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Even though it is recognized as the macro-language skill most strongly correlated with the rapid development of foreign language skills, listening is reported to be the most under-researched and the most neglected by foreign language teachers. Motivated by our will to improve as L2 listening teachers, we embarked on an action research project aiming to develop a series of listening training approaches based on contemporary listening research. Focusing on a combination of metacognitive, top-down and bottom-up strategies, twelve English as a lingua franca-informed listening training activities were implemented at a private Japanese university. This paper provides a review of the listening training program for 147 Japanese students. It considers pre and post-program listening assessment, student perceptions of their self-efficacy as L2 listeners, teachers’ observations and student reactions to the explicit training program. While the program was received favorably by students, as indicated by their positive stance towards listening and communicating in English at the end of the treatment, no improvement in listening test scores was observed.
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Introduction

It was argued by White (2008) that L2 learners with high proficiency in listening make greater progress in acquiring their second language. Despite this observation, L2 listening has been described by commentators in the field as the ‘Cinderella’ skill of the four macro-language skills as the processes employed by L2 listeners are not well understood (Harding, Anderson, & Brunfaut, 2015; Vandergrift, 2007; Yeldham, 2017) and most L2 teachers are unaware how to teach L2 listening effectively (Field, 2008; Graham, 1997 & 2006; Graham, Santos, & Vanderplank, 2011; Nation & Newton, 2009; Siegel, 2014; Siegel & Siegel, 2015). Moreover, the methodology for teaching listening skills and strategies is undeveloped and outdated (Siegel, 2015; White, 2008). White (2008) also highlighted, “we urgently need research to inform the development of effective listening materials, equipment, and teaching methodology” (p. 215). With this backdrop in mind, we conducted an action research study to establish whether a balanced focus on bottom up (BU), top down (TD), and metacognitive strategies would be effective in developing beginner-level English learners’ listening performance and self-efficacy.

Coming into this project the researchers (i.e., experienced English language instructors) matched the archetype of classroom teachers whose knowledge of the listening process and the skills to teach them were underdeveloped. It was this lack of efficacy which led us to question how we could become more
Theoretical Foundation of the Study

Listening Theory

In contemporary listening research, there are a number of competing frameworks for promoting L2 students’ listening skills. On one side, there is the implicit argument (e.g., Renandya & Farrell, 2010) which advocates heavy exposure to the L2 rather than instructional interventions to promote listening fluency. In some ways, this approach follows an individual’s experience in L1 listening, whereby providing one has had enough exposure to the L1, they will develop listening abilities without explicit instruction.

On the other side, there is the argument for explicit listening instruction, where L2 learners are taught how to listen by focusing on the development of listening strategies. Initially, awareness of the different listening skills required to listen effectively is raised, then students are instructed or given opportunities to use one or a combination of strategies to achieve a certain listening objective.

The reported benefits of explicit training range from students becoming better able to cope with phoneme, word recognition, and segmentation issues (e.g., Goh, 2000; Siegel & Siegel, 2015) in listening texts, increased levels of student confidence and motivation in their listening (Graham & Macaro, 2008; Kobayashi, 2018; Siegel & Siegel, 2015; Yeldham & Gruba, 2016), to greater overall gains in students’ listening performance (Graham & Macaro, 2008; Graham, Santos, & Vanderplank, 2011; Kobayashi, 2018; Sheshgelani, Sadeghli, & Aidinlon, 2013; Siegel, 2015; Siegel & Siegel, 2015; Zanjani & Izadpanah, 2016).

Our review of the research led us to pilot an explicit listening strategy training focusing on the development of some core listening strategies. Broadly speaking, these listening skills and strategies are classified into three distinct categories, (1) bottom-up (BU) processing, (2) top-down (TD) processing, and (3) metacognitive processing.

**Bottom-up listening processing skills**

BU processing begins with learners making sense of individual pieces of information and attempts to combine them into a whole. Siegel (2015) defines this process as local processing- when listeners focus on linguistic, grammatical and semantic signals to ascertain meaning. Siegel then goes on to highlight that the decoding of acoustic, semantic, and grammatical features is crucial for successful BU processing. As BU processing involves actual linguistic data, it can be examined, unlike the educated guessing that takes place with TD processing.

Awareness of common BU skills are typically lacking in L2 learners (Lynch, 2006). This may help explain why in Siegel and Siegel’s (2015) study, the explicit practice of phonological and parsing skills enhanced overall listening comprehension.

**Top-down listening processing skills**

In contrast, TD strategies focus on broader meaning. Hence, listeners make use of their priori knowledge and life experiences, which they can then compare and relate to the listening content in order to formulate conclusions and test their predictions and hypotheses. For instance, listeners start by making sense of the macro-level, which then helps them understand micro-level items (e.g., individual words or phonemes). According to Yeldham (2009), TD strategy training can be highly beneficial and most easily
incorporated by lower-level learners, in particular. At the same time, Siegel (2015) proposes a level of caution as an over-reliance on TD processing can be potentially detrimental if learners’ prior knowledge, on which they base their assumptions, is contradictory.

**Metacognitive processing skills**

Metacognitive strategies refer to a learner’s ability to plan, monitor, and reflect on their listening. Development of metacognitive processing generally centers around awareness raising. This can be highly effective as it enables learners “to deal with listening tasks much more tactfully, to plan in advance for the strategies to be used and to be aware and responsible for their own learning” (Movahed, 2014, p. 94), and it helps them tackle authentic listening texts on their own (Vandergrift, 2004). Moreover, as a learner’s listening proficiency and use of metacognitive processing increases, their reliance on TD strategies begins to decrease. Not surprisingly, then, scholars in the field have reported on the benefits of metacognitive consciousness raising on learners’ listening performance (e.g., Chen, 2010; Graham & Macaro, 2008; Kobayashi, 2018; Macaro, 2006; Movahed, 2014; Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, & Tafaghodtari, 2006).

Yeldham (2018) notes that many scholars have debated whether focusing on just one or a combination of the aforementioned processing skills is more beneficial. Based on the findings and recommendations of researchers in the field (e.g., Graham & Macaro, 2008; Graham, Santos, & Vanderplank 2011; Siegel, 2015; Yeldham, 2018; Zanjani & Izadpanah, 2016), we decided to implement an approach that addresses all three processing skills.

