

Effects of Task Conditions on Use of Listening Strategies by Chinese EFL Learners

by Yang Manzhen (jenny_yang88@hotmail.com) and Yu Zhuo (yuzhuo@hotmai.com), *Guangdong University of Foreign Studies*

This paper reports an exploratory study on the effects of two task conditions (i.e., without doing any listening task or Zero-task condition and after taking a listening comprehension test or Task condition) on listening strategies used by Chinese EFL learners. The purpose of the study is to find out whether different task conditions affect strategy application, whether learners at different proficiency levels use strategies differently on different task conditions, and whether strategy instructions have significant effects on learners' strategy use. Fifty-two first-year university students participated in this study, with ages ranging from 18 to 20. A listening proficiency test differentiated them into two groups: high level group or G_{high} (N=29) and low level group or G_{low} (N=23). The instrument of the study is a questionnaire with 24 items of specific cognitive listening strategies. The participants were required to answer the questionnaire twice: before and after eight-weeks' listening strategy training. Results show that (1) from Zero-task to Task condition, the overall mean score of the reported frequency of strategy use increased slightly for G_{high} while it decreased slightly in G_{low} ; (2) G_{high} used strategies more frequently on Task condition than on Zero-task condition, while G_{low} did not show significant difference on both task conditions; (3) on the same task conditions, the two groups showed significant differences in their strategy application in that G_{high} used strategies more frequently than G_{low} , especially on Task condition; (4) G_{high} responded more actively and effectively to strategy instructions than G_{low} .

■ Introduction

Learning strategies can be defined as conscious "steps taken by students to enhance their own learning" (Oxford, 1990: 1). More particularly, they are "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (Oxford, 1990: 8). Since the 1990s, many studies with diverse focuses have been done to investigate the effects of various factors on strategy use in language learning, such as language proficiency (Bedell & Oxford, 1996) and gender (Gu, 2002). In addition, more and more studies have also been done to assess the effectiveness of specific strategies applied on different task conditions during language learning (Hsiao & Oxford, 2002; Oxford et al., 2004).

The present study is a partial replication of Oxford et al.'s (2004) study on how task difficulty and proficiency affect the reported frequency of reading strategies used by language learners. The findings of their study indicate that task-based strategy assessment provides a more detailed and more contextualized picture of strategy use (Hsiao & Oxford, 2002). However, does this task-based strategy assessment apply to the listening strategies used by Chinese EFL learners? Our study aims to investigate the effects of two task conditions (Zero-task and Task) on the use of listening strategies by Chinese EFL learners at different proficiency levels.

Listening comprehension and listening strategies

Listening has been shown to play a key role in language learning because of its contribution to the development of the overall language proficiency (Rost, 2002). Listening comprehension is an active and complex process in which learners construct meanings from inputting information through a complex interaction between the characteristics of the input, the types of the declarative knowledge that is received, and the use of strategies to enhance understanding (Anderson, 1995). Cognitive theory holds that effective processing of information requires both top-down and bottom-up processing. The top-down processing is "a form of language processing that bases inferences on expectations and predictable generalisations cued by the incoming language" (Rost, 2002: 96), while the bottom-up processing begins with receiving and analyzing messages from different levels of organisation of an utterance (i.e., sounds, words, clauses, and sentences) and ends with getting the intended meaning (Abd El Al, 2002). During this procedure, the learners (processors) use "various techniques to select information, organize it, relate it to what they have already known" (Abd El Al, 2002: 39).

