Outcomes to Teaching Metacognitive Listening Strategies to EFL Japanese Young Learners: A Research Proposal

Benjamin Sanchez Murillo

Temple University

Japan Campus

Tokyo Center

EPSY 8625 Introduction to Research Methodology

Dr. James Sick

April 17, 2021

Outcomes to Teaching Metacognitive Listening Strategies to EFL Japanese Young Learners: A Research Proposal

One of the complaints I often hear from my Japanese students when they try to listen to native English speakers (NES) is that students perceive NES's productions as too fast and have difficulty understanding what NES says. Celce-Murcia et al. (2010) stated that speech rate is one of the student's "hurdle to comprehension" (p. 375), and Kurita (2017) identified unknown vocabulary and pronunciation as two other sources of difficulties that students in Japan encounter in listening comprehension. While speech rate, vocabulary, and pronunciation are factors that affect English understanding among Japanese students, little is known as to whether more attention to a process of listening would enable these learners to achieve better listening comprehension (Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010).

Furthermore, when I approach my Japanese students and ask them what strategies they use when they try to understand a conversation in English, they cannot respond. This lack of response can be either because students do not have the vocabulary to express their strategies or simply because they do not have a listening strategy in mind. The majority of my students are between the ages of 9 and 12 (Young Learners) and attend a *juku* to learn English. My interest in this research is to enable these young learners to develop listening comprehension skills whenever they encounter English listening activities either in school or outside school.

Literature Review

Kurita (2017) identified two frameworks that enable teachers to analyze "students' breakdown in listening comprehension and identifying the problems that they need to address" (p. 17). These two frameworks are Anderson's model of language comprehension and top-down

and bottom-up processing frameworks. However, for this proposal, I will only briefly address the top-down and bottom-up processing frameworks.

Top-down processing is the background knowledge a person uses to decode a message, while bottom-up processing uses an incoming message as the foundation for understanding a message. A person uses both types of processing during listening comprehension (Kurita, 2017). For instance, if a person hears a familiar word, they will use their background knowledge to identify the meaning. However, if a person is not familiar with a particular word's sound, they would try to process it as the word comes in using bottom-up processing.

Regarding students who are learning a new language, Kurita (2017) stated those students "will depend on their ability to make use of all the available resources to interpret what they hear by top-down process (p. 18). Kurita (2017) also mentioned that two listening instruction approaches advocating top-down processes and bottom-up process are metacognitive awareness and "lexical segmentation and word recognition skills" (p. 18).

In terms of investigating listening, two research categories emerge, which are the product of listening and the process of listening (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2015). In a product of listening category, experimental researchers are concerned with measurable outcomes. In this type of study, researchers typically have two groups (i.e., experimental and control groups) complete a pre-test. The experimental group receives an intervention, and the experimental and control groups receive a post-test to determine if the intervention was effective (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2015). However, Paltridge and Phakiti (2015) mentioned that this type of research "is not interested in exploring the problems listeners may experience in comprehension" (p. 304). The kind of research that explores the problems that listeners encounter with comprehension difficulties is the process of listening (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2015). The process of listening makes

use of questionnaires, interviews, stimulated recalls, think-alouds, observations, diaries, and other tools to investigate the student's decision-making process during listening comprehension (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2015). This research proposal will focus on the process of listening among younger learners of English through a series of metacognitive instructions.

Metacognition and Metacognitive Instructions

Kobayashi (2018) defined metacognition as a mental capability and stated that it is "often referred to as thinking about our own thinking" (p. 311). Flavell (1979) believed that "the monitoring of a wide variety of cognitive enterprises occurs through the actions and interactions among four classes of phenomena" (p. 906). Flavell (1979) identified metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive experiences, tasks, and strategies as those four classes. These phenomena can be incorporated into a series of instructions that engage learners in predicting, monitoring, evaluating listening activities, and identifying problems that inhibit listening comprehension (Cross, 2011).

Several studies have found listening instructions an effective tool to enhance learners' listening comprehensibility (e.g., Bozorgian, 2014; Goh & Hu, 2014, Goh & Taib, 2006; Cross, 2011; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010; Kobayashi, 2018). These metacognitive instructions followed a process-based approach that instead of focusing on teaching individual strategies, the instructions focused on activities that required participants to listen to recorded dialogues, an opportunity for personal reflection, and an opportunity to share these reflections in a group discussion (Goh & Taib, 2006; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010). These instructions or task sequences are also known as a pedagogical cycle (Cross, 2011; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010).

