UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
Faculty of Education

*ISSN 2043-8338*

*Journal of Trainee Teacher Education Research*

# Listen up: a critical analysis of the effects of Listening-As-Modelling on students' bottom-up listening skills and self-efficacy

**Katrina Barnes**

(PGCE Modern Languages, 2017-2018)

email: kb44689@gmail.com

## Abstract

*The aim of this study was to discover whether using activities which encourage students to notice linguistic features (rather than simply test their aural comprehension) could serve to improve both students' bottom-up listening skills and their self-efficacy, and therefore assist them in becoming more competent, confident linguists. To this end, I delivered a series of Listening-As-Modelling (LAM) activities to a mixed-attainment Year 7 French class over a 3-week period. Data were collected through a pre- and post-intervention dictation and questionnaire, as well as my own observation notes. The results indicated that LAM activities do have a generally positive impact on students' bottom-up processing skills, with lower attaining students making the most significant gains. Students' self-efficacy with listening also improved, and the study highlighted that LAM activities were particularly successful when they were student-centric in nature and delivered in a 'safe', familiar format.*

© Katrina Barnes, 2019

# Listen up: a critical analysis of Listening-As-Modelling on students' bottom-up listening skills and self-efficacy

**Katrina Barnes**

## Introduction

This action research study was conducted with a mixed-attainment Year 7 French class at a mixed, 11-16 comprehensive school in Cambridgeshire. Over the course of seven one-hour lessons within a 3-week period, I delivered lessons containing listening activities that differed from their usual ones in that they were designed to model the French language rather than present students with a comprehension challenge.

During my experience as a trainee teacher, I have been particularly concerned that many students display a marked listening skills deficit, despite the primacy of listening within the development of other language skills such as reading and writing (Pachler, Evans, Redondo, & Fisher, 2014). A seemingly relentless focus upon comprehension during listening exercises appears to have resulted in students missing out on vital opportunities to master the sounds of new language before they are asked to infer complex information from it, which in turn has resulted in an under-development of decoding skills. I have suspected for a while that this lack of emphasis upon phonic awareness and bottom-up skills training (through which learners arrive at comprehension by first processing individual sounds, then words, and eventually whole sentences) may be linked to the high levels of anxiety and lack of self-confidence students display when faced with listening tasks, which is corroborated by various studies (Arnold 2000; Graham 2006). Due to the immediacy of aural input, every listening comprehension activity becomes an examination in which a sense of failure is instantaneous if the listener misses what has been said.

I was determined to discover whether the listening problems I had witnessed were commonly reported by others, and how the introduction of lower-stress, lower-stakes listening tasks might enable students to become competent, confident listeners and, by extension, competent, confident linguists. I became familiar with the work of John Field and Gianfranco Conti, both advocates of 'Listening-As-Modelling' (LAM) activities (Conti, 2016) which are designed to present students with an opportunity to notice language patterns, decode aural input using bottom-up processing



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

skills, and to give them a model on which to base their spoken production. After reading further into the subject, I decided to trial listening activities similar to Field and Conti's recommendations to determine their impact, both upon students' bottom-up listening skills and upon their self-efficacy. I hoped that I would then be able to incorporate successful activities into my future teaching practice.

In this report, I shall begin by giving an overview of the literature associated with listening instruction and its impact upon students' listening skills and self-efficacy, with a primary focus on recommendations for early-stage second language (L2) listeners, on whom this study is based. I shall then give an account of how I planned and conducted my intervention, and how I collected and analysed my data. My findings and analysis will follow, and I will finish by discussing my results and drawing some tentative conclusions and recommendations based upon my findings.