A number of studies have been done to examine the listening strategies employed by successful and less successful listeners. For example, O'Malley, Chamot, & Küpper (1989) examined what strategies high school

ESL students use in different stages of listening and whether there are any differences in the using of listening strategies between effective and ineffective listeners. By using think-aloud protocols, they identified three major listening strategies: self-monitoring, elaboration and inferencing. They also found significant differences in the use of listening strategies between effective and ineffective listeners. Vandergrift (1992) used a combination of semi-structured interviews, stimulated recall and think-aloud protocols to investigate the strategies used by French high school students in transactional and interactional tasks. It found that more proficient listeners used more listening strategies and that less successful listeners tended to rely on such strategies as focusing on semantic cues and contextual clues to understand a text. Goh (1998) investigated the cognitive and metacognitive strategies and tactics used by Chinese ESL learners in a university in Singapore and to compare the use of these strategies and tactics by high- and low- ability listeners. Her study found that high-ability listeners used more strategies and tactics than low-ability ones. Yu (2004) studied the effect of strategy use on learners' autonomy by 160 Chinese EFL learners at two proficiency levels. With the use of a written questionnaire of 36 specific listening strategies, he classified these strategies into three major categories: metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective. He found that high-ability students used more metacognitive and cognitive strategies than low-ability students, while little difference was found in the use of socio-affective strategies between these two groups. He also found that students thought highly of strategy use and would like to receive strategy instructions in order to improve their listening skills.

While the above studies on listening strategies have quite consistently shown that good and poor listeners may use different strategies with different frequencies in their comprehension process, it is not known whether and to what extent the use of listening strategies by students with different language proficiency levels is linked to a particular L2 task. According to Oxford et al. (2004), the use of appropriate strategies on a given task can be more important than the numbers and frequencies of strategies employed.

Listening strategies training

Strategy training helps learners to become more consciously aware of what strategies might be useful in a given learning situation. L2 listening strategy training has been shown to greatly benefit learners in their use of listening strategies. For example, Vandergrift (1999) demonstrated how teachers can nurture the development of listening strategies and how L2 listeners can use the instructed strategies to enhance their learning processes. Teng (2003), after teaching her 50 college students 30 EFL listening strategies for 15 weeks, found that systematic strategy instruction enhanced the improvement of strategy use for EFL listeners. Ma (2005) examined the effects of listening strategy training on Chinese EFL learners. After 15 weeks of instruction, the 62 EFL

learners at three proficiency levels (high, intermediate and low) showed significant improvement in strategy use, especially for the intermediate level students. In addition to the enhanced use of strategies, strategy training has also been shown to help learners to become more self-directed and autonomous (Wenden, 1991, 1998; Cohen, 1998), to be more aware of their learning processes and thus more willing and more able to manage their learning, to enhance their learning motivation (Wenden, 1991, 1998), and to reduce anxiety and uncertainty and foster self-confidence (Niyokos, 1996).

Task-based strategy assessment

According to Cohen (1998), when learners respond to a strategy questionnaire without actually doing a L2 task, their responses about strategy use may not corroborate with their actual behavior. Learners' different interpretations of their task experience have also been shown to affect their reporting of strategy use. Ikeda & Takeuchi (2000), for example, examined whether reported strategy use was affected by the presence or absence of an actual task and how types and frequencies of strategies varied with levels of task difficulty. Their study found that having students complete a task significantly affected their reporting of reading strategies. Specifically, the reported frequencies of strategy use in both the high and low proficiency learners declined in three task situations: no task, easy task and difficult task. Oxford et al. (2004) conducted a similar study to investigate how students' reported strategies differ when a language task is easy versus difficult. While Oxford et al. (2004) found significant effects of task situations on reported strategy use as in Ikeda & Takeuchi's (2000) study, they also found that low-proficiency students reported to employ more strategies than high-proficiency students in specific task situations. Besides, the two groups of students reported use of different types of strategies with the low-proficiency group using more 'bottom-up' strategies and the high-proficiency group using more 'top-down' strategies.

So far, most of the studies on task-based strategy assessment have focused on the assessment of strategy use in reading; task-based strategy assessment with regards to strategy use in listening has seldom been explored. The present study aims to examine the effects of the presence (or Task condition) or absence (or Zero-task condition) of a listening task on students' reporting of their listening strategy use. As strategy use has been shown to be closely related to L2 proficiency, we will also examine the effects of students' listening proficiency on their strategy use. Finally, we also intend to find out whether listening strategy instruction has any impact on the frequency of strategy use under the two different task conditions. More specifically, the present study attempts to find out answers to the following research questions:

1. Do task conditions (Task or Zero-task) and listening proficiency levels (high or low) have any main or interaction effects on the frequency of strategy use?
2. Do high- and low-proficiency listeners report different frequencies of strategy use under different task conditions?