Implementing a pedagogical cycle has resulted in studies that showed positive relationships between metacognitive awareness and listening performance (Goh & Hu, 2014); others have implemented metacognitive instructions to help young learners (Goh & Taib, 2006) and less-skilled learners (Cross, 2011) and yet others have implemented a pedagogical cycle and a Metacognitive Awareness Questionnaire (MALQ) to determine the type of metacognitive strategies participants use when engaged in listening activities (Bozorgian, 2014, Goh & Hu, 2014 & Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010).

For instance, Goh and Hu (2014) administered a listening questionnaire (MALQ) and a listening component of the International English Language Testing System (IELTS) to 113 English-as-a-Second-language (ESL) Chinese learners at a university in Singapore to assess participant's metacognitive awareness. Participants participated in a listening class, took an IELTS listening test, and answered the MALQ. Goh and Hu (2014) found that participants scored higher for directed attention and problem-solving strategies than for mental translation and person knowledge, thus indicating a positive relationship between metacognitive scores and listening performance.

Goh and Taib (2006) defined metacognitive instruction as "teaching that explicitly elicits and develops learners' knowledge about the listening process" (p. 222). Goh and Taib (2006) provided 11 and 12 years old students in primary school with eight process-based listening lessons in their study. Participants listened to recorded exercises and answered ten comprehension questions. After comparing the listening scores, researchers found that weaker learners benefited the most from these process-based listening lessons.

Cross (2011) compared learners with different skills in two separate groups (i.e., less skilled and more skilled). The participants, 20 adult Japanese females studying EFL in Japan,

took a listening comprehension test to determine participants' skill level. Cross (2011) found that the less skilled learners improved more in listening comprehension than the more competent group and attributed this improvement to metacognitive instructions given through a series of pedagogical cycles. Cross (2011) concluded that a pedagogical cycle served as a practical method for metacognitive instructions in the listening lessons.

Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010) compared 106 (N=106) university-level students taking French as a second language (FSL) courses. The groups consisted of an experimental group (n = 59) and a control group (n = 47). Both groups listened to the same text; however, only the experimental group received metacognitive instructions (i.e., treatment). Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010) administered a listening comprehension pre-test and post-test and determined that the group who received the treatment outperformed the control group.

Kobayashi (2018) also administered a listening proficiency test to her experimental group (n = 26) and control group (n = 22). Just as in the Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010) study, both groups in Kobayashi (2018) also listened to a similar text, and only the experimental group received metacognitive listening instructions. Kobayashi (2018) observed more significant listening proficiency gains in the experimental group than the control group.

Although all the participants from the above studies have benefited from metacognitive instructions, most of the participants have been adults, and studies using young learners as participants are scarce. Only the research from Goh and Taib (2006) used young learners as participants; however, the study consisted of only 10 participants, so it is difficult to tell if similar results can be obtained with a larger sample using young learners. Therefore, further research is needed to investigate whether metacognitive instructions can improve comprehension among less-skilled young learners.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

This study proposes investigating the effects of metacognitive instruction and will be guided by the following research questions and hypotheses.

1. Would less skilled participants that receive metacognitive listening strategies surpass participants in a control group on a listening comprehension test?

   H_1: The group receiving the experimental treatment will surpass the control group in the last listening comprehension test (following Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari, 2010)

2. Would less skilled participants show more improvement in metacognitive awareness of listening, as measured by the MALQ?

   H_3: The less skilled participants in the experimental group will exhibit the greatest growth in metacognitive awareness of listening, as measured by the MALQ (following Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari, 2010).

Methods

Participants

Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010) suggested that researchers wishing to replicate their study used learners with different language backgrounds in different learning contexts. The type of participants that I intend to obtain for this study are Japanese learners between the ages of 9 and 12 years old studying at an English as a Foreign Language (EFL) program at elementary schools in Japan who attend the fourth, fifth and sixth grades. I plan to obtain participants (N=100) consisting of children for an experimental group (n =50) and children for a control group (n = 50). Ideally, the children's gender will be equally balanced (50 boys; 50 girls); however, a non-balanced gender will also be acceptable. I currently teach English at a juku

(Kumon) to children in that age range. Hence, I intend to use convenience sampling (snowball sampling) as the nonprobability sampling method to obtain participants. According to Trochim et al. (2016), a disadvantage of snowball sampling is low external validity. The problem with low external validity is future researchers would not be able to generalize my findings to similar populations. However, future researchers who would like to replicate the study could use random selection to improve their external validity.