## Literature review

### Teaching listening

Throughout the latter part of the 20th Century, listening enjoyed a privileged position within language teaching, as it was considered fundamental to new instructional frameworks based on functional language and communicative approaches (Morley, 2001). More recent voices also recognise the value of teaching listening, as it can be considered the basis of the language acquisition process; "writing and speaking need input and modelling from reading and listening to inform their development" (Pachler et al., 2014, p.214; see also Krashen, 1987). In addition, listening forms one side of the "two-way traffic" of communication; if a speaker cannot also listen, they will be unable to sustain a conversation (Field, 2008, p.3). In the UK context, this ability to communicate is now a key stipulation of the National Curriculum: students must be able to "understand and respond to spoken and written language from a variety of authentic sources" (DfE, 2013, p.1). This value has arguably only intensified with the arrival of the digital era; students must now access information from aural texts on an unprecedented scale (Vandergrift, 2007).

Although listening has generally been valued for some time, previously in-vogue methods such as the Audiolingual Method (which, as its name indicates, required a great deal of listening) contained little-to-no instruction as to *how* students should learn to listen. Students were effectively expected



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

to listen to the target language at length, and in so doing would somehow arrive at comprehension "by osmosis" (Osada, 2004, p.54). It is now widely accepted that students do not innately know how to listen, but that listening requires strategy and skill training (Mendelsohn, 1994; Goh, 2000; Morley, 2001; Vandergrift, 2004). A more complex question is how best to deliver listening instruction. As Vandergrift (2004, p.4) notes, researchers must "take into account the complex cognitive processes that underlie the listening construct", which include physiological, cognitive and social clue-reading processes at different levels.

**How should listening be taught: top-down or bottom-up?**

Listening may be considered the "least explicit" of the four skills, making it the "most difficult to learn" (Vandergrift, 2004, p.4). In extension, the fact that listening "is ephemeral in nature" (Lund as cited in Osada, 2004, p.57) may also make it more difficult to teach, often rendering it over-looked (Field, 2008). Furthermore, listening is not a single skill, but rather can be considered the result of a series of micro-processes belonging to two distinct categories: top-down and bottom-up processes (Vandergrift, 2007). Listeners use top-down processes when they tap into prior knowledge and context knowledge to comprehend what they are hearing, whereas bottom-up processes are used to derive meaning by decoding linguistic input and gradually combining increasingly large linguistic units (beginning with individual sounds, then words, then whole sentences and extended texts). This issue of which of these should be prioritised in listening instruction continues to be contentious.

Ginther (as cited in Vandergrift, 2007, p.204) investigated how context and content visual clues (which trigger top-down processing) might aid students' comprehension, and concluded that content clues had only a slightly beneficial effect, with context clues serving only to confuse students and decrease comprehension. Osada (2001) has argued more fervently in favour of a top-down approach, positing that beginner-level listeners cannot arrive at meaning when dealing with single words (as his bottom-up exercises necessitated), and tend to resort to a word-for-word translation approach. I would argue that not only was Osada's sample group small (31 college students), but this 'word-for-word' translation approach may be symptomatic of years of exposure to the often rigid, Grammar Translation-based Japanese education system and may not be generalisable. (O'Malley, Chamor, & Kupper, 1989) also argued in favour of top-down instruction, concluding that ineffective listeners relied on bottom-up strategies. Although their study is useful in



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

that its participants were of a comparable age to those in the current study, its use of Think-Aloud protocols necessitates a reliance upon the test subjects' abilities of self-expression which, at high-school age, may not have been fully developed.

Advocates of Skill Theory (Field 2008, Conti 2017) posit that any skill must be learnt in a bottom-up fashion, beginning with the mastery of lower-order skills and gradually progressing towards higher-order ones. In the beginning stages of listening, these include decoding and awareness of how the spoken language looks when it is written, or grapheme-phoneme correspondence (GPC), which are targeted in a bottom-up approach. Woore notes the importance of developing listening micro-skills:

> "Being able to generate phonological forms for unfamiliar written words … provides a key to acquiring new vocabulary; vocabulary knowledge, in turn, underpins all other aspects of L2 proficiency"
>
> (Woore as cited in Pachler et al., 2014, p.218)

Graham (2006) echoes this argument; she found that students' main self-perceived difficulties were associated directly with the micro-skills of listening, including "dealing adequately with the speed of delivery of texts, making out individual words in a stream of spoken French, and making sense of any words identified" (p.165). Goh (2000) also found that beginner listeners encountered difficulties most often with bottom-up skills such as segmenting phonemes, not recognising words and not chunking the speech stream. Although experienced by all listeners, these were particularly acute for low-proficiency listeners, indicating that beginner instruction should focus on this area.