**Important Studies that have Shaped this Evaluation**

In a context similar to the current study, Siegel and Siegel (2015) reviewed an explicit listening treatment for 21 lower-intermediate Japanese university English learners studying in their compulsory English courses. The treatment focused on a series of supplementary listening activities targeting six BU skills (e.g., phonological and parsing skills), repeated three times in addition to listening activities connected to the course textbook. Participants from the treatment group recorded greater improvement in the post-treatment dictation test compared to the control group. Also, only the treatment group achieved a more significant increase in the standardized listening test (CASEC). When participants reflected on their listening skills at the end of the treatment period, they reported an improvement in their confidence listening, listening comprehension skills, and overall listening proficiency. Moreover, their participants expressed positive opinions of the BU activities. In their conclusion, the authors argued that BU skills (e.g., perception, parsing, and chunking) require explicit attention during listening instruction and they called for more interest from researchers in this area as BU skills may be more efficiently acquired through explicit training and instruction.

Following the progress of four Taiwanese English learners, Yeldham and Gruba (2016) evaluated a listening course that emphasized BU skills. After establishing learner’s preferences as either being predominantly TD or BU, students received a coordinated sequence of BU instruction. Although individual students benefited from some aspects of the instruction, little improvement was observed overall. A number of participants expressed boredom with BU rules and conventions, leading the authors to conclude that a more interactive instructional style that incorporates both BU and TD listening strategies would be preferable. As this study focused on only six participants, individual learner characteristics and preferences may have affected the findings.

In 2015, Joseph Siegel reported on his explicit listening strategy training component for upper-intermediate EFL students at a Japanese university. Guided by a qualitative action research orientation, that oversaw the teaching of 13 listening strategies over three treatment phases (N = 54; N = 23; N = 44), he reviewed each treatment cycle and provided insights into the different refinements that took place as the training program developed. Data were collected using questionnaires, interviews (with students and teachers), classroom observations, pre- and post-training listening tests, and research diaries. Siegel found
the training program was positively reviewed by students and teachers, in that students (1) preferred the explicit approach to other forms of L2 listening pedagogy, (2) developed a set of generalizable listening strategies which they believed could be deployed beyond the classroom, and more importantly, (3) believed their listening skills had improved. Despite strong perceptions of improved listening proficiency (evidenced by improved test scores and ease of listening to other L2 texts), Siegel’s participants still lacked confidence when listening. When they were asked to elaborate on the factors which restricted them from being more confident, students highlighted the native-like features of spoken English (e.g., rhythm and speed), accent varieties, and the pressure felt while listening, such as during a listening test. Many correlations can be drawn between this and the current study. These include the context (i.e., Japanese University L2 English course); the action research orientation (adopted to refine current pedagogy and the English program’s stance overall towards listening pedagogy); and approaches to data collection.

Another paper that was influential towards the design of the current study was Graham and Macaro’s (2008) review of 68 lower-intermediate French learners in England. Their study showed that learners who received listening strategy instruction not only performed significantly better on a listening test than those not receiving instruction, their sense of self-efficacy as L2 listeners also improved. The listening self-efficacy scale (LSES) employed by Graham and Macaro was adopted in the current study. Furthermore, their use of scaffolding (e.g., strategy lists & learner diaries) for developing learners’ metacognitive awareness, promoting reflection on strategy use and increasing learner’s sense of control over their learning were insightful in the way each of the processing skills were introduced to learners in the current study.

**ELF-informed listening**

An important fact that cannot be ignored in a discussion on L2 listening is that English is used as a contact language by a vastly greater number of non-native speakers than native speakers throughout the world (Graddol, 2003). This proliferation of ELF continues to spread and underscores the need for today’s learners to possess an ability to interpret, and be accepting of, the multitude of non-standard accents and lexicogrammatical features used in the real world.

This reality requires English educators to reconsider a long-held (and outdated) tendency to base classroom listening texts solely on content produced by native speakers. Instead, contemporary thinking calls for the inclusion of authentic listening texts that expose learners to a variety of non-standard accents and increase their awareness of how English is actually being used on a global, and more realistic, level (e.g., Bjorkman, 2011; McBride, 2016; Smith & Bisazza, 1982; Walker, 2010).

**Gaps in the Literature and Purposes of this Study**

With this study, we wanted to provide another account of an explicit listening strategy training program. Importantly, our focus is on Japanese beginner-level (CEFR level A1) English learners, studying in a foreign language learning context. This level of L2 learners has not been considered in any of the aforementioned studies. Moreover, compared to the aforementioned studies, this review reports on a much larger treatment group (N = 147). Our objective was to understand whether a balanced focus on TD and BU strategy training would be feasible with this level of language learner. Another factor that distinguishes this study from others is its ELF-orientation; namely, whether an ELF-informed approach to explicit listening instruction can effectively prepare students for listening to and engaging with other ELF users. Perhaps more importantly, we are not aware of any studies that have presented empirical findings which provide insights on lower proficiency English learners’ performance and efficacy in ELF-listening contexts.
Research Aims

This project was centrally driven by an action research orientation, with objectives to improve our efficacy as listening instructors and to develop listening training approaches that were more in alignment with the goals of our university’s ELF program. Following Burns’ model (1999), the four stages of action research in this study were:

- **Plan**: Identify the problem or area to improve, review available literature and plan a response for improving that area (i.e., create a more effective listening training program for ELF students).
- **Act**: Implement the response (i.e., to run the explicit listening training program)
- **Observe**: Collect data related to the intervention (e.g., listening tests, teacher observations, questionnaire data)
- **Reflect**: Review the data, draw conclusions, and redevelop the listening program for another implementation.

Qualitative and quantitative approaches were employed to gauge whether this intervention was successful in promoting our learners’ listening proficiency and self-efficacy. Furthermore, students’ perceptions of the different activities were sought. The training program lasted two months (December 2018 & January 2019) and we set out to answer the following questions:

1. Can an ELF informed program of listening strategy instruction bring about a change in listening performance for beginner-level English students?
2. Did the treatment help learners become more confident about listening in ELF contexts according to the listening self-efficacy scale?
3. Did students perceive ELF-informed listening activities positively?

Methodology

Data Collection

The following section describes our methods of data collection. This includes details concerning the measurement devices and treatments that were employed as well as a description of the participants.

Measurement devices

To establish the proficiency level of participants, two measurements were employed. Students’ aural vocabulary understanding was measured using McLean, Kramer and Beglar’s (2015) listening vocabulary levels test (LVLT), that tests students’ knowledge of the first five thousand bands of high-frequency English vocabulary and the academic word list. This test was implemented during the class time immediately before the treatment period.

To appraise changes in listening performance, pre- and post-training listening tests (shared in Appendix A) were created by the researchers. The ELF-focused listening tests featured a conversation between two, non-native English speakers (Mexican male and Guatemalan female). In order to establish some degree of standardization between the pre- and post-listening tests: (1) a corpus analysis of the transcripts using Lex Tutor (lextutor.ca) was conducted to confirm that both texts were of a similar level of difficulty linguistically; (2) both texts contained the same (two) speakers, (3) the conversations were similar in length, and (4) both conversations focused on the same topic "Have you ever had a bad job?". The first section of the tests consisted of six multiple-choice listening comprehension questions, each with four
answer choices (i.e., A-D). Then, during the second listening, students completed a cloze test based on the conversation’s transcript to evaluate the BU processing skills and word recognition. Compared to other popular approaches for measuring BU processing skills, such as a dictation task, a cloze test format was adopted because it could be more reliably marked, and we could be more selective of the words to omit from the text (Yeldham, 2017). Based on Yeldham’s (2017) recommendations, we did not mark misspelled responses as incorrect in the cloze test. For both sections of the listening test, students were only permitted to listen to the text once. A final consideration relating to the tests’ design was that these formats were not practiced during the training period. This decision was made so as to provide evidence of strategy transferability (Macaro, 2006); that students could transfer the strategies they learned to a different listening task.

Immediately following the cloze test, students were instructed to complete a digital, Japanese version of the Listening Self-Efficacy Questionnaire - LSEQ (adapted from Graham & Macaro, 2008), which aimed to gauge students’ perceptions of their listening abilities and their level of confidence. The online questionnaire featured the following questions:

1. How sure are you that you could understand the gist of what you hear?
2. How sure are you that you could understand the details?
3. How sure are you that you could work out the meaning of unknown or incomprehensible words?
4. How sure are you that you could recognize opinions expressed in the text?

The timing for the LSEQ was based on the approach taken by Graham and Macaro (2008) and Yeldham’s (2017) suggestion to implement it immediately after a listening task to reduce temporal distance. Upon completing the LSEQ, the researchers marked the listening tests, and students recorded their scores in a Google Form. At the post-treatment stage, this Google Form also included four questions asking respondents to reflect on the listening training program and changes to their listening skills.

**Treatments**

Informed by our reading of the literature, our collective understanding of our students’ needs and the ELF course objectives, six BU and six TD activities were created. The activities summarized in Table 1 below were administered in the authors’ classes and took 15 to 30 minutes to complete. To ensure a unified approach to leading the different activities, and to improve instruction, the researchers observed each other’s classes, made notes, and informally discussed their experiences during the treatment period.

**TABLE 1**

*List of Activities Designed to Practice BU and TD Listening Strategies*

| Bottom Up | Top Down |
|-----------|---------|
| 1. Discriminate between phonemes (/æ:/ & /ʌ:/) | 2. Taking notes & Inferencing |
| 3. Identifying fillers | 4. Picture match |
| 5. Identifying lexical differences | 6. Picture ordering |
| 7. Nuclear stress | 8. Predicting syntax and lexicon |
| 9. Running dictation | 10. Summarizing |
| 11. Word catch | 12. Inferencing |

Common features of this treatment program include:
1. Individual worksheets created for each listening strategy (see examples in Appendix B & C). All worksheets featured a title (noting the specific strategy), a clear goal statement for the activity, and a brief summary highlighting the purpose and relevance of the strategy to pique students’ metacognitive awareness.

2. An ELF focus, with all listening texts featuring non-native English speakers. Pronunciation research in ELF (e.g., Jenkins, 2000; Walker, 2010) also informed some of the listening activities (e.g., Discriminate between phonemes & Nuclear stress). A more detailed explanation of the ELF-informed activities can be found in Dimoski and Milliner (2019).

3. A personal tracking element (listening diary) whereby students followed their progress with a strategy list.

4. Self-evaluation (Listening diary). Students reflected on their listening immediately after each training session (e.g., ranking how well they listened to the text, and the usefulness of the training session).

5. A dedicated introduction to each activity which (a) clearly defined the strategy to be focused on, (b) promoted schemata relating to the topic discussed by the speakers or the speaker’s backgrounds, and (c) in most activities, modeling from the teacher to illustrate the listening process.

**Listening diary**

To raise metacognitive awareness and promote reflection on listening strategy use, a listening diary (see Appendix D) was implemented. Following the experience of Graham and Macaro (2008, p. 762), where their students’ diaries “were not well kept”, this study implemented a more scaffolded approach. Immediately following each treatment, students were asked to rate three aspects related to the particular training session: (1) the usefulness of the skill training, (2) how well they were able to listen, and (3) what they thought of the activity. Students also had the opportunity to write comments if they wished. Both researchers read the diaries throughout the treatment period, to gather feedback and also to inform the design of future training sessions. After the training period, learner’s diaries were also analyzed to help answer the third research question, *Did students perceive ELF-informed listening activities positively?*

**Participants**

This study was undertaken in eight of the researchers’ compulsory, four-skills ELF-focused classes at a private university in Japan. Participants were a combination of freshman and sophomore Japanese students aged between 18 and 21 years old studying in either the Education, Agriculture, Liberal Arts, Engineering, or Humanities departments. All students were streamed into their beginner-level English class (correlating with CEFR level A1) based on TOEIC test scores. The average TOEIC score achieved prior to the treatment was 301/990 (listening section average 187/495) and participants’ average score in the LVLT was 88/150. The mean scores for each class are summarized in Table 2 below. Our review of these scores indicated that participants had a similar level of listening and overall English proficiency. The overall sample (N = 147) was made up of students who participated in listening training sessions and who completed both the pre- and post-treatment tests.

Ethical guidelines for academic research were carefully followed by the researchers. Approval from the university’s research committee was received before commencing this study and students signed a written consent form that permitted the researchers to analyze their test scores and survey responses.
TABLE 2
Summary of Class Levels Prior to the Treatment according to the TOEIC® Test and LVLT (N=147)

| Class | TOEIC Overall (Mean score/990) | TOEIC Listening (Mean score/495) | LVLT (Mean score/150) |
|-------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|
| A6 (n=17) | 325                           | 199                             | 84                    |
| B6 (n=17) | 320                           | 192                             | 95                    |
| E6 (n=17) | 281                           | 173                             | 91                    |
| F8 (n=16) | 297                           | 187                             | 84                    |
| G6 (n=18) | 290                           | 178                             | 89                    |
| H4 (n=24) | 305                           | 196                             | 94                    |
| J2 (n=20) | 295                           | 185                             | 88                    |
| K2 (n=18) | 306                           | 189                             | 86                    |

Analysis and Findings

Listening Test Results

The independent variable was the treatment group and there were two sets of dependent measures taken at the pre- and post-treatment stages: (1) listening comprehension test scores and (2) cloze tests scores. All statistical analysis was undertaken using the JASP 0.9.1.0 (jasp-stats.org) software. A paired samples t-test was used to assess the hypothesis that students would achieve a higher listening test score after the listening training component (research question one).

A comparison between pre- (3.17/6) and post-listening training test scores (2.95/6) showed that the listening comprehension score went down slightly (SE:.139; see Figure 1). The paired samples t-test, however, showed the decrease was not statistically significant ($t(146) = 1.562, p > .05$).

![Figure 1. Plot comparing the pre- and post-listening comprehension test scores.](image-url)
In the cloze test, students’ scores also went down slightly between the pre-training (4.10/15) and post-training (3.82/15; SE .222). Again, the returns from the paired samples t-test showed the decrease to be insignificant (t(146)= 1.288, p > .05). Figure 2 describes the trend in scores.

Along with the slight decrease in scores, the actual scores themselves are noteworthy. Despite efforts taken by the researchers to ensure the listening texts were an appropriate level, in each test, the sample averaged close to 50% of the maximum score in the comprehension test and slightly over 25% in the cloze. Some explanations for why the sample performed so poorly will be addressed in the discussion section.

Listening Self-Efficacy Questionnaire (LSEQ)

The LSEQ questionnaire was administered immediately following the pre- and post-listening tests. Figure 3 below shows improved outcomes occurred across all four items at the end of the treatment. Specifically, in response to question one, ‘How sure are you that you could understand the gist of what you hear?’; the mean value prior to the treatment was 27.8 and 33.27 (up 5.47) following Test 2. Similarly, in response to question two, ‘How sure are you that you could understand the details?’; the mean rose from 25.7 to 31.8. Post-treatment responses for question three, ‘How sure are you that you could work out the meaning of unknown or incomprehensible words?’ resulted in the greatest increase in mean values; rising from 25.12 to 32.52. The second largest increase in mean values (up 7.28) was in response to question four, ‘How sure are you that you could recognize opinions expressed in the text?’; which went from 31.18 to 38.46. These results indicate modest gains in students’ perceived ability to infer the meaning of unknown words, follow opinions, and slightly less so, understand the gist and specific details with greater confidence.
Students’ Perceptions of the ELF-Informed Listening Activities

Listening diary responses

Students’ responses for each of the twelve listening activities from their listening diaries were analyzed to help answer research question three. The results summarized in Table 3 below report on students’ responses to the following questions: (1) How useful was this skill training? (2) How well did you listen? and (3) How was this activity? It is important to note that, due to student absences during some activities, the number of respondents ranged from 126 to 138 during the treatment period.

In summarizing ‘My Listening Diary’ data set, five of the activities stand out. Activity 2 (Taking notes) recorded the lowest (or among the lowest) mean, and median, values pertaining to each of the three questions. We suspect this lower rating may, at least in part, be due to the exceptionally poor audio quality of the associated listening text. Another activity that ranked lowly, although to a lesser extent, in terms of median and mean values was Activity 10 (Summarizing). Activity 11 (Word catch) received the highest median and mean values of all twelve activities as well as in all three of the question items. It was closely followed by activities 1 (Discriminate between phonemes), 3 (Identifying fillers), 7 (Identifying nuclear stress), and 8 (Predicting syntax and lexicon), which generally resulted in higher mean values than the other activities across all three items.

It is interesting to note that, for the most part, students’ responses to questions one and three appear somewhat aligned. Responses to question two (How well did you listen?), on the other hand, are among the lowest in almost every case. This suggests that students were able to distinguish between the value of the skills (and activities) they were practicing and their ability to use them. In other words, students did not appear to dismiss the value of a skill (or activity) simply because they found it challenging.
TABLE 3
Results from Students’ ‘My Listening Diary’.

| Activity                          | 1. How useful was this skill training? | 2. How well did you listen? | 3. How was this activity? |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| N  | S  | Med | M  | SD | N  | S  | Med | M  | SD | N  | S  | Med | M  | SD |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. Discriminate between phonemes  | 137 | 531 | 4  | 3.88 | 0.85 | 461 | 3  | 3.36 | 0.98 | 533 | 4  | 3.89 | 0.88 |
| 2. Taking notes                   | 126 | 427 | 3  | 3.39 | 0.95 | 329 | 3  | 2.61 | 0.95 | 409 | 3  | 3.25 | 0.89 |
| 3. Identifying fillers            | 136 | 516 | 4  | 3.79 | 0.84 | 485 | 4  | 3.57 | 0.89 | 512 | 4  | 3.76 | 0.80 |
| 4. Picture match                  | 126 | 468 | 4  | 3.71 | 0.82 | 408 | 3  | 3.24 | 0.87 | 473 | 4  | 3.75 | 0.77 |
| 5. Identifying lexical differences | 138 | 515 | 4  | 3.73 | 0.82 | 477 | 4  | 3.46 | 0.89 | 512 | 4  | 3.71 | 0.83 |
| 6. Picture ordering               | 136 | 495 | 4  | 3.64 | 0.85 | 475 | 4  | 3.49 | 0.88 | 503 | 4  | 3.70 | 0.92 |
| 7. Identifying nuclear stress     | 134 | 497 | 4  | 3.77 | 0.85 | 478 | 4  | 3.57 | 0.95 | 517 | 4  | 3.86 | 0.89 |
| 8. Predicting syntax and lexicon  | 130 | 493 | 4  | 3.79 | 0.77 | 463 | 4  | 3.56 | 0.88 | 497 | 4  | 3.82 | 0.80 |
| 9. Running dictation              | 129 | 481 | 4  | 3.73 | 0.83 | 448 | 4  | 3.47 | 0.85 | 489 | 4  | 3.79 | 0.82 |
| 10. Summarizing                   | 138 | 459 | 3  | 3.33 | 0.78 | 421 | 3  | 3.05 | 0.97 | 476 | 3  | 3.45 | 0.84 |
| 11. Word catch                    | 130 | 514 | 4  | 3.95 | 0.79 | 515 | 4  | 3.96 | 0.84 | 527 | 4  | 4.05 | 0.84 |
| 12. Inferencing                   | 134 | 489 | 4  | 3.65 | 0.76 | 463 | 3  | 3.46 | 0.91 | 508 | 4  | 3.79 | 0.82 |

Note. N=Number of respondents, S=Sum, Med=Median, M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation

Post-treatment questionnaire responses

Following the treatment and post-treatment test, students were invited to reflect on the training in a short questionnaire that solicited their level of agreement with three statements (written in Japanese): (1) The listening training I did in this class has enabled me to listen more effectively; (2) The listening training I did in this class will enable me to communicate more effectively in ELF interactions in the future; and, (3) The listening training I did in this class has improved my overall English communication skills. In addition, students were asked to share any comments or suggestions they had for the listening training program. For analysis purposes, all comments were translated by the researchers from Japanese to English. Regarding the first item on the questionnaire; that is, whether the listening training had enabled students to listen more effectively (see Figure 4 below), the majority (81%) of them either agreed (71%) or strongly agreed (10%) that the listening training had been effective. Comments received by two students provide further evidence of this perceived improvement, “My listening skills increased.”, and “I think my listening skills have improved.” Disagreement with the item was expressed by 19% of the participants. Comments shared by some in this minority group provide additional insights: “It was very difficult.”, and “Pronunciation is difficult to hear in the first place.”
The results show that 112 (76%) of participants believed or strongly believed that the listening training would enable them to communicate more effectively in ELF interactions in the future (see Figure 5). A comment by one student, who strongly agreed with this statement, demonstrates that despite the difficulty, exposure to non-native pronunciation (i.e., an ELF context) was viewed positively: “There was a problem of pronunciation that was a little difficult, but it was a good opportunity to study because it was the original pronunciation.” Twenty-six (18% of) students indicated they were undecided, while seven (5% of) students disagreed with the item, and 2 (1%) of them strongly disagreed.

Finally, in response to the third item on the questionnaire, a total of 107 (73%) students agreed or strongly agreed that their overall English communication skills had improved as a result of the listening training (see Figure 6).
Because we incorporated speaking opportunities in the listening activities to allow students to practice the skills with each other, a comment by one student, who agreed with the statement, demonstrates an improvement in their communication skills, “I felt like I was talking a little faster.” Conversely, 32 (22%) of our participants registered a neutral response, while 7 (4%) disagreed and 3 (1%) strongly disagreed with the statement.

Discussion

In this section, we address the relationship and relevance of our findings by revisiting each of our research questions. We also acknowledge the challenges we faced during the study and propose interventions for the next phase of our research.

Listening Performance

Contrary to our hypothesis that participants’ listening scores would increase at the post-treatment stage, no significant change was observed across both the comprehension and cloze tests. There are a number of potential reasons which may account for this. Firstly, the condensed training period could have prevented learners from being able to acquire the targeted skills effectively. Each training lasted between 10 and 20 minutes, and a different skill or strategy was focused on almost every class, hence only a very short period of time was dedicated to practicing each skill. Moreover, we did not provide additional opportunities for students to try implementing the strategies they had just learned outside of the training program. Additionally, as Yeldham and Gruba (2016) found, too much direct teaching of strategies at one time risks alienating some students because it can be monotonous and misdirected as there may be some strategies that the learners are already using. Although this did not appear to be an issue in the current study, a less condensed training period may have fostered better listening test results.

An additional explanation is whether the specific strategies targeted and the time spent working on practicing each strategy prepared students to succeed in these listening tests. Some of the BU trainings, such as, Nuclear Stress or Discriminating Between Phonemes may have served the ELF utility of the program, but they, perhaps, are not as effective as training on Connected-Speech and Short-Dictations for helping students to succeed in the cloze test. And, likewise, most of the TD trainings worked with
pictures and taking notes on paper. They did not require students to read and deduct the answer from comprehension questions.

This treatment’s focus on lower proficiency listeners and their poor scores in the listening tests are important considerations. Students’ scores in the LVLT taken prior to the listening training program indicated a lack of high-frequency vocabulary knowledge. According to Nation and Newton (2009), the most important 2000 and 3000-word families make up a large portion of spoken discourse, hence it is difficult to be able to listen effectively without a solid knowledge of them. The critical importance of high-frequency vocabulary knowledge to listening comprehension has also been shown empirically by Wang and Treffers-Daller (2017), and more recently, Matthews (2018). Interestingly, a student comment; namely, “I felt the need to develop more words.” in the Post-Treatment Questionnaire provides added credence to Nation’s and Newton’s claim.

Our learners’ limited vocabulary knowledge may have meant they fell under Graham, Santos and Vanderplank’s (2010) proposed linguistic threshold for the effective use of listening strategies, such as inferencing and monitoring. For our learners, the use of these strategies may have amounted to not much more than guessing. Furthermore, students’ under-developed, knowledge of high-frequency vocabulary could have moved them to (a) focus too much on decoding words, which limited areas of their working memory that could otherwise be dedicated to top-down processes, (b) over-rely on top-down processes that is to the detriment of their comprehension accuracy (Siegel & Siegel, 2015; Yeldham & Gruba, 2016), and/or (c) utilize a specific group of strategies because those strategies are the only ones that their linguistic knowledge allows them to use (Graham & Macaro, 2008). While this study did not look into students’ actual use of strategies, poor LVLT results and the groups’ poor performance in the listening tests may indicate that a more effective listening training would also consolidate learners’ knowledge of high-frequency vocabulary. Also, Graham, Santos and Vanderplank’s (2010) proposed linguistic thresholds for the effective use of strategies may be an important area of exploration in future listening training and research.

Based on our findings, it appears that our learners’ uptake of certain listening strategies, although at their disposal, was low. Given these results, and recognizing that a linguistic threshold may have prevented our lower-proficiency learners from taking advantage of otherwise valuable TD processing skills, we surmise that a dual approach; that is, the incorporation of comprehensible material (see Renandya & Farrell, 2010), such as listening to graded reader audiobooks, alongside simple BU, TD, and metacognitive training may have yielded more positive results.

**Learner Attributes**

An increase in students’ self-efficacy was observed across all items in the LSEQ, mirroring the findings of Graham and Macaro (2008). Also, in the post-training questionnaire, students displayed positive beliefs that the training fostered improved listening skills, helped prepare them to communicate more effectively in ELF, and bolstered their confidence to communicate in English. In some regards, this result was surprising. When reflecting on the listening training he implemented at a Japanese university, Siegel (2015) stressed the importance of tying the strategy training to its application in the wider L2 context (e.g., connecting to speaking skills). Some attention from the teachers in this study was given to communicating this point, nevertheless, it was not a carefully planned out component. Furthermore, as noted in the previous section, the condensed nature of the treatment period meant that students received a few practical opportunities to use the strategies they learned. Therefore, we were somewhat surprised to learn how strongly participants made these connections. One explanation may be related to the listening texts selected, as they all featured non-native speakers, engaging in real-life communicative scenarios, which this group of students could relate to (e.g., taking telephone messages, summarizing and dealing with a speaker who has an unfamiliar accent). In future implementations of the training, this is a concept that is worth exploring. Furthermore, it emphasizes the utility of carefully selected listening texts.
Perceptions of ELF-Informed Listening Activities

On the whole, the analysis of students’ listening diaries and responses to the post-treatment questionnaire revealed an overall satisfaction with the ELF-informed listening activities. This is evidenced, in part, by the fact that nearly all (i.e., except two) of the activities resulted in a median value of 4 out of five from responses collected in students’ listening diaries. Comments also provided by students in the post-treatment questionnaire help to validate this conclusion:

- There was a problem of pronunciation that was a little difficult, but it was a good opportunity to study because it was the original pronunciation and a little characteristic on the whole.
- Very interesting and enjoyable.
- There were a lot of activities and it was fun.
- I wanted to practice more listening.

There were, however, some students who found the non-native speaker texts exponentially more difficult:

- I felt that using the elllo.org texts was effective, but I think that the speaker’s English made it by far my most difficult listening training.
- Because the speakers were not native speakers, it made the tasks too difficult for my listening level.

In view of students’ beginner level, the researchers recognize that some students at this stage may need to be nurtured with listening tasks featuring pronunciation and lexicogrammatical styles that students may be more familiar with (e.g., standard American pronunciation that dominates most high-school textbooks).

Implications

Results reported in the current study raise several issues and potential lessons for language practitioners, both in general and ELF-focused contexts.

First of all, the outcomes from the current study suggest that explicit teaching of listening skills/styles to beginner-level students is a worthwhile endeavor. This assertion is based on the positive outcomes observed from multiple data, including the listening self-efficacy questionnaire, post-treatment questionnaire, and students’ listening diaries, which collectively show that, despite the fast pace and the challenges our low-level learners faced to learn new listening skills, their responses to the training, activities, and their own self-efficacy was favorable. These outcomes are all the more noteworthy when considering that listening comprehension is known to induce anxiety among L2 learners (e.g., Elkhafaifi, 2005; Kim, 2002; Movahed, 2014; Vogely, 1999) as it requires them to process a large volume of auditory input rapidly (Graham & Macaro, 2008).

Additionally, we concur with Yeldham and Gruba, (2016), who argue that learners should be made aware of a wide variety of strategies so they can use whichever ones they see fit. Given that this study took a multi-skill approach to listening training, we believe it has provided our students with a tool-set they can apply independently to match their individual learning styles and address their unique learning needs, we hope, far beyond this study.

Finally, based on results from the pre and post-listening tests, it is clear that the development of listening skills is not instantaneous, but rather requires sustained practice. In addition to the relatively short treatment period, our learners’ lack of vocabulary knowledge may have hindered their ability to listen accurately and comprehend meaning. Furthermore, it may be safe to assume that our learners’
unfamiliarity with the non-native accents and pronunciation they encountered added to the difficulty of the listening tasks. Although we have no empirical means of ascertaining the degree to which this may have been a factor, comments by students in the post-treatment student questionnaire, such as “There was a problem of pronunciation that was a little difficult, but it was a good opportunity to study because it was the original pronunciation and a little characteristic on the whole.”, and “Pronunciation is difficult to hear in the first place.”, provide at least some evidence to support this assertion. Consequently, establishing the degree to which, if at all, an unfamiliarity with non-native accents and non-standard lexicogrammatical usage (i.e., not only a lack of vocabulary) might affect learners’ listening efficacy could be a useful line of inquiry for future research.

Limitations

While our study observed a more positive outlook towards L2 listening from our learners and the listening activities were well received, the research design did not include a contrast group. As such, this study is unable to show that learners’ listening scores and levels of self-efficacy improved as a direct result of the explicit listening strategy training.

A second shortcoming concerns our measurement of listening development. Cross and Vandergrift (2014) recommend that a researcher-designed test is supplemented with a standardized test. Timetable constraints meant that we could not employ a standardized test of listening proficiency. This absence of a standardized measure makes it difficult to determine whether similar results would be observed in other L2 listening training contexts and whether the listening skills learned could be transferred to other listening tasks (i.e., listening outside of a dialog between two ELF speakers). In addition, some other types of listening tests may have provided a more valid measurement of listening development. For example, students could have been asked to produce a paragraph or orally describe what they understood from the listening text. We also did not measure how well our students acquired the different listening strategies. Using Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal and Tafaghodtari’s (2006) metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire, or Kobayashi’s (2018) Self-Regulated Learning in Listening Questionnaire, which was designed for Japanese students would have allowed us to comment on this area of students’ listening proficiency.

This project was not designed to fit positivist expectations for research (e.g., generalizability and validity), hence it was not undertaken under, strictly controlled laboratory-like conditions. Consequently, there was no control for incidental out-of-class English listening opportunities (e.g., internet use, conversations with English speakers on campus, and additional listening to the course’s textbooks). It is likely that student exposure to oral English outside the classroom varied, and it is difficult not to discount these activities from having an effect on the learner’s skills and perceptions.

Lastly, our data collection only measured participants’ opinions and skills at the end of the treatment period. The somewhat rushed, condensed treatment may have handicapped listening development as the different concepts may have only started to “sink-in” after further listening practice. Following Graham and Macaro (2008) and implementing a delayed post-test may have been a wiser decision to measure changes in listening skills and whether the most positive outlook relating to L2 listening could be maintained.

Conclusion and Future Directions

This action research study set out to understand whether an ELF-focused listening training component, with a balanced focus on BU, TD and Metacognitive strategies for beginner-level English learners would be well received and effective in promoting L2 listening skills. We were encouraged to learn that the activities were well received by the students, and while it may not have fostered an increase in listening
proficiency, the explicit training seemed to be successful in raising student awareness about the L2 listening process, and it elevated students’ sense of self-efficacy towards listening in their L2, English.

Given the action research focus of this study, we are now refining our approaches before embarking on a new treatment cycle. Some of the refinements will include: (a) using a standardized test of listening proficiency (TOEIC); (b) conducting a maximum of two strategy trainings a week compared to three or four times per-week; (c) exposing students to listening tasks external from the training (e.g., graded reader audiobooks and other online content), which students can practice combining different listening strategies; (d) including a comparison group to more validly evaluate the effectiveness of this training program; (e) conducting a delayed post-test (similar to Graham & Macaro, 2008); (f) giving students greater opportunities to reflect on their strategy use with peers and in the listening diary document; (g) improving our approaches for introducing and modeling the different strategies because we recognize that the technical terminology used and the concepts behind these labels may be beyond our beginner students; and, (h) communicating the utility of these skills outside of the TOEIC test and classroom assessment.

Based on the outcomes reported in the current study, we acknowledge that a wide scope for further research still remains. One worthwhile area of investigation, for example, would be to compare the effect, if any, of non-native accents versus native speaker accents, which learners are more accustomed to, on learners’ listening efficacy and their use of listening strategies. Such a comparison, to the best of our knowledge, has yet to be explored.
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Appendix A

Pre-Test: Listening Comprehension  <http://www.elllo.org/video/1451/1458-Silvia-BadBoss.html>

Name: __________________________  Class: ____________

LISTENING COMPREHENSION: Part 1 (Score: _____/6)
Watch the video of Silvia and Diego speaking and then answer the questions below.

Silvia talked about the worst job she ever had.

1. What was the main reason she didn't like it?
   A. The location
   B. The boss
   C. The salary
   D. The customers

2. How long did she work there?
   A. Three years
   B. One year
   C. Two months
   D. Four weeks

3. What time did Silvia start her job?
   A. Eleven
   B. Five
   C. Ten
   D. Seven

4. In what kind of shop did Silvia work?
   A. Prada
   B. Movie rental
   C. Clothing
   D. Carpet

5. How many shops did the store chain have?
   A. 8
   B. 18
   C. 80
   D. 118

6. What can be inferred about the woman?
   A. She loves Prada.
   B. She hated her boss.
   C. She loved her job.
   D. She is famous.
Pre-Test: Listening Cloze

LISTENING COMPREHENSION: Part 2 (Score: _____/15)
Watch the video of Silvia and Diego speaking, and fill-in the blanks below.

Diego: Hello, this is Diego from Mexico.

Silvia: Hi, I'm Silvia from Guatemala.

Diego: And I (1) _______ (2) _______ you a question. Can you tell me about your worst job ever?

Silvia: Yeah, I had a really bad job. I was there for two months. Have you seen the movie The Devil Wears Prada?

Diego: Yes.

Silvia: Well, that movie (3) _______ (4) _______ of my job.

Diego: Really?

Silvia: Imagine.

Diego: Why?

Silvia: Because my boss was the devil. He was. Actually, it was a very exhausting job, and you had to be there by seven a.m. until five. But, I never left after five. I always, I'm sorry, I never...

Diego: Before five.

Silvia: Before five. I always left around six, and still you had to go on Saturday

(5) _______ (6) _______ (7) _______.

Diego: Oh, and what was this job for?

Silvia: Actually, it's a clothing chain in Guatemala. It's quite famous, so they have around 80 stores, and the job was (8) _______ (9) _______ , and the boss was just...

Diego: Too demanding.

Silvia: And even a little bit, how do you say, like (10) _______ (11) _______ of treating people was not nice at all. Like he would even tell you, like, "Are you stupid or what?"

Diego: Wow, that sounds horrible.

Silvia: It was horrible. So (12) _______ (13) _______ the Devil Wears Prada is one of my favorite movies. It just reminds me of my job.

Diego: Oh!

Silvia: I (14) _______ (15) _______ nightmares of my boss after quitting.

Diego: Wow!

Silvia: Imagine. It was a really bad job.
**Post-Test: Listening Comprehension**  [http://www.elllo.org/video/1451/1457-Deigo-BadDay.html]

| Name: ___________________________________________________________________________ Class: __________ |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| **LISTENING COMPREHENSION: Part 1 (Score: _____/6)**                                                                                     |
| Watch the video of Diego and Silvia speaking and answer the questions below.                                                         |
|                                                                                                                                 |
| **Diego talked about a bad experience at work.**                                                                                     |
| 1. Why did Diego carry his boss's bag?                                                                                               |
| A. His boss had a toothache.                                                                                                       |
| B. His boss had a headache.                                                                                                        |
| C. His boss had a backache.                                                                                                        |
| D. His boss had a stomachache.                                                                                                     |
| 2. Which ONE of the following was Diego NOT carrying?                                                                                |
| A. Files                                                                                                                          |
| B. Two bags                                                                                                                       |
| C. Laptops                                                                                                                        |
| D. Food                                                                                                                          |
| 3. Which of the following statements is true?                                                                                       |
| A. Diego didn't arrive at the meeting.                                                                                              |
| B. Diego arrived at the meeting early.                                                                                              |
| C. Diego arrived at the meeting right on time.                                                                                      |
| D. Diego arrived at the meeting a little late.                                                                                      |
| 4. Where did Diego spill the coffee?                                                                                               |
| A. In a cafeteria                                                                                                                 |
| B. In a meeting room                                                                                                               |
| C. In his boss's office                                                                                                            |
| D. In India                                                                                                                       |
| 5. On whom did Diego spill the coffee?                                                                                             |
| A. A Mexican man                                                                                                                  |
| B. An Indian man                                                                                                                  |
| C. A Mexican woman                                                                                                                |
| D. An Indian woman                                                                                                                |
| 6. What can be inferred about the coffee?                                                                                          |
| A. It was very delicious.                                                                                                          |
| B. It was too sweet.                                                                                                               |
| C. It hurt someone.                                                                                                                |
| D. It was from Starbucks.                                                                                                          |
Post-Test: Listening Cloze

LISTENING COMPREHENSION: Part 2 (Score: _____/15)
Watch the video of Silvia and Diego speaking, and fill-in the blanks below.

Silvia: Hi, my name is Silvia. I’m from Guatemala.

Diego: And my name is Diego. I’m from Mexico.

Silvia: Diego, I want to ask you something. Have you ever had a really bad job?

Diego: Ummm. I don’t think I’ve (1)_________ (2)_________ (3)_________ bad job, but I had a really bad experience while working. And, I was working at the World Trade Organization, and it’s a very intense place to work at, and what happened is that my boss had a back problem, so one day his back really, really hurt, and we were a bit late for a meeting, but we needed coffee because when (4)_________ (5)_________ you need coffee. Right?

Silvia: Of course.

Diego: So, we went to buy coffee at the cafeteria, and I asked him if I should carry his bag, and he said yes because he had the back problem, so I was carrying his bag, my bag and files, because I was an intern.

Silvia: Don’t (6)_________ (7)_________ you spilled the coffee on the files?

Diego: No.

Silvia: OK.

Diego: It’s even worse.

Silvia: Worse?

Diego: Worse!

Silvia: Oh my God!

Diego: I was carrying, coffee, files, (8)_________ (9)_________ laptops, or two bags and what happened is that it was a meeting. And, it was a very important meeting with representatives from 153 countries, and we went inside the meeting room and it’s long, long, long, long tables with chairs on each side. And I was staggering, (10)_________ (11)_________ through the chairs, and what happened is that I was holding the coffee, and then my bag fell from my shoulder to my elbow. And the coffee just went like Huu into the meeting room, and it (12)_________ (13)_________ the representative from India and ... 

Silvia: Oh, my gosh!

Diego: It was horrible because we were there late, so the meeting was going on, and I spilled the coffee, burning hot coffee on the guy from India. And, he just jumped and he screamed, and then everybody was just looking at me, and I think it’s one (14)_________ (15)_________ most embarrassing moments in my life.

Silvia: It is actually.
Appendix B

Example of a TD Lesson

Predicting Syntax and Lexicon

- **Goal**: To predict syntax and lexicon before it is used.
- **Purpose**: To be able to predict the syntax and lexicon spoken by a non-native English speaker more effectively.

1) Before You Watch

Read the transcript below and try to predict the words in the blank spaces (on the left).

**Aiste / Lithuania**

![Aiste's image](http://www.ello.org/video/M001/M020Freetime.htm)

**Transcript**

Hello, this is ello.org and my 1. (_________ / __________) is Aiste. I'm 2. (_________ / __________) Lithuania, and I will talk now about the free time and how I spend it. Well currently I'm a student so I try to study a lot, but as a student, I also 3. (_________ / __________) to have fun and spend my free time in the way I want to. Usually when I'm tired, I like relaxing in my 4. (_________ / __________) time and that would be just going out somewhere for a walk, going to the sea, 5. (_________ / __________) to eat something nice, to cook something nice or just watch 6. (_________ / __________) and try not to think about many things. The other way of spending my free time if I am not 7. (_________ / __________), then I like to do something and that would probably be traveling. I think I prefer 8. (_________ / __________) the most of all the activities I could think of, for the spending free time. I 9. (_________ / __________) think that knowing other countries and going for even a small trip around your village or your town that you stay in is a wonderful thing 10. (_________ / __________) you can never know what things you can discover there and what unknown places you can see.

2) While You Watch

Check your predictions by writing the words you hear in the spaces (on the right).
Appendix C

Example of a BU Lesson

Word Catch

- **Goal:** To recognize and identify specific words you hear.
- **Purpose:** To be able to recognize and identify specific words spoken by a non-native English speaker more effectively.

**Part 1**

Read the list of words below. Then watch the video of Widuri, from Indonesia, talking about traveling alone, and circle only the words you hear.

---

**Widuri / Indonesia**

[Image: Widuri from Indonesia]

[Video Link: http://www.ello.org/video/1451/1462-Widuri-Travel.html]

---

**Word List**

------------- dislike / like ------------- actually / however ------------- maybe / definitely

------------- we’re / you’re -------------. map / maps ------------- homepage / website

------------- usually / always ------------- relatives / friends ------------- bad / good

------------- feel / think

---

**Part 2**

Listen again in small teams (or in pairs) and clap your hands (loudly) when you hear each of the words you circled above. The first team (or pair) to clap will receive one point. If you clap on the wrong word, you will lose a point.
Appendix D

Listening Diary

| Date | Listening Activity | How useful was this skill training? | How well did you listen? | How was this activity? |
|------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
|      | 1. Discriminate between phonemes (BU) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|      | 2. Taking notes (TD) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|      | 3. Identifying fillers (BU) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|      | 4. Picture match (TD) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|      | 5. Identifying lexical differences (BU) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|      | 6. Picture ordering (TD) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|      | 7. Nuclear stress (BU) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|      | 8. Predicting syntax and lexicon (TD) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|      | 9. Running dictation (BU) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|      | 10. Summarizing (TD) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|      | 11. Word catch (BU) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |
|      | 12. Inferencing (TD) | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 | 1 2 3 4 5 |