Instrumentation

There are two instruments I plan to use for the experiment. One of the instruments is sample questions from the Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) Junior Listening Comprehension Section Test (See Appendix A). The other instrument is the MALQ (See Appendix B).

The TOEFL Junior Listening Comprehension Section Test "assesses the degree to which students have the listening skills required to function in English-medium instructional environments" (So et al., 2015, p. 9). The listening section is composed around the idea that students can listen to inputs such as personal conversations and lectures. (So et al., 2015). Some of the skills students need to succeed in school are understanding the main ideas, making inferences, predictions, and distinguishing intonation and contrastive stress (So et al., 2015).

So et al. (2015) identified three types of listening abilities that the listening section covers, and they include "the ability to listen for social and interpersonal purposes, the ability to listen for navigational purposes, and the ability to listen for academic purposes" (p. 9). In sum, the abilities that the listening test measures coincide with the abilities I intend to measure. These measurements will allow me to separate less skilled learners and more skilled learners using five TOEFL Junior Standard Sample Questions.

The TOEFL Junior test was developed by Educational Testing Service (ETS) and was designed for young students ages 11 and above (Gu & Hsieh, 2019). In Gu and Hsieh (2019), the researchers had access to data from students taking the TOEFL Junior Speaking test, and the study included students between the ages of 9 and 12. Gu and Hsieh (2019) had test-takers younger than 11 years old as it provided them with "an opportunity to observe qualitative differences" (p. 184). Therefore, I believe I can observe qualitative differences from children of similar age ranges in my study.

The MALQ was developed by Vandergrift et al. (2006) to measures strategies in listening tasks. It comprises 21 items representing five areas of metacognitive awareness of L2 listening, and it uses a 6-point Likert scale. The five areas are planning-evaluation, directed attention, person knowledge, mental translation, and problem-solving.

Planning and evaluation elicit how listeners devise a plan and how they evaluate their efforts, problem-solving is about making inferences and tracking those inferences, directed attention is about focus and how they stay on task, mental translation inquires whether the listener translates what they hear, and person knowledge is about how a person feels towards listening to an L2 (Vandergrift et al., 2006).

Using a large sample (N = 966), the MALQ was validated using participants older than the intended age range in this study (i.e., 9–12 years old). The participants in the study were composed of "university students (65%) high school students (11%), federal government employees in full-time language instruction (24%)" (Vandergrift et al., 2006, p. 441), which implies they were designed for a much older audience than the current intended use.

Therefore, instead of administering all 21 items of the MALQ to the prospective participants, I will only use five items covering each of the metacognitive categories that would

be easier for younger participants to understand. These categories are identified in bold letters in Appendix B and translated into Japanese. I will also use a 5-point Likert scale instead of a 6-point Likert scale so that participants have an option for a neutral point. I anticipate that a 5-point Likert scale will be appropriate for that age range because, in a study that measured mathematical attitudes of elementary students (Adelson & McCoach, 2010). In the study, 606 participating students received a 4-point or 5-point format of a survey; Adelson and McCoach (2010) found that "children in Grades 3 to 6 are capable of discriminating among five responses options and do not tend toward the neutral point more so than with a 4-point scale" (p. 796). The participants' age range in Adelson and McCoach (2010) and this intended study are similar, and I suspect their cognitive levels are identical. Therefore, I believe that young learners in my research will also handle the 5-point Likert scale.

Design and Procedure

This research will be implemented using a quantitative and qualitative approach. The design for the proposed study is a nonequivalent pretest-posttest nonequivalent groups quasi-experiment. The TEOFL Junior Standard Sample Questions will be administered to all participants. The mean scores will be calculated so that participants can be separated between less skilled and more skilled in listening ability. The test will contain 10 sample question items from the TEOFL Junior Standard Sample Questions. Once participants complete taking the tests, participants will be randomly assigned to an experimental and control group.

After the groups are divided into an experimental and a control group, the experimental group will receive eight listening lessons, one lesson per week. The lessons will consist of different texts, including dialogues, talks, discussions, stories, etc. The various texts' objective is that they resemble the text length of approximately 65–285 words. I chose this length because

the TEOFL Junior Standard Sample Questions contain a similar number of words, and I would like to keep the text length consistent.