3. Does listening strategy instruction have any effects on students' strategy use?

■ Methodology

Altogether 83 first-year college students participated in the present study, of whom 47 were male students and 36 were female students, with their ages ranging from 18 to 20. They majored in law and computer science in a large university in southern China. They receive College English instruction six hours a week as a compulsory course, which includes Integrated Skills of English, Learning Strategy and Listening. They were required to take a nationwide English proficiency test (College English Test Band 4 or CET-4 in short) after their two years of study. Though all the 83 students were asked to answer the listening strategy questionnaire twice, that is, once before and once after the eight-week session of listening strategy training, only 52 of them returned both questionnaires. These 52 questionnaires were thus used in this research.

After the eight-week listening strategy training, we conducted a listening comprehension test, which consisted of 50 multiple choice test items in three parts: short dialogues, long conversations and short passages. The total score was 50 points. A statistical validity analysis showed that the listening proficiency test was reasonably reliable with α (Cronbach's Alpha) value of .832. Based on the results of this test, we divided the 52 participants into two groups. Those whose scores were above the average 35 points were put in the high-level group (G_{high} , $N = 29$), while those scored equal or below the average were placed in the low-level group (G_{low} , $N = 23$). A t -test ($t = 0.16$) in SPSS revealed that the two groups were significantly different in their listening comprehension ability.

We adapted the cognitive listening strategy questionnaire (LSQ) developed by Yu (2004) into 24 strategies under the three major categories of before, while and after listening, and the students' responses were recorded using Likert Scale of 0 (almost never) to 5 (almost always) to measure each strategy (see appendix A for the questionnaire). The reliability of the questionnaire employed by the present study was .869 using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of internal consistency.

Data collection procedures

It was made clear to the participating students that this study would not affect their course grades. They responded to the questionnaires anonymously, but the listening comprehension test would be part of their course grades in order to ensure the validity of the group pattern. Data collection was conducted in the following steps:

First, the students were asked to complete the listening strategy questionnaire (LSQ) without doing any listening task ('Zero-task condition'). Then after eight weeks of listening strategy instruction which was conducted once a week during their English classes, the

students were asked to take the thirty minute listening comprehension test. Right after the listening test, the students were required to complete the LSQ again ('Task condition').

Data analysis procedures

To answer Research Question 1 in the present study, i.e., whether task conditions and listening proficiency levels have any main or interaction effects on the frequency of strategy use, we used repeated measures analysis of ANOVA to identify the significance. The results of ANOVA would tell us:

- whether the reported mean frequency of strategy use was significantly different on the two task conditions (i.e., the main effect for task condition);
- whether the reported mean frequency of strategy use was significantly different across the two proficiency levels (i.e., the main effect for proficiency levels); and
- whether G_{high} and G_{low} reported different mean frequencies of strategy use across the two task conditions,

To answer Research Question 2 and 3, i.e., whether high- or low-proficiency listeners report different frequencies of strategy use under different task conditions and whether listening strategy instruction have any effects on strategy use, we employed multiple measures of Paired T-test and Independent T-test. We set the significance level at $p < .05$ for both T-tests. The results of Paired T-test would tell us whether there would be significant differences in specific strategy use by the same level group on the two task conditions. Independent T-test would help us find out whether there would be any significant differences between the two proficiency groups in specific strategy use on either of the two task conditions.