Khuziakhmetov and Porchesku's 2016 study demonstrated the effectiveness of bottom-up instruction, in terms of both performance and confidence. Pre-intermediate adult learners of English were given 30 minutes of extra bottom-up listening training per week for one month, by the end of which the experimental group demonstrated higher confidence and lower anxiety when doing listening tasks and required fewer replays of audio material than the control group. It is beneficial for the context of the current study in that the interventions were conducted over a similar period, although the study was also conducted on a very small scale (8 subjects in the experimental group and 9 in the control), which may limit the results' generalisability.

Further support for bottom-up instruction can be found on a much larger scale. In their compelling study of 140,000 L2 English learners in Hong Kong over a 7-year period, Tsui and Fullilove (1998) found that only more skilled listeners achieved comprehension when schemata did not match the



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

content of an aural text. They concluded that, whilst top-down strategies were important for beginner students, bottom-up processing skills must be developed for L2 learners to develop into skilled listeners.

Arguably more directly relevant to the present study, and more alarming, is research carried out by Erler (2004). Erler administered a rhyming-word test at the beginning and end of the school year to 359 Year 7 pupils from two comprehensive schools in England. After 2 contact hours per week, she found no improvement in students' knowledge of spelling-sound rules. She uses this research to support her call for further decoding training in secondary schools. The fact that the results were just as low at two different schools, added to the fact that the sample pool was sizeable for an action research project, make the study a compelling and useful one, and indicate that, although studies such as Osada's might emphasise the benefits of top-down instruction in other contexts, bottom-up skills are certainly lacking in the UK secondary context.

It may be concluded from these reports, as Vandergrift (2007) does, that students must be taught both top-down and bottom-up skills to become proficient listeners. However, it would also seem that bottom-up skills training has been particularly neglected (Conti, 2017) and may therefore deserve to be prioritised, especially in the UK context.

**Listening activities**

In recent years, the cause for bottom-up listening instruction has been taken up by Conti, whose blog 'The Language Gym' is now a well-known source of pedagogical discussion and teaching ideas for MFL teachers. As both practising teacher and academic, Conti uses research to inform his recommendations for classroom practice. His 'Listening-As-Modelling' (LAM) exercises (a term which I also adopt for the purposes of this study), are a good example. LAM includes activities which:

> "1 Focus learners on pronunciation and decoding skills, facilitating phonological processing and segmentation;
>
> 2 Are designed to develop aural-input processing;
>
> 3 Use target language to "explicitly model and recycle new language and to deliberately promote noticing.""
>
> (Conti, 2016)



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

Conti recommends "frequent exposure" to these activities, which target the development of the micro-skills required for successful bottom-up processing. His focus is supported by Brown's (2007) list of listening micro-skills, which includes: "discriminating among distinct target-language sounds; recognising reduced forms of words; distinguishing word boundaries; processing speech at different rates of delivery" (p.308). LAM is also designed to develop awareness of the target language's GPC, and general phonological awareness, such as knowledge that different languages follow different phonological rules (Conti, 2016).

Conti (2017) also conducted a study into the impact of his LAM activities on Year 8 students' ability to transcribe French texts, correctly pronounce common French spelling patterns and identify parts of speech. Whilst he acknowledges that, as a pilot study, the research was opportunistic and at times lacking rigour, the initial results showed significant gains in transcription, decoding and listening comprehension skills, as well as increased alertness to sound and student confidence, as students perceived a "causality between the LAM activities and their enhanced can-do attitude".