The modified MALQ will be administered to both groups after participants complete the listening test and at the end of the study. A bilingual assistant will help translate and explain the questionnaire items to make sure that they understand the concepts. The reason for administering the questions at the beginning and end of the study will be to determine if participants would identify any listening strategies gained during listening activities.

Experimental Group

The experimental group lessons will include predictions, discussions among students, discussions among students and teachers, and time to complete a personal reflection.
Upon the beginning of the lesson, the participants will receive a notebook divided into four columns. One column to make predictions and the remaining three columns will be used to write anything they might remember after each listening activity.

Before the first listening activity, participants will receive the title and topic of the text in writing. The purpose of providing the title and topic is to write any predictions in their notebooks. Once participants have completed their predictions, the first listening activity will begin.

During the first listening activity, participants will mark any information and words they predicted correctly and write any new words or information they remembered on the listening column. Once the first listening activity ends, participants will be asked to work in pairs.

During pair work, participants will compare their predictions and will have an opportunity to discuss among themselves any differences or similarities in their listening perceptions. Noting differences and similarities will help students create awareness of

information they might have missed on their first listening activity. Hopefully, they can notice them on a second listening activity.

At the second listening activity, students will have a chance to write any new information they might encounter. They will be able to refer to any notes they made during the pair work activity. Once the second listening activity is finished, students will share their findings and strategies with a teacher. The teacher will confirm whether participants comprehended the listening activity and will continue with the last listening activity.

Students will once again write any new information that they might have heard during the third listening activity. They will refer to any notes or past pair work and group discussions, which will help them verify any missed information.

At the end of the listening activities, students will have a chance to write their reflection about the activities and be asked to write if they noted any strategies they could implement in the future. A random sample of participants in the experimental group will be taken to help interpret the MALQ responses. It will be asked to participate in an interview to discuss the strategies they used. Interviews will be recorded and transcribed to gain a better understanding of participant's feedback on the treatments. Their answers will help develop insights for future questionnaires creating targeting young children.

Control Group

The control group will also have the opportunity of listening to the same activities that the control group and will have a chance to write in their notebook any new information they encountered as a result of the listening activities. However, the control group will not have an opportunity to make predictions about the listening activities, nor a chance to discuss comprehension with a classmate. The control group will not have a chance to discuss strategies

with the instructor nor with other students. After the third listening activity, participants will have an opportunity to discuss with the instructor for comprehension only.

Analysis

There are two types of experimental designs. Those that try to enhance the construct being measured (i.e., signal), these signal-enhancing experimental designs are called *factorial designs.* Those that try to reduce distractions (i.e., noise) or noise-reducing experimental designs are known as *covariance* and *blocking designs*. (Trochim et al., 2016).

Trochim et al. (2016) mention that in factorial designs, "the focus is entirely on the set up of the program or treatment, its components, and its major dimensions" (p. 237). Trochim et al. (2016) further expanded that the design allows researchers to determine the effects of the program and subcomponents and "whether there are interactions in the effects caused by subcomponents" (p.237). On the other hand, noise-reducing design can be further subdivided into *covariance* and *blocking* designs (Trochim et al., 2016). A covariance design uses one or more variables (i.e., *covariates*) to account for this variability (Trochim et al., 2016).

In this experiment, I plan to administer a listening test (i.e., pre-test) to both the experimental and control group to reduce any differences in participants' listening abilities that might bring to the experiment. Accounting for these differences is a method to reduce the investigation's noise, and as such, I will implement a noise-reducing experimental design. To control these initial differences, I will use the pre-test as the covariate and use covariance design.

Trochim et al. (2016) state that one can perform an Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) to estimate "the difference between groups on the post-test after adjusting for the differences on the pre-test" (p. 249). They also state that an ANCOVA design "falls in the class of a noise-reduction experimental design" (p.249). However, this experiment will make use of two factors.

The factors (i.e., independent variables) are Group Type (i.e., treatment and control) and Listening Ability (i.e., less skilled and more skilled). I will thus use a two-factor ANCOVA to determine the two hypotheses.

Ethical Considerations

According to Trochim et al. (2016), ethics in research is essential because it promotes moral and social values, advances new knowledge, and ensures accountability. Therefore, the following ethical considerations will be observed in this proposed study.

Participation in this experiment will be voluntary. I will obtain informed consent from parents for all participants (see Appendix C), and the participants will sign assent forms (see Appendix D). The informed consent will inform parents about the study and whether they allow their children to participate. The assent form will inform participants about the research and whether they wish to participate.

Privacy is of utmost concern, so all data will be maintained in a locked file cabinet when not used to ensure data security. Only researchers participating in the study will have access to the participant's private information. The researcher will ask the parent's permission if participants' records need to be shared with other parties other than the researcher. Participant's audio recordings will be kept for 90 days and then erased.

The control group will be offered special classes to discuss metacognitive strategies after the study to avoid denial of service. These classes will be provided after the completion of the research and will also consist of eight courses. Special arrangements will be made with students who do not wish to participate in the special classes to discuss alternative options.

Significance of the Study

The purpose of this study is to determine the effects of metacognitive instruction in young learners and whether these instructions can improve their listening comprehension. A series of listening and discussion activities will be offered to the experimental group. Most past research has been performed with the adult population, and more research is needed with the younger population.

The results of this study will benefit elementary school children and elementary school, teachers. It will show elementary school teachers how they can prepare their students to become more autonomous inside and outside of the classroom by offering students instructions in metacognitive processes of listening. These results, in turn, can make language learning more relevant and exciting.

Proposed Timetable

Time	Activity
May 2021	Obtain official permission from Kumon
June - July 2021	Obtain participants
June 2021	Secure two rooms two conduct study
July 2021	Mail consent and assent forms
August 2021	Administer listening test
September 2021	Study begins
October 2021	Analyze results
November 2021	Write report
December 2021	Write report
January 2021	Write report
February 2021	Write report
March 2021	Write report
April 2021	Write report
May 2021	Submit a report to Kumon

Limitations

Some of the limitations of this study are the non-random sampling, the number of participants required for this study, and participants' age. Lack of direct access to elementary schools will make it challenging to conduct random sampling; however, hopefully, the number of students in the snowball sampling is sufficient to find the number of participants required. Because of the young age of participants, there is a possibility that despite adjusting the MALQ to include five questions instead of 21, translating and explaining the concepts of the questionnaire in Japanese, some of the participants would still not able to understand these concepts fully. However, the information obtained will be valuable as it can help set the foundations for a new study to develop a questionnaire targeting children in this age range.

References

Adelson, L. J., & McCoach, B. D. (2010). Measuring the mathematical attitudes of elementary students: The effects of a 4-point or 5-point likert-type scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *70*(5) 796–807. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164410366694

Bozorgian, H. (2014). The role of metacognition in the development of EFL learners' listening skill. *The International Journal of Listening*, *28*(3), 149–161. https://doi.org/10.1080/10904018.2013.861303

Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D., Goodwin, J., & Griner, B. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A course book and reference guide* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Cross, J. (2011). Metacognitive instruction for helping less-skilled listeners. *ELT Journal*, *65*(4), 408–416. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq073

Flavell, J.H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. *American Psychologist*, *34*(10), 906–911. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906

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

Goh, C., & Taib, Y. (2006). Metacognitive instructions in listening for young learners. *ELT Journal*, *60*(3), 222–232. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl002

Gu, L., & Hsieh, C. (2019). Distinguishing features of young English language learner's oral performance. *Language Assessment Quarterly*, *16*(2), 180–195. https://doi.org/10.1080/15434303.2019.1605518

Kobayashi, A. (2018). Investigating the effects of metacognitive instruction in listening for EFL learners, *The Journal of AsiaTEFL*, *15*(2), 310–328. https://doi.org/10.18823/asiatefl.2018.15.2.4.310

Listening comprehension sample questions. (n.d.). Retrieved April 10, 2021, from https://www.ets.org/toefl_junior/prepare/standard_sample_questions/listening_comprehension

Paltridge, B. & Phakiti, A. (2015). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: A Practical Resource (Research Methods in Linguistics)*, 2nd edition. New York, New York: Bloomsbury USA Academic.

Parental permission for children participation in research english. (n.d.). Retrieved April 14, 2021, from https://research.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2015/10/parental_permission_for_children_participation_in_research_english.doc

Sample assent form. (n.d.). Retrieved April 14, 2021, from https://www.rit.edu/research/hsro/sample_assent_form

Trochim, W.M.K., Donnelly, P.J., & Arora, K. (2016). *Research methods: The essential knowledge base*. Cengage Learning.

Kurita, T. (2017). Teaching listening in pre-tertiary and tertiary English education in Japan. In H. P. Widodo, A. Wood & D. Gupta (Eds.), *Asian English language classrooms where theory and practice meet* (pp. 14–29). Routledge.

Vandergrift, L., Goh, C. C., Mareschal, C.J., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2006). The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire: Development and validation, *Language Learning*, *56*(3), 431–462. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2006.00373.x

Vandergrift, L., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2010). Teaching students how to listen does make a difference: An empirical study, *Language Learning*, *60*(2), 470–497. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00559.x

So, Y., Wolf, M.K., Hauck, M.C., Mollaun, P., Rybinski, P., Tumposky, D., Wang, J. (2015). *TOEFL Junior® Design Framework*. TOEFL Junior Research Report No. 02. ETS Research Report, No. RR-15–13. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service. https://doi.org/10.1002/ets2.12058

Appendix A

TOEFL Junior Standard Sample Questions
Listening comprehension sample questions. (n.d.). Retrieved April 10, 2021, from https://www.ets.org/toefl_junior/prepare/standard_sample_questions/listening_comprehension

1. What is the subject of the announcement?

A. The school will be adding new classes.
B. Three new teachers will be working at the school.
C. Some students have received an award.
D. The school is getting its own newspaper.

2. What does the teacher want the students to do?

A. Take everything out of their desks
B. Put the painting supplies in plastic bags
C. Bring paints with them to school on Monday
D. Put covers on their desks to keep the paint off

3. What are the speakers mainly discussing?

A. A new art project in the city
B. An assignment for their art class
C. An art display inside the public library
D. A painting that the girl saw downtown

4. Why is the boy excited?

A. A famous artist is going to visit his class.
B. His artwork might be seen by many people.
C. His class might visit an art museum.
D. He is getting a good grade in his art class.

5. Where does the boy say he may go this weekend?

A. To the zoo
B. To an art store
C. To Main Street
D. To the public library

Appendix B

Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ)
Vandergrift et al. (2006)

Type scale	Strategy or belief/perception	
Planning-evaluation	Before I start to listen, I have a plan in my head for how I am going to listen	1 2 3 4 5 6
Directed attention	I focus harder on the text when I have trouble understanding.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Person knowledge	I find that listening in French is more difficult than reading, speaking, or writing in French.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Mental translation	**I translate in my head as I listen.**	1 2 3 4 5 6
Problem-solving	I use words I understand to guess the meaning of the words I don't understand.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Directed attention	**When my mind wanders, I recover my concentration right away.**	1 2 3 4 5 6
Problem-solving	As I listen, I compare what I understand with what I know about the topic.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Person knowledge	I feel that listening comprehension in French is a challenge for me.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Problem-solving	**I use my experience and knowledge to help me understand**	1 2 3 4 5 6
Planning-evaluation	Before listening, I think of similar texts that I may have listened to.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Mental translation	I translate keywords as I listen.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Directed attention	I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Problem-solving	As I listen, I quickly adjust my interpretation if I realize that it is not correct.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Planning-evaluation	After listening, I think back to how I listened, and about what I might do differently next time.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Person knowledge	I don't feel nervous when I listen to French.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Directed attention	**When I have difficulty understanding what I hear, I give up and stop listening.**	1 2 3 4 5 6
Problem-solving	I use the general idea of the text to help me guess the meaning of the words that I don't understand	1 2 3 4 5 6
Mental translation	I translate word by word, as I listen.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Problem-solving	When I guess the meaning of a word, I think back to everything else that I have heard, to see if my guess makes sense.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Planning-evaluation	As I listen, I periodically ask myself if I am satisfied with my level of comprehension.	1 2 3 4 5 6
Planning-evaluation	**I have a goal in mind as I listen.**	1 2 3 4 5 6

Appendix C
Parental Permission for Children Participation in Research

Retrieved April 14, 2021, from https://research.utexas.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2015/10/parental_permission_for_children_participation_in_research_english.doc
(with modifications)

Title: Outcomes to Teaching Metacognitive Listening Strategies to EFL Japanese Young Learners

Introduction

The purpose of this form is to provide you (as the parent of a prospective research study participant) information that may affect your decision as to whether or not to let your child participate in this research study. The person performing the research will describe the study to you and answer all your questions. Read the information below and ask any questions you might have before deciding whether or not to give your permission for your child to take part. If you choose to let your child be involved in this study, this form will be used to record your consent.

Purpose of the Study

Your child will be asked to participate in a research study about English language ***listening strategies if you agree*****.** This study aims to find if discussing listening activities will help less skilled learners improve their listening comprehension.

What is my child going to be asked to do?

If you allow your child to participate in this study, they will be asked to:

- Take an English listening comprehension test before and after the study
- Participate in eight classes where students will listen to recorded material about school events (e.g., classroom activities, teacher lectures) and events that occur outside of school (e.g., playing in the park).
- Complete a questionnaire consisting of five questions about strategies they use when listening to English. The questionnaire will be administered at the beginning, middle, and end of the study after a listening activity.

This study will have participants meet every day for eight days for one hour, and there will be **100 children** in this study.

What are the risks involved in this study?

There are no foreseeable risks to participating in this study.

What are the possible benefits of this study?

The possible benefits of participation are that students might be able to improve their English listening comprehension strategies.

Does my child have to participate?

No, your child's participation in this study is voluntary. Your child may decline to participate or withdraw from participation at any time. Withdrawal or refusing to participate will not affect their relationship with Kumon in any way. You can agree to allow your child to study now and change your mind later without any penalty.

What if my child does not want to participate?

In addition to your permission, your child must agree to participate in the study. If your child does not want to participate, they will not be included in the research, and there will be no penalty. If your child initially agrees to be in the study, they can change their mind later without penalty.

Will there be any compensation?

Neither you nor your child will receive any type of payment participating in this study.

How will your child's privacy and confidentiality be protected if s/he participates in this research study?

Your child's privacy and the confidentiality of his/her data will be maintained in a locked file cabinet at Kumon's facilities.

If it becomes necessary for Kumon Institute of Education Co., Ltd to review the study records, information linked to your child will be protected to the extent permitted by law. Your child's research records will not be released without your consent unless required by law or court order. The data resulting from your child's participation may be made available to other researchers in the future for research purposes not detailed within this consent form. In these cases, the data will contain no identifying information that could associate it with your child or with your child's participation in any study.

If you choose to participate in this study, your child may be audio-recorded. Any audio recordings will be stored securely, and only the research team will have access to the recordings. Recordings will be kept for 90 days and then erased.

Whom to contact with questions about the study?

Prior, during, or after your participation, you can contact the researcher at the phone number and email address indicated in the attached return envelope, or you may contact us at Kumon.

Signature

You are deciding to allow your child to participate in this study. Your signature below indicates that you have read the information provided above and have agreed to allow them to participate in the study. If you later decide that you wish to withdraw your permission for your child to participate in the study, you may discontinue his or her participation at any time. You will be given a copy of this document.

_____
Printed Name of Child

_____ _____
Signature of Parent(s) or Legal Guardian Date

_____ _____
Signature of Investigator Date

Appendix D
Minor Assent Form
Retrieved April 14, 2021, from https://www.rit.edu/research/hsro/sample_assent_form
(with modifications)

Project Title: Outcomes to Teaching Metacognitive Listening Strategies to EFL Japanese Young Learners
Researcher: Benjamin Sanchez

We are doing a research study about English language listening strategies**.** A research study is a way to learn more about people. If you decide that you want to be part of this study, you will be asked to listen to five recordings about things that happen in school and answer five questions about those recordings. After you finish answering the questions, you will go to a classroom with other children to take listening classes. You will take one class every day for a total of eight courses. You will listen to different recordings about things you do in school and outside of school in the classroom. You will receive a notebook so that you can take notes about what you heard. The teacher will tell you what you need to write**.**

There are some things about this study you should know. Some of you will talk with other children, your teacher, and as a class about what you listened to in the recordings, and others will not.

If your group did not discuss what you listened to, you would have a chance to retake the class, and you will have the opportunity to discuss the recordings with classmates and a teacher the following week.

If you do not want to be in this research study, we will tell you what other options there are for you.

When we are finished with this study, we will write a report about what was learned. This report will not include your name or that you were in the study.

You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to be. If you decide to stop after we begin, that's okay too. Your parents know about the study too.

If you decide you want to be in this study, please sign your name.

I, _____, want to be in this research study.

_____ _____
(Sign your name here) (Date)

Murillo