■ Results and discussion

Effects of task conditions and listening proficiency levels on strategy use

Table 1 presents the mean scores and standard deviations of the two proficiency groups across Zero-task and Task conditions. The mean LSQ scores for the two proficiency groups showed different directions on the two tasks. For G_{high} , the reported frequency of strategy use on the Zero-task condition ($X = 2.97$, $SD = 1.4$) was lower than on the Task condition ($X = 3.09$, $SD = 1.49$). In other words, while the overall strategy use by high-proficiency students increased slightly from Zero-task to Task condition, that by low-proficiency learners somewhat decreased from Zero-task to Task condition. The reported frequency of strategy use on the Zero-task condition ($X = 2.82$, $SD = 1.5$) was slightly higher than on the Task condition ($X = 2.76$, $SD = 1.4$).

These results did not seem to agree with those of Ikeda & Takeuchi (2000) and of Oxford et al. (2004) on reading strategy use, as the two studies showed a slight increase from no task to difficult task for the low

Table 1 LSQ scores of two proficiency groups across zero-task and task conditions

Proficiency		Zero-task	Task	Proficiency		Zero-task	Task
G _{high}	Mean	2.97	3.09	G _{low}	Mean	2.82	2.76
	N	29	29		N	23	23
	SD	1.4	1.49		SD	1.5	1.4

Table 2 Interaction effects of task conditions and proficiency levels

		Sum of squares	df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Z-task G _{high} *G _{low}	Between Groups	.371	1	.371	1.703	.198
	Within Groups	10.891	50	.218		
	Total	11.262	51			
Task G _{high} *G _{low}	Between Groups	1.318	1	1.318	7.485	.009
	Within Groups	8.801	50	.176		
	Total	10.118	51			
G _{high} Z-task*task	Between Groups	.136	1	.136	.828	.367
	Within Groups	9.221	56	.165		
	Total	9.357	57			
G _{low} Z-task*task	Between Groups	.033	1	.033	.138	.712
	Within Groups	10.472	44	.238		
	Total	10.505	45			

proficiency group but a slight decrease for the high-proficiency group. The discrepancies may be attributable to the different nature of listening and reading tasks and their different interactions between task presence and learners' strategy use.

Table 1 also shows that the mean LSQ scores for G_{high} were higher on both Zero-task and Task conditions than those for G_{low}. This result is in conformity with previous findings (e.g., Goh, 1998; Yu, 2004) in that high-ability listeners use more strategies and tactics than low ability ones.

Systematic strategy training has been shown to have a positive effect on strategy use for EFL learners (e.g., Teng, 2003; Ma, 2005). But the result of the present study seems to show a mixed picture for the two proficiency groups (Table 1). Specifically, strategy instruction showed a positive effect on strategy use for the high-proficiency group but a negative effect for the low-proficiency group. In other words, strategy training seems to be more effective for high level students, but less effective for low level students. To find out the statistical significance of these differences, we used repeated ANOVA with SPSS 13.0.

Table 2 presents the results of the repeated ANOVA on mean frequency of strategy use on Zero-task and Task conditions. The results showed that there were no significant main effects for tasks and listening proficiency levels. In other words, the overall reported mean frequency of strategy use did not differ significantly on Zero-task conditions for the two proficiency groups. Neither of the two groups differed from each other significantly on the reported mean frequency of strategy use across the two different task conditions. However, on the Task condition, the reported overall mean scores were significantly different between the two proficiency

groups ($F(1, 50) = 7.485, p < .05$). This finding is in agreement with our earlier finding that high proficiency students used more listening strategies and were more receptive to strategy training than their low proficiency counterparts.

Frequencies of strategy use by high- and low-proficiency listeners under different task conditions

To find out the different effects of task conditions on levels of listening proficiency with respect to each specific listening strategy use, we used paired T-test. Table 3 presents the results.

Within the same proficiency level, low proficiency students did not report to use more strategies on either of the two task conditions. But high proficiency students employed two more strategies on Zero-task condition and five more strategies on Task condition. The two strategies these high proficiency students reported using more on Zero-task conditions were No.3 (*I try to understand the meaning of every word*) and No. 9 (*I try to give a word-for-word translation from English to Chinese*). This indicates that high proficiency students may have better awareness of listening strategies and would try such strategies as detailed associations and translation to help with their comprehension of listening materials. This is in line with the finding on Task condition where high level students employed five more specific strategies including No.4 (*I try to think ahead and anticipate what comes next*), No.7 (*I try to connect what I hear with information I have gained from experience in the world*), No.10 (*I group information into different meaningful groups*), No.18 (*I try to take notes about important information*) and No.24 (*I give a summary of the information I heard*).

The results showed that high proficiency students

Table 3 Differential use of strategies on two task conditions by G_{high} and G_{low}

Proficiency	Strategy	Zero-task Mean	Task Mean	Sig. $p < .05$	Difference	
					Z-t > T	T > Z-t
G_{high}	No. 3	2.62	2.03	.041	x	
	No. 4	3.31	4.03	.006		x
	No. 7	2.62	3.24	.036		x
	No. 9	1.62	1.03	.035	x	
	No. 10	1.69	2.31	.039		x
	No. 18	2.76	3.55	.015		x
	No. 24	1.52	2.45	.001		x
G_{low}	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 4 Use of strategies by the two groups on given task conditions

Task condition	Strategy	G_{high} Mean	G_{low} Mean	Sig. $p < .05$	Difference	
					$G_{high} > G_{low}$	$G_{low} > G_{high}$
Zero-task	No. 9	1.62	1.83	.038		
	No. 17	3.93	3.60	.049	x	x
Task	No. 4	4.03	3.39	.029	x	
	No. 5	3.86	3.00	.022	x	
	No. 6	3.52	2.73	.036	x	
	No. 7	3.24	2.30	.025	x	
	No. 18	3.55	2.30	.010	x	
	No. 21	3.34	2.26	.007	x	

were good at listening strategy use. They seemed to be more receptive to listening strategy training. After the eight weeks of training, they had better understanding and awareness of listening strategies. For specific Task condition, they were more likely to employ more cognitive strategies such as inferring, associating, grouping, note-taking and summarizing in their listening comprehension exercises. Besides, high proficiency students were also more likely to use strategies to make predictions before listening, take notes and group information during listening, and summarize information after listening. Low proficiency students, however, did not seem to use more strategies on either task condition. This may suggest that low proficiency students still lack familiarity with specific listening strategies and thus have difficulty in using them.

Table 4 shows the use of strategies by the two proficiency groups on a given task condition, i.e., on either Zero-task or Task condition. On Zero-task condition, high proficiency students employed strategy No.17 (*If I do not understand some information such as a word or a phrase, I try to guess its meaning based on relevant information about the topic*) more frequently than their low proficiency counterparts whereas low proficiency students used strategy No. 9 (*I try to give a word-for-word translation from English to Chinese*) more often than high proficiency students. This indicates that high proficiency students generally would prefer top-down processing by using their world knowledge to aid their listening comprehension whereas low proficiency students would employ bottom-up processing by translating a message into their mother tongue for the same purpose.

When the two groups were given a specific task, the frequencies of their reported strategy use differed significantly for the six specific strategies, i.e., anticipating (No.4 *I try to think ahead and anticipate what comes next*), making personal association (No.5 *I try to make personal association with what I hear* and No.7 *I try to connect what I hear with information I have gained from experience in the world*), resourcing (No.6 *I try to relate what I hear to information I have already studied*), and note-taking (No.18 *I try to take notes about important information* and No.21 *I try to understand the meaning of the key words*). Specifically, high proficiency students employed all these strategies more frequently than their low proficiency counterparts. This result is in conformity with our earlier findings that high level students use more listening strategies than low level students.

Effects of listening strategy instruction on students' strategy use

In the present study, both the low and high proficiency level students received about sixteen hours (two hours a week for eight weeks) of classroom listening strategy training, which covers such strategies as *anticipating, inferring, associating listening information with world knowledge, making use of various resources while listening and note-taking*. The training sessions were conducted by one of the authors. After the training procedures, the students took the listening comprehension test.