It is worth mentioning that, although it is important to be wary of Conti's reports of the success of these practices due to his blog articles not being 'academic' in nature (they are not peer-reviewed and often contain anecdotal examples), the fact that he bases his approach upon Skills Theory (Field, 2008) and consistently supports his arguments with examples from empirical studies, adds weight to his assertions. His approach is also preceded by Field (2008) and Hulstijn (2001), who make a number of similar recommendations for LAM activities (albeit not termed as such). These include gapped dictations, dicto-glosses, and 'spot the intruder' tasks which train listening micro-skills.

In addition, Kiany and Shiramiry (2002)'s study into the impact of dictation upon listening performance showed that the group which received listening instruction through dictation activities significantly outperformed those who received instruction through comprehension-based textbook exercises. The study can be considered valuable in that it was conducted over a whole term, which arguably gave the authors enough time to sufficiently test the impact; as Conti (2017) has suggested, progress in listening can only be achieved through frequent and consistent training over an extended period. However, it must also be borne in mind that the study was conducted with voluntary adult learners of English in Iran, who may have been significantly more motivated and disciplined enough to persevere with dictation than the subjects of the current study: British 11-



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

year-olds for whom learning French is compulsory. That said, both groups are elementary learners, so the effect of dictation-based activities may remain somewhat comparable.

Lively, Logan and Pisoni (1993) demonstrated how to effectively teach sound discrimination when they trained Japanese learners to discriminate between English minimal pairs by exposing them to a variety of different speakers. Learners showed significant improvement after three weeks and also maintained this level six months after training had ended, suggesting that this type of sound discrimination exercise is both effective and enduring. The authors also emphasised that these tasks were most beneficial for recognition and retention when phonemes were studied and practised within word contexts (e.g. 'glass' and 'grass'). Although it must be acknowledged that the Japanese college context is in many ways distant from the British secondary school one, these studies are valuable given the similar issues faced by Japanese and British students, including low self-confidence and under-developed listening and speaking skills compared with reading and writing skills, as my previous professional experience attests.

Finally, a frequent recommendation is that listening activities should contain high levels of repetition. Hulstijn (2003, p.422) argues that students should be able to hear aural input "as often as necessary" as part of his 6-step listening procedure. Field (2008) also notes that repetition of sounds and words brings students nearer to the amount of input necessary to start confidently copying what they hear. As Conti (2016) argues, students must be exposed to "systematically recycled 'patterned' input" which resembles the amount native speakers are exposed to when learning their mother tongue (Krashen, 1987); they must be given more chances to hear and analyse aural input than most listening-as-comprehension exercises allow.

**Listening and self-efficacy**

One major issue surrounding listening instruction is self-efficacy, defined by Bandura (1986, p.391) as "people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performances". In other words, self-efficacy can be understood as the level of confidence a person has when performing a specific task. In her 2006 study into students' self-perceptions of their listening problems, Graham (2006) identified self-efficacy as a key issue within listening development; according to her research, students "attribute their difficulties in listening to their own supposed low ability in the skill" (p.178). The study is a useful one in the context of the present study, given that the data were also collected from students of French in UK



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

schools. In addition, Abedini and Rahimi (2009) highlighted the importance of self-efficacy in listening success: in their study of 61 Iranian students, there was positive correlation between Iranian students' self-efficacy beliefs and listening proficiency.

Other issues which impact upon students' self-efficacy in language learning are perceived task difficulty, anxiety and lack of confidence (Raoofi, Tan, & Chan, 2012). Students frequently encounter these during listening tasks; Graham (2006) and Hasan (2000) both report that students perceive listening to be difficult. This may be due to its immediacy and associated time pressures (Arnold, 2000), and the fact that listening instruction also tends to follow a "testing model" (Field, 2008, p.5) focusing upon the "product of listening" (Vandergrift, 2007, p.196). In addition, numerous studies report high levels of anxiety present within listening tasks (ibid). Mills, Pajares and Herron (2006) found not only that self-efficacy was negatively associated with students' listening anxiety but also that there was a significant relationship between listening anxiety and proficiency. Furthermore, Scarcella and Oxford (1992) found that anxiety has a negative effect upon Working Memory, thus looping back into a vicious cycle of perceiving listening as difficult.

My review of the available literature on listening instruction led me to plan a series of interventions designed to develop my students' bottom-up processing skills. This would involve guiding them through a variety of activities focusing on the development of their listening micro-skills through modelling rather than testing their comprehension. I have borrowed Conti's term 'Listening-As-Modelling' (LAM) when referring to the activities, which I have used to address the following research questions (RQs):

RQ1: To what extent do LAM activities improve students' bottom-up listening skills?

RQ2: To what extent do LAM activities improve students' sense of self-efficacy with listening?

RQ3: Which LAM activities do students feel are most beneficial?

Details of my methodology, including the research design, data collection instruments and means of analysis, are provided in the next section.



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

## Methodology

Having identified bottom-up listening skills as my area of focus, I designed an action research project with a view to conducting a "small-scale intervention in the functioning of the real world" (Cohen & Manion, 1994, p.186). In line with the British Educational Research Association (BERA) (2011), students participating in the study were made to feel as comfortable as possible throughout the study; all interventions and data collection took place within their usual lesson time, students were repeatedly reassured that the information they gave would not be shared publicly and that their performance would not have any bearing on their school attainment scores.

The study consisted of administering a pre-intervention test and questionnaire, followed by a series of seven interventions over a 3-week period, during which I made observation notes. A post-intervention test identical to the pre-test in format but differing in content was then completed, and finally students completed a post-intervention questionnaire, which was identical to the first questionnaire but with an additional section inviting students to provide feedback about the intervention activities. In retrospect, it might have been prudent to anonymise responses at the point of completion (Taber, 2013, p.97) as this could have encouraged students to answer honestly and confidently. However, I judged that I had developed a sufficient level of trust within the class that they would feel able to express themselves fully and without fear of ramifications. To this end, I emphasised constantly that they would not offend or anger anybody by anything they wrote, and that I was purely interested in finding out their feelings and the effectiveness of my activities.

The data collection methods are summarised in Table 1:

| Research Questions (RQ) | Data used |
|---|---|
| To what extent do LAM activities improve students' bottom-up listening skills? | Pre-intervention and post-intervention dictations |
| To what extent do LAM activities improve students' sense of self-efficacy with listening? | Attitudes to listening section of questionnaire<br>Teacher observations<br>Post-dictation feedback sentences |
| Which LAM activities do students feel are most beneficial? | Listening activities feedback section of questionnaire<br>Teacher observations |

**Table 1: Data collection methods**



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

## Class context

I identified a mixed-attainment group of 28 Year 7 French students upon which to test my LAM activities. Although school data revealed that some students within the group had had weekly French lessons at primary school, all had received 1.5 terms of secondary French instruction. The class contained a wide variety of attainment levels, from students working at 'Above' level to those at 'Working Towards' level. It also contained four students who were on the school's SEN register, two of whom struggle with native language (L1) literacy, and two students identified as having English as an Additional Language. The group's instruction had been rather disrupted due to the unexpected resignation of their teacher, at which point the class was shared between three different teachers. Although enthusiastic and hard-working overall, some students had become disengaged, possibly due to the lack of consistency they had experienced prior to this study. I judged this to be a good group with which to run the interventions, as it was hoped that the activities would enable them to make up for lost confidence and progress. In addition, I deemed them suitable due to Field (2008) and Conti (2017)'s suggestions that such activities may be particularly beneficial in the early stages of acquisition.

## The intervention

Over a 3-week period, I delivered 7 consecutive lessons, each featuring at least one LAM exercise which were based on suggestions discussed in the literature review. Each was aimed at developing different listening micro-skills, as Table 2 below illustrates.

## Data collection instruments

### *Dictations*

These were adapted from the revision sections of the class' current textbook (Studio 1: Pearson ActiveLearn). As I was required to incorporate my intervention sessions into the class' usual Scheme of Work, the passages were based on topic areas that students had just covered; the pre-test topic was 'Dans ma ville il y a/il n'y a pas de…' ('In my town there is/there isn't…'), and the post-test topic was 'Dans ma ville on peut…' ('In my town we can…').



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

| LAM activity | Description of activity | Micro-skill(s) targeted |
|---|---|---|
| Faulty echo | The teacher reads TL sentences from the board twice: once correctly; once with one phoneme pronounced incorrectly. Students identify whether the first or second time was correct | GPC awareness; phonological unit discrimination |
| Add the spaces | Students listen to an aural text and follow the written version on a handout in which the spaces between words have been removed. They must mark where the gaps should be. | Sentence segmentation; awareness of word boundaries |
| Fill in the missing syllables | Gapped dictation: students listen to an aural text and fill in the gaps in their incomplete copy of the text. | Phonological unit discrimination; GPC awareness |
| Speaking ping pong | Students model different target sentences for each other. Their partner must fill the gap in their copy according to what they hear their partner read out. | Word boundary identification; GPC awareness |
| Listen and sing to the lyrics | Students sing along to a song using the lyrics shown on the board. | GPC awareness |
| Spot the intruder | The teacher plays a song and gives students a modified version of the lyrics. Students must correct the words that are different in their copy according to what they hear. | Phonological unit discrimination; GPC awareness |
| What have I written? | Students guess which topic word or phrase the teacher has written on her concealed mini whiteboard; they base their guesses on what they have heard their classmates guess incorrectly. | Phonological unit discrimination |
| Find the rhymes | Students sort the words on the board into groups that rhyme with each other (but often have different spellings). | Phonological unit discrimination; GPC awareness |
| Sentence building | Students listen to the teacher read out sentences and write out words in the order that they heard them from a jumbled-up selection to complete a table of the parts of speech. They then analyse each word's function within the sentence. | Sentence segmentation; word boundary identification; parsing |
| Count the words and place your bets | Students listen to the teacher read out sentences and write down how many words they think they heard. They 'place their bets' and students who wrote the right number get a point. | Word boundary identification |
| Trapdoor | In pairs, students are given a text with gaps and three possible options for each gap. Student 1 silently chooses one option for each gap. Student 2 reads through the text and guesses which option Student 1 chose for each. If they are right, they carry on. If they are wrong, they must start from the beginning. | Phonological unit discrimination |

**Table 2: LAM activities and associated micro-skills**



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

I decided to assess progress using dictation as it simultaneously tests students' ability to:

> "(a) discriminate phonological units,
>
> (b) make decisions concerning word boundaries in order to discover sequences of words and phrases that make sense, i.e. that are grammatical and meaningful, and
>
> (c) translate this analysis into a graphemic representation"
>
> (Oller, 1971, p.259)

However, I acknowledge that dictation is also problematic as a data collection instrument; my intervention targeted students' bottom-up skills, and the presence of familiar vocabulary in the tests introduced the possibility that students would resort to using prior knowledge to complete the exercises rather than using bottom-up skills alone. To mitigate this issue, I adapted the dictation text to include words that I was fairly sure they would not have come across before (such as proper nouns). On reflection, it might have been more revealing if I had used a 'nonsense' words test (Conti, 2017) to get a firmer grasp of students' ability to decode and re-code common French grapheme combinations using only bottom-up skills.

To answer RQ2, students were also asked to write a sentence about how they felt directly after completing the dictation. They were invited to write anything they liked, with no written cues at all, so as not to limit their self-expression (Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007).

*Questionnaires*

The pre-intervention questionnaire (Appendix 1) contained questions relating to students' attitudes towards listening in general. It was inspired by questions posed by Graham (2006), given her study's similar focus upon secondary school students' attitudes to listening. The questionnaires consisted of seven Likert Scale questions and three rank order questions. Given Cohen et al. (2007)'s suggestion that these types of questions may prevent students from fully expressing themselves in their own terms, I added two opportunities for students to give additional responses; they were invited to write any additional feelings experienced when listening and any other reasons they feel they struggle with listening tasks. The questionnaires contained items designed to elicit different emotional reactions of students to listening tasks, including anxiety, sense of difficulty and confidence, all of which may underpin an individual's level of self-efficacy (Bandura, 1986).



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

The post-intervention questionnaire (Appendices 1 and 2) consisted of two parts: the same 'attitudes to listening' section as the pre-test, plus a 'listening activities feedback' section. The latter consisted of 11 box-tick questions: one for each LAM activity. Students could select as many descriptors as they felt appropriate for each activity. To limit unreliable data, they could also tick a separate box if they did not remember doing the activity, and I provided an 'other' option, in which students could write their own descriptor. To support students' recall of each task, I gave the class 20 seconds to think about and answer each question, whilst also displaying the PowerPoint slide that I had used during the original activity. Having noticed that some students struggled to concentrate during the pre-intervention questionnaire and had difficulties understanding its format, I took extra care to explain the instructions clearly to the class (Denscombe, 2007, p.161), modelling where they should answer using my own copy and repeating instructions as often as necessary. I also had the second questionnaire made up into a booklet together with the dictation task, to prevent anyone from missing pages (ibid, p.158).

*Observations*

I took notes during and immediately following each intervention. These included impressions of individual student reactions to the tasks, as well as students' general quality of learning and the quality of my teaching. A summary of these can be found in Appendix 3 (names have been anonymised). Despite the potential complications of observation as a data collection method, such as dependence upon individual perception and memory, and potential for bias (Denscombe, 2007, p.197), I considered this a valid method due to its 'naturalness' and potential for rich social insights (ibid, p.213-4). However, I acknowledge that using observation notes made by the usual class teacher instead of my own might have helped to mitigate my individual perception and memory bias, which would arguably have strengthened this data somewhat.

## Findings

My findings are presented below and are grouped according to their relevance to each of my three research questions. A discussion of these findings will follow, grouped in the same way, in which I will compare my data and its indications with studies referred to in the literature review in order to draw some tentative conclusions about the benefits of LAM activities.



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

**RQ1: To what extent do LAM activities improve students' bottom-up listening skills?**

*Dictation results (for full results, see Appendix 4)*

The dictation was marked by awarding one mark per correct word. A total of 88 marks were available for the pre-test dictation, whilst 95 marks were available in the post-test dictation. To achieve parity of results, raw marks were converted into percentages shown in Table 3 below:

| | Pre-intervention dictation score (%) | Post-intervention dictation score (%) | Improvement (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Class average | 35.97 | 39.84 | **+3.87** |
| Average for top 50% of class | 52.19 | 46.53 | **-5.66** |
| Average for bottom 50% of class | 19.76 | 31.88 | **+12.12** |

**Table 3: Dictation task results**

The results of the dictation showed that the class performed better in the post-intervention dictation compared to the pre-intervention, achieving 3.87% higher on average. In addition, significant gains were made by those who had scored below average in the pre-test, improving by 12.12% on average. Conversely, the higher attainers (the upper 50%) did not make gains at all, scoring 5.66% lower on average than they had done in the pre-test.

*Listening micro-skills*

Although a dictation is useful in that it tests a variety of micro-skills at the same time, awarding a simple mark per correct word does not give us specific information about *which skills* students were developing through the interventions. For example, some students showed improvement in their GPC awareness but also made segmentation errors, resulting in their GPC improvement going unrecognised. It was therefore necessary to analyse the responses with reference to individual micro-skills and their associated errors, the most salient features of which are discussed below.

**Omission** may be a symptom of frustration, lack of confidence or of being unable to successfully break down the speech flow. Although omission of individual words was a common trait in both the pre- and post-intervention dictations, in the results for the latter there were only two responses in



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

which one or more whole sentences had been missed, compared to seven at pre-intervention. This indicates a general improved ability to break the speech flow, and possibly also to persevere when unsure.

**Recognising word boundaries**. Overall, students made significant gains in their ability to segment sentences into individual words. In the pre-tests, unsuccessfully-segmented sentences were a common feature (“douze ans” realised as “doussent”; “parce qu’il neige” realised as "palscilneursh"). In the post test, these occurrences were far rarer, and word boundary errors tended to occur in structures involving apostrophes and more unfamiliar structures (“on t’attend” realised as “ontattont” or “ent aton”). Of course, it must be acknowledged that students may simply have recognised more words in the post-test than they did in the pre-test.

**Sound discrimination**. Students displayed some improvement in this area; more were able to discriminate between ‘le’ and ‘la’ than had been able to pre-intervention. However, there was continued confusion between ‘on’, ‘un’ and ‘en’, despite having targeted these minimal pairs specifically during the interventions, with no students getting these correct 100% of the time. Other examples of persistent sound discrimination issues at post-test were "sais" (si), "redeon" "reshion" (region), "soir" (sur), "boco" (beaucoup) "beur/beau de la mere" (bord de la mer) and "un tatoo" (on t'attend).

**GPC awareness.** Students made progress with their GPC recognition; they increasingly spelt words correctly, or partially correctly, without necessarily being familiar with the word (Loire was frequently realised as “loir”, and in three cases was completely correct). These rules were often misused: “pourtant” (important); “mere/maire” (mer); “on tatont” (on t'attend); "cent" (sont); “sher nul/che nul” (chez nous); “rondonné” randonnées. However, the realisations did contain GPC combinations that are common in French, indicating an awareness of these patterns. That said, there were persisting and widespread issues with words involving vowel clusters, even in high-frequency words such as “beaucoup”, which was correctly spelt in four cases but was widely realised as “bookoo”, “bocoup”, and “buku”.

The latter example is also indicative of continued **L1 GPC usage**. This had been reduced on the whole by the post-test, indicating increased assurance with the GPC of French. However, there were frequent instances of students falling back on L1 GPC patterns: “lwa” (Loire); “montanya” (montagne); “shey” (chez). As might be expected, the most accurate realisations at both pre- and



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

post-tests were L1 cognates ("surf", "ski", "cool"). In six instances, even these were not successfully realised ("skee", "serf", "kul"), although it must be borne in mind that these errors were made predominantly by students with general literacy problems, and one for whom English is not her first language.

**Phonic awareness.** The post-intervention task indicated that students continued to struggle in this area. Taking an example of an English cognate which students would possibly not have struggled to identify in the written form ("l'histoire"), only two students made the connection between "l'histoire" and "history", indicating a lack of awareness of common sound pattern similarities and differences between English and French. Many instead realised "histoire" as "le soir", "listrua" or "listwa". One student showed awareness of the connection but resorted to an L1 in realisation, perhaps indicating a panic moment and subsequently resorting to top-down strategy use at the expense of bottom-up ("listorie").

**RQ2: To what extent do LAM activities affect students' self-efficacy with listening?**

To answer this question, I collected data from the pre-and post-intervention questionnaires, and from my own observation notes. Unfortunately, the results may have been skewed by some students' disengagement during completion of the pre-intervention questionnaire, leading to several incomplete answers. For each section of the questionnaire, raw scores were recorded, and percentages were found for each, as a different number of students completed each questionnaire. Likert scale averages were also calculated. I have taken the most salient findings and grouped them thematically below. A summary of students' responses to both questionnaires can be found in Appendix 5.

*Difficulty in listening*

Listening was ranked the least difficult skill both at pre- and post-test, although at post-test students ranked listening as slightly more difficult than they had at pre-test (pre-test mean = 3.0 and post-test mean = 2.7, where 1 = most difficult and 4 = least difficult). Similarly, students' responses to the Likert item "Listening is the most difficult aspect of learning a foreign language" were ambivalent both at pre-test (mean = 3.3) and post-test (mean = 3.2). This appears to contradict the data obtained through students' post-dictation reactions, many of which mentioned the difficulty of the dictation



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

task at both pre- and post-test ("I found this very difficult"; