecting, and acting upon message.

The mean frequencies of Statement 17 are in the 'sometimes used' range for both groups, suggesting that students sometimes evaluate themselves in terms of how proficient they are in understanding a listening task and how successful they are in completing a listening task.

Thus, the comparison of the mean frequencies of the two statements for the two groups suggest that both groups of students evaluate their comprehension in listening equally frequently.

In summary, the comparison of the mean frequencies of the statements referring to the same strategies suggest that the responses were consistent. If the frequencies were in the higher ranges for one statement, the mean frequencies of the paraphrase were generally in the lower ranges for oppositely coded pairs.

4. DISCUSSION AND CONCULUSION

5.1 Summary

The aim of this study was to determine whether there were differences in the frequency of listening strategy use between students who went through a year of preparatory classes and those who did not. Two groups of students, the Prep Group and the Non-Prep Group responded to a Listening Comprehension Strategy Inventory (LCSI) which enquired about 13 listening comprehension strategies efficient listeners use in the literature.

To determine whether the two groups differed in the mean frequency of overall strategy use, these 13 listening strategies were tested. The results revealed that the mean frequency of overall strategy use is similar between the two groups. Both groups of students used listening comprehension strategies moderately and there was no significant difference statistically in frequency of listening comprehension strategies between the two groups.

To determine whether the two groups differed in terms of individual strategy use, the mean frequencies of each strategy was compared. Results showed that both groups used the listening strategies equally frequently. For 6 of the 13 strategies there were 2 (or 3 for one strategy) statements referring to the same strategy. When the statements referring to the same strategy are compared, the mean frequencies suggest that the two groups are again similar in terms of how frequently they use the strategy.

5.2 Discussion

The studies on general language learning strategies and listening comprehension strategies revealed that learners do use strategies in EFL and ESL language learning situations and we must not assume that learners do not use strategies (Mandesohn 1995:135, cited in Goh, 1998: 142). The problem is often transferring L1 strategies into L2, particularly in listening.

The results of this study which aimed to determine the effects of prep listening classes on frequency of listening comprehension strategy use are also consistent with Mandesohn's findings. The findings of this study showed that the subjects who participated this study were able to apply a number of listening comprehension strategies. However, it was expected that the Prep Group would have had higher mean frequency for positively coded statements and lower mean frequency for negatively coded statements than the Non-Prep Group. The reasons for this expectation was that the Prep Group students attended Prep classes for one year and had a separate listening course - 2 hours a week- in which implicit strategy training is done. Listening course syllable at the Preparatory School at Anadolu University is based on improving students' listening comprehension as much as possible in a foreign language setting by applying listening strategies implicitly, as this is assumed to help students develop their listening comprehension in the target language. The listening course materials and instruction included the following strategies; making predictions about what the speaker is going to say next or where the discourse is 'leading to'; matching what students hear and forming a mental picture which corresponds roughly to that of the speaker; distinguishing the main points from less important details; responding intellectually and emotionally to what is said, agreeing or disagreeing, approving or disapproving; inferring information about the speaker(s), and their situation implied in what is heard, perceiving the meaning of a message in English as automatically as possible without referring to Turkish equivalent of it.

The findings of this study however revealed no difference in the use of the frequencies of listening comprehension strategies between the Prep Group and the Non-Prep Group although the Prep Group students were taught listening comprehension strategies, namely translation, prediction, inferencing, elaboration, reconstruction, directed attention in their listening courses.

The findings of this study have shown that students use strategies in their listening. However, the findings suggest that there is certainly need for some form of strategy training in listening course curriculum at Anadolu University Prep School. Thus, there is certainly need for revision of listening course design and syllabus.

5.3 Conclusion

Research and theory in second / foreign language learning strongly suggest that good language learners use a variety of strategies to assist them in gaining command over new language skills. By pedagogical implication, less competent learners should be able to improve their skills in the second or foreign language through training on strategies used by more successful learners. With successful training, less competent students could be able to apply strategies that they did not use before in the acquisition of a variety of different language skills.

This implication however raises the question of how to train the learners. Richards (1990:47) states that "some researches advocate a direct approach which involves explicit training in the use of specific strategies and teaching students to consciously monitor their own strategies (O'Malley et al 1985,a,b, Russo and Stewner-Manzaranes (1985) others favour a more indirect approach in which strategies are incorporated into other kinds of learning content".

Oxford (1989) claims that the most effective strategy training is explicit training. She (1989: 244) states that "strategy training explicitly teaches learners why and how they use new strategies, why and how they evaluate the effectiveness of different strategies and why and how they decide when it is appropriate to transfer a given strategy to a new situation. This explicit results in completely informed training. In addition to explicitness, strategy should be integrated with activities of regular language learning programme". The findings of this study also suggest that explicit strategy training may be more effective as students exposed to implicit strategy training did not use more or different strategies than those who were not.

Teachers can play an important role in strategy training by conveying strategy applications to students and thereby supporting students efforts to learn the new language (O'Malley, et al, 1987).

In particular, for listening comprehension, predominantly used listening comprehension used by good listeners could be taught to poor listeners and they could be encouraged to develop these strategies in their listening comprehension activities. The strategy training theory developed by Rubin (1985) supports the idea that poor

listeners will improve in their listening comprehension ability at the end of a strategy training session (cited in Cinemre 1991:66).

Field (1998:115) states that "listening strategies can and should be taught". He recommends that listening strategies should be taught explicitly and singly, but explicit strategy training should not aim to teach either a uniform set of procedures or the principles of strategy use. This training could be integrated and adapted into the listening course as subskills. To be able to this, listening lessons should be broken into a series of separate subskills and strategies should be modelled in relation to a task rather than taught separately. He also points out that the structure of the lessons should be rethought and the aim of the listening courses should be to incorporate strategies into our teaching repertoire, materials and curriculum.

In the light of Filed's recommendations, teaching of listening strategies should be incorporated into listening tasks rather than teaching these strategies separately as a uniform set of procedures. As there is a separate listening course in the Prep school, such a curriculum can be designed.

Another implication that underlies strategy training theory is the learners' beliefs. "Learners are important elements of the learning task and they are the only source that will facilitate their own learning (Rubin, 1985 cited in Cinemre 1991:66)". Students' beliefs from the essence of learning strategies and what strategies good listeners report using in listening comprehension result from their beliefs of how one can learn listening comprehension effectively. These beliefs on strategy training should also be considered.

Goh (1998:142) points out that "language learners have and use listening comprehension strategies in their first languages, but transforming those strategies into the second or foreign language is a problem". He suggests that teachers could make language learners become aware of the strategies they use in their L1. He states that "some cognitive strategies seemed to have made transition without explicit instruction, so that more time should be spent on metacognitive strategies". According to Goh the weaker listeners are less able to manage their listening process, especially when they encounter problems. He (1998:143) suggests that "apart from direct training, teachers can help learners develop better strategic approaches by raising their awareness about

listening strategies that they are already using, in listening to English and how their existing repertoire can be further improved".

The selection of which listening strategies to teach should be based on the proficiency level of the language learner. Generally, in strategy training, students are exposed to different learning strategies, who are then expected to choose those strategies which best fits them. Similarly, in listening courses, students should be exposed to different listening strategies. Students then should be encouraged to choose and develop their strategies. However, it should be kept in mind that "adoption of strategies cannot offer miracles of understanding but each strategy entails some movement from a current state of knowledge or current orientation to another (Rost, 1990:156)".

In the view of this, the curriculum for listening courses at Anadolu University Prep School could be revised and reorganised including both "direct strategy training and awareness raising (Chamot,1995) incorporating special activities for learner training (Ellis and Sinclair,1989, Wenden, 1999 cited in Goh:1998:143)".

5.4 Suggestion for Further Studies

It can be suggested for further research that retrospective think-aloud protocols can be used for gathering listening strategy data. Subjects can be designated as effective and ineffective listeners, based on both their listening proficiency and their language proficiency.

This study was carried out with 59 students who attended Preparatory School and 80 students who did not. The same study might also be carried out with an increased number of students to obtain more concrete results and also to determine the listening comprehension strategy types which are employed by Turkish EFL learners.

The same study could be carried out with the categorisation of listening comprehension strategies according to the phases of listening course through pre-listening, while-listening, and post-listening sessions as a prior for the study.

Furthermore, an experimental study can be carried out with two groups of students with one group receiving explicit strategy training on listening comprehension strategies and the other group receiving this training implicitly. Therefore, the

comparison of these two groups can lead us to get more concrete results about the efficiency, applicability and practicality of strategy training either explicitly or implicitly.

APPENDIX A

İNGİLİZCE DİNLEME STRATEJİLERİ ENVANTERİ

Yönergeler

Bu envanter İngilizce dinlemede anlamanızı kolaylaştıran yöntemleri belirlemek ve İngilizce öğrenmekte olan Türk öğrencilerinin dinleme anlama yetilerini geliştirmeye yardımcı olmak amacı ile düzenlenmiştir. Envanterin öğrencilik başarınızı değerlendirmekle hiç bir ilgisi yoktur. Envanter 28 cümleden oluşmaktadır. Envanterde İngilizce dinlemeye yönelik tutumlarla ilgili olabileceği düşünülen bazı ifadeler yer almaktadır. Bu ifadelere gösterilebilecek tepkiler kişiden kişiye değişik olabileceğinden, yanıtlarınızın doğru ya da yanlış olması söz konusu değildir. Bizim için önemli olan yanıtlarınızın içten ve düşünülerek verilmesi ve sadece sizin durumunuzu yansıtmasıdır. Lütfen her cümleyi okuyunuz ve cevaplarınızı sizi ne kadar iyi tanımladığını göz önüne alarak veriniz. Nasıl olmanız gerektiğini ya da başkalarının yaptıklarını değerlendirerek vermeyiniz. Envanter maddelerine vereceğiniz yanıtlarda ne denli içten olabilirseniz bu çalışmaya ve dolayısıyla kendi gelişiminize sağlayacağınız katkı da o denli çok olacaktır. Cümlenin size ne kadar uygun olduğunu gösteren rakam (1,2,3,4 veya 5) cevap kağıdınız üzerine işaretleyiniz. Rakamların ne anlam geldiği aşağıda açıklanmıştır. Lütfen yanıtsız madde bırakmayınız ve her madde için yalnız bir seçenek işaretleyiniz. Sorularınız varsa lütfen öğretmeninize sorunuz. Envanter üzerine hiç bir işaret koymayınız. Teşekkür ederim.

1. Hiç yapmam
2. Genellikle yapmam
3. Ara sıra yaparım
4. Genellikle yaparım
5. Her zaman yaparım

Cevap kağıdınız üzerinde sizden istenen bilgileri lütfen eksiksiz doldurunuz.

1. İngilizce dinlerken ilgimi çekmeyen bir konu ya da bilgi olduğu zaman dinlemekten uzaklaşırım.

2. İngilizce dinlerken, sözcüklerin sözlük anlamı dışında da kullanılabileceğini düşünerek bağlama (context) dikkat ederim.

3. Bir dinleme etkinliğini daha kolay anlamak için duyduklarımı Türkçe'ye çeviririm

4. Sınıf içinde bir dinleme etkinliğine katılıyorsam sınıf içi fiziksel koşullara elimden geldiğince kendimi hazırlarım. Örneğin; teybe uzak / yakın otururum / camları kapatırım / arkadaşlarımı ikaz ederim.

5. İngilizce dinlerken sadece sunulan bilgiyi değil verilmek istenen mesajı da yakalamaya çalışırım. Örneğin; arıları anlatan bir metni dinlerken her bir arının yaptığı görev ve aldığı isim bana bilgi olarak sunuluyordur ama aslında arıların hiyerarşik bir toplumsal düzen içinde yaşadıkları mesajı veriliyordur. Ben de bu mesajı almaya çalışırım.

6. Sınıf içi bir dinleme alıştırmasına başlamadan önce aktivitenin başlığını okur, fotoğraf resim ya da grafik varsa onlar hakkında ne bilip bilmediğimi kendi kendime düşünür alıştırmanın ne hakkında olabileceğini tahmin ederim. Kendimi zihnen alıştırmaya güdülerim.

7. İngilizce dinlerken bilmediğim bir sözcük, kalıp ya da sözcük grubu duyduğumda dinlemeyi bırakırım.

8. İngilizce dinlerken sunulan bilgileri anlayamamaktan korkar ve endişelenirim.

9. İngilizce dinlerken konuşmanın nasıl devam edeceğini ya da daha sonra ne söyleneceğini düşünmeden dinlerim.

10. Bir dinleme etkinliğini daha iyi anlamak için duyduklarımı Türkçe'ye çevirmeden anlamaya çalışırım.

11. Bir İngilizce dinleme aktivitesinde sadece sunulan bilgileri alır; üzerinde yorum, tahmin ya da çıkarımlar yapmam.

12. İngilizce dinlerken, kendimce anlamlı notlar alırım.

13. İngilizce dinlerken dikkatimin dağıldığını fark edince dikkatimi toplar ve akışı yakalamaya çalışırım.

14. İngilizce dinlerken duyduğum bilgileri kendi kendime toparlar ve özetlerim.

15. İngilizce dinlerken duyduğum fikirleri zihnimde sürekli düzenler ve daha önceden var olan bilgilerimle bağdaştırır, kendi bilgilerime eklerim.

16. Bir dinleme aktivietesi boyunca not almam.

17. Dinleme derslerine hiç bir hazırlık yapmadan katılır kitabı dersten derse açarım.

18. Bir dinleme etkinliği bittikten sonra dinlediğim bilgileri aklımda kategorize eder, iletilmek istenen mesajı duyduklarımdan ayrıştırır, notlarımı gözden geçirir ve dinlediklerimi özümserim.

19. İngilizce dinlerken anlamadığım bir yer olsa da (sözcük, yapı, fikir) sormam.

20. Bir dinleme alıştırmasını gereklerine göre (örneğin; alıştırmada bir tablo doldurma, True - False cümleleri, Comprehension Questions olabilir) dinleme amacımı belirler (benden

alıştırmanın bütününe mi yoksa ayrıntılarına mı yönelik bilgi isteniyor) sorgular ve alıştırmayı tamamlamak için nelere dikkat edeceğime karar veririm.

21. İngilizce dinlerken metni sonuna kadar dinlemeden de çıkarımlar yapar sonuca ulaşırım.

22. Bir dinleme etkinliği öncesinde dinleyeceğim metni daha iyi anlayabilmek için o konu ile ilgili metaryellere göz atarak kendimi hazırlarım.

23. Bir dinleme alıştırmasını yaparken bir konuyu, ne kadar, neden anlayıp anlamadığımı öğretmenimle ya da arkadaşlarımla konuşarak paylaşırım.

24. İngilizce dinleme yeterliliğimi, dinlemedeki bilgileri ne kadar anladığımı, kendi kendime tartarak ne kadar başarılı ya da başarısız olduğumu sorgularım.

25. İngilizce dinlerken bilmediğim sözcük, kalıp ya da sözcük grubu duyduğumda dikkatim dağılmaz ve dinlemeye devam ederim.

26. Bir dinleme aktivitesi sırasında dikkatim dağılırsa tekrar dinlemeye devam edemem.

27. İngilizce not alırken duyduğum herşeyi yazmaya çalışırım.

28. Bir dinleme etkinliğinde yukarıda sözü edilmeyen ancak sizin aktiviteyi tamamlamanızı ve anlamanızı kolaylaştıran kullandığınız yöntem / teknik varsa buraya yazınız.

İngilizce Okutman

Funda Gerçek

APPENDIX B

REVISED EDITTION OF LCSI

İNGİLİZCE DİNLEME STRATEJİLERİ ENVANTERİ

1. İngilizce dinlerken ilgimi çekmeyen bir konu olduğu zaman dinlemekten uzaklaşırım.
2. İngilizce dinlerken, sözcüklerin sözlük anlamı dışında da kullanılabileceğini düşünerek bağlama (context) dikkat ederim.
3. Bir dinleme etkinliğini daha kolay anlamak için duyduklarımı Türkçe'ye çeviririm.
4. Sınıf içi dinleme alıştırmasına başlamadan önce aktivitenin başlığını okur, fotoğraf resim ya da grafik varsa onlar hakkında ne bilip bilmediğimi kendi kendime düşünür alıştırmanın ne hakkında olabileceğini tahmin ederim. Kendimi zihnen alıştırmaya güdülerim.
5. İngilizce dinlerken bilmediğim bir sözcük, kalıp ya da sözcük grubu duyduğumda dinlemeyi bırakırım.
6. İngilizce dinlerken sunulan bilgileri anlayamamaktan korkar ve endişelenirim.
7. Bir dinleme etkinliğini daha iyi anlamak için duyduklarımı Türkçe'ye çevirmeden anlamaya çalışırım.
8. İngilizce dinlerken, kendimce anlamlı notlar alırım.
9. İngilizce dinlerken dikkatimin dağıldığını fark edince kendimi toplar ve akışı yakalamaya çalışırım.
10. İngilizce dinlerken duyduğum fikirleri zihnimde sürekli düzenler ve daha önceden varolan bilgilerimle bağdaştırır, kendi bilgilerime eklerim.
11. Bir dinleme aktivitesi boyunca not almam.
12. Dinleme derslerine hiç bir hazırlık yapmadan katılır, kitabı dersten derse açarım.
13. Bir dinleme etkinliği bittikten sonra dinlediğim bilgileri aklımda kategorize eder, iletilmek istenen mesajı duyduklarımdan ayrıştırır, notlarımı gözden geçirir ve dinlediklerimi özümserim.
14. İngilizce dinlerken anlamadığım bir yer olsa da (sözcük,yapı, fikir) sormam.
15. Bir dinleme etkinliği öncesinde dinleyeceğim metni daha iyi anlayabilmek için o konu ile ilgili metaryellere göz atarak kendimi hazırlarım.

16. Bir dinleme alıştırmasını yaparken bir konuyu, ne kadar, neden anlayıp anlamadığımı öğretmenimle ya da arkadaşlarımla konuşarak paylaşırım.
17. İngilizce dinleme yeterliliğimi, dinlemedeki bilgileri ne kadar anladığımı, kendi kendime tartarak ne kadar başarılı ya da başarısız olduğumu sorgularım.
18. İngilizce dinlerken bilmediğim sözcük, kalıp ya da sözcük grubu duyduğumda dikkatim dağılmaz ve dinlemeye devam ederim.
19. Bir dinleme aktivitesi sırasında dikkatim dağılırsa tekrar dinlemeye devam edemem.
20. İngilizce not alırken duyduğum her şeyi yazmaya çalışırım.

APPENDIX C

İNGİLİZCE DİNLEME STRATEJİLERİ ENVANTERİ
CEVAP KAĞIDI

İSİM:_____ **YAŞ:**_____ **GRUP:**_____

Yüksek öğreniminize başladığınızda İngilizce hazırlık eğitimi aldınız mı?EVET HAYIR

Cevabınız EVET ise kaç yıl?_____

	1	2	3	4	5
1.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	1	2	3	4	5
27.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

28_____

_____

_____

_____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bacon, S. M. (1992) "Authentic Listening in Spanish: How Learners Adjust Their Strategies to the Difficult of the Input", **Hispania**, Vol: 75 No: 2 398-412 .

Baysal, O. (1997) "The Role of Narrow Focus Strategy Training in Promoting Reading Comprehension of Turkish EFL Students", Bilkent: Ankara. Unpublished M. A.Thesis.

Brown, G. (1986) "Investigating Listening Comprehension in Context", **Applied Linguistics** Vol: 7 No:3 285-240

Cinemre,Y. (1991) "An Investigation of Listening Comprehension Strategies in Intermediate Level Turkish EFL Students", Bilkent: Ankara. Unpublished M.A. Thesis.

Chaistain, K. (1971) **Developing Second Language Skills: Theory to Practice.** Virginia: University of Virginia Charlottesville.

Chaistain, K.D. (1979) "Testing Listening Comprehension Tests", **TESOL Quarterly**, Vol:13 No:1 81 -88.

Chamot, A.U et al (1988) "A Study of Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Instruction" The third year final report (Eric document reproduction service) No.ED 352 825

Chamot, A.U. and L. Küpper (1989) "Learning Strategies in Foreign Language Instruction" **Foreign Language Annals,** Vol: 22 No:1 13-24.

Doff, A. (1988) **Teach English A Training Course For Teachers,** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dunkel, P. (1991) "Listening in the Native and Second / Foreign Language: Toward an Investigation of Research and Practice", **TESOL Quarterly**, Vol:25 No:3 431-457.

Ellis, R. (1985) **Understanding Second Language Acquisition.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1994) **The Study Of Second Language Acquisition.** Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Field, J. (1998) "Skills and Strategies: Towards a New Methodology for Listening", **ELT Journal** , Vol:52 No: 2 110-118.

Fullilove, J. and A. B.M. Tsui (1998) "Buttom-up or Top-down Processing as a Discriminator of L2 Listening Performance", **Applied Linguistics.** Vol:19 No 4 432-451.

Goh, C. (1997) "Metacogitive Awareness and Second Language Listeners", **ELT Journal.** Oxford University Press. Vol: 51 No:4 361-369.

Goh, C.C.M (1998) "How ESL Learners with Different Listening Abilities Use Comprehension Strategies and Tactics", **Language Teaching Research.** Vol:2 No:2 124-147.

Hatch, E and H.Farhady (1982) **Research Design and Statistics for Applied Linguistics.** Massachusetts: Newbury House Publishers.

Murcia-Celce, M. (1991) **Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language.** 2nd Edition Boston: Heinle and Heinle Publishers.

O'Malley, J.M. and A.U. Chamot, G. Stewener-Manzaners, R. P. Russo, L. Küpper (1985b) "Learning Strategy Applications with Students of English as a Second Language", **TESOL Quarterly**. Vol:19 No:3 557-583.

O'Malley, J.M. et al (1987) "The Effects of Training in the Use of Strategies on Learning English as a Second Language". In Wenden, A. and J. Rubin (Eds.) **Learner Strategies in Language Learning.** (p.p 43-55) New York : York College, City University of New York.

O'Malley, J.M and A.U. Chamot, L. Kupper (1989) "Listening Comprehension Strategies in Second Language Acquisition", **Applied Linguistics.** Vol: 10 No:4 419-437.

O'Malley, J.M. and A.U. Chamot (1990) **Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oxford, L.R. and D. Crookal (1989) "Research on Language Learning Strategies: Methods Findings and Instructional Issues", **The Modern Journal** . Vol:73 No:4 404-419.

Oxford, J.R. (1990) **Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know.** Boston: Heinle and Heinel Publishers.

T.C. YÜKSEKÖĞRETİM KURULU
DOKÜMANTASYON MERKEZİ

Namlu, A. G (1997) "Öğretmenlerin Ders-Araç Gereçlerinin Kullanımına Yönelik Tutum Ölçeği Geliştirme Çalışması", **4.Ulusal Eğitim Bilimleri Kongresi Bildirileri3.** Eskişehir: Anadolu Üniversitesi .

Rivers, W. M. (1981) **Teaching Foreign Language Skills.** Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Richards, W.M. (1990) **The Language Teaching Matrix.** Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rost, M. (1990) **Listening in Language Learning .** London: Longman.

Rubin (1987) in Wenden, A.J. Rubin (eds) **Learner Strategies in Language Learning.** New Jersy: Prentice Hall.

Shehan, P. (1989) **Individual Differences in Second Language Learning.** London: Edward Arnold.

Thompson, I. and J. Rubin (1996) "Can Strategy Instruction Improve Listening Comprehension?" **Foreign Language Annals.** Vol: 29 No: 3 331-342.

Vogely, A. (1995) "Perceived Strategy Use During Performance on Three Authentic Listening Comprehension Tasks", **The Modern Language Journal .** Vol:75 No:1 41-56.

Yılmaz, N. (1998) "The Effects of Field Dependency and Field Independency on the Performance of Certain Activity or Question Forms in Listening Comprehension Ability". Eskişehir: Anadolu University, Unpublished M.A. Thesis.