From Table 3, we have already noted that high proficiency students used significantly more strategies on Task condition than on Zero-task condition. However, no differences have been found on strategy use by low

proficiency students on the two task conditions. From Table 4, we have also shown that on the Task condition (i.e., after the strategy instruction), high proficiency students employed more listening strategies than their low proficiency counterparts. These sets of results indicate that listening strategy training seems to benefit high proficiency students more than low proficiency students in their strategy use.

■ Conclusion

The present study investigated the effects of two task conditions (Zero-task and Task) on the use of cognitive listening strategies by two different listening proficiency levels of Chinese EFL learners. The findings can be summarized as follows:

1. No significant interactive effects have been found between the two variables of task conditions and levels of listening proficiency. Even though there was a slight increase for high proficiency learners and slight decline for low proficiency learners in the frequencies of strategy use from Zero-task to Task conditions, the differences were not statistically significant. However, the two groups differed in

overall frequency of strategy use on Task condition in that high proficiency learners reported to use strategies much more often than their low proficiency peers.

2. High proficiency learners have shown to be better strategy users. Specifically, high proficiency students tend to employ more top-down strategies such as *inferring, resourcing, making personal association* in their listening comprehension process. In addition, they used these top-down strategies more often on Task condition than on Zero-task condition. No difference has been found for low proficiency learners on the two task conditions for their specific strategy use.
3. Strategy training was found to be more effective for high proficiency learners than for low proficiency learners.

While the above findings are interesting, we acknowledge the limitations of the study such as a small sample size and the relatively short duration of listening strategy training. In light of these limitations, caution must be exercised in interpreting the findings in this study and future studies are needed to confirm these findings.

REFERENCES

- Abd El Al, A. (2002). *The effect of a strategy-based instruction programme on developing EFL listening comprehension skills*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Warwick, UK.
- Anderson, J. (1995). *Cognitive psychology and its implications* (5th Ed.). New York: W.H. Freeman.
- Bedell, D.A., & Oxford, R. (1996). Cross-cultural comparisons of language learning strategies in the People's Republic of China and other countries. In R. Oxford (ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 47-60). Manoa: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii.
- Cohen, A. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.
- Goh, M. (1998). How ESL learners with different listening abilities use comprehension strategies and tactics. *Language Teaching Research*, 2(2), 124-47.
- Gu, Y. (2002). Gender, academic major, and vocabulary learning strategies of Chinese EFL learners. *RELC Journal*, 33, 35-55.
- Hsiao, T.Y., & Oxford, R. (2002). Comparing theories of language learning strategies: A confirmatory factor analysis. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(3), 368-383.
- Ikeda, M., & Takeuchi, O. (2000). Tasks and strategy use: Empirical implications for questionnaire studies. *JACET Bulletin*, 31, 21-32.
- Ma, Y. (2005). *Incorporating strategy training into EFL listening class: From theory to practice*. Unpublished MA thesis, Wuhan University of Technology, Wuhan, China.
- Nyikos, M. (1996). The conceptual shift to learner-centred classrooms: Increasing teachers and students strategic awareness. In R. Oxford (ed.), *Language learning strategies around the world: Cross-cultural perspectives* (pp. 109-118). Manoa: Second Language Teaching & Curriculum Center, University of Hawaii.
- O'Malley, M., Chamot, A., & Küpper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied linguistics*, 10(4), 418-437.
- Oxford, R., Cho, Y., Leung, S., & Kim, H.J. (2004). Effect of the presence and difficulty of task on strategy use: An exploratory study. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, 42, 1-47.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, Mass.: Heinle & Heinle
- Rost, M. (2002). *Teaching and researching listening*. London: Longman.
- Teng, H.C. (2003). Teaching EFL listening strategies to college students in Taiwan. Paper presented at the 12th English Language Teaching Symposium, Taipei.
- Vandergrift, L. (1992). *The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Alberta, Canada.
- Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring successful strategies. *ELT Journal*, 53, 168-176.
- Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy: Planning and implementing learner training for language learners*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Wenden, A. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge: a language learning. *Applied linguistics*, 19(4), 515-537.
- Yu, Z. (2004). *An investigation into Chinese university students' use of listening strategies in their self-studies on listening comprehension*. MA thesis, University of Warwick, UK.

APPENDIX

听力策略调查问卷

Listening Strategy Questionnaire (LSQ)

说明: 通过回答问题表明你在练习听力时使用策略的频率。0表示“几乎没有”, 5表示“几乎总是”。

回答问题时重要的是每个答案能很好地反映你的情况, 而不是你应该怎样做或其他人是如何做的。这不是一个测试。答案没有正误之分。你的得分不会影响到你的成绩。

根据你学习语言的经验和需要, 你可能使用不同的策略。这里所举的策略是一般性的。不是每个人都需要使用相同的策略。一个“低”的得分并不意味着你是一个失败的学习者。

Directions: The purpose of this questionnaire is to investigate your listening strategy use frequency. Number '0' stands for 'almost never', while number '5' means 'almost always'.

This is NOT a test. There is no right or wrong answer to each of the questions. Based on your English learning experience and need, you may employ different strategies. These strategies are general ones. Different people may use different strategies. Your choice should truly reflect your own learning habits. Your score will NOT affect your course grades.

在做听力练习之前 (Before listening)

1. 我尝试思考一下主题。
I try to think of the topic.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
2. 我借助题目来预测内容。
I try to anticipate what I will hear from the title.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是

在做听力练习时 (While listening)

3. 我尝试理解文中的每一个单词的含义。
I try to understand the meaning of every word.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
4. 我尝试预先思考并推测后面的内容。
I try to think ahead and anticipate what comes next.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
5. 我尝试进行相关联想来理解内容。
I try to make personal association with what I hear.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
6. 我尝试联系我已经学到的内容来获得更好的理解。
I try to relate what I hear to information I have already studied.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
7. 我尝试联系我的人生经历理解所听到的内容。
I try to connect what I hear with information I have gained from experience in the world.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
8. 如果我只听不看, 我会通过想象来加深理解。
I visualise what I hear, if I am only listening without watching.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
9. 我努力将英文逐个字地翻译成中文。
I try to give a word-for-word translation from English to Chinese.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
10. 我将内容按不同意群分类。
I group information into different meaningful groups.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是

11. 我运用我的中文知识去获得更好的理解。
I use my knowledge in Chinese to understand better.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
12. 我尝试辨认运用中文或其它我懂的语言里相似的单词来识别英文单词。
I try to recognise the English words that are similar to a word in Chinese or in another language I know.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
13. 我使用语法结构去理解听到的信息。
I use the grammatical structure to comprehend the message.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
14. 如果我不理解所听到的内容, 我尝试从说话人的语调来猜测它的含义。
If I do not understand something I hear, I try to guess what it means from the speaker's tone of voice.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
15. 如果我不理解所听到的内容, 我继续听以期稍后澄清。
If I do not understand something I hear, I keep on listening for clarification later on.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
16. 如果我在练习听力时不理解某些单词或短语, 我脑子里短时间内会反复重复这些单词或短语来尝试理解。
If I do not understand some words or phrases when I am listening, I repeat the words or phrases over and over for a short period in mind and try to understand them.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
17. 如果我不理解某些内容如一个单词或短语, 我会运用我了解的有关该主题的信息去猜测它的含义。
If I do not understand some information such as a word or a phrase, I try to guess its meaning basing on relevant information about the topic.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
18. 对于重要的部分我做笔记。
I try to take notes about important information.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是
19. 我尝试通过不将课文翻译成我的母语的方式去理解文中含义。
I try to understand the meaning without putting it into my mother tongue.
几乎 0 1 2 3 4 5 几乎
没有 (Never) (Always) 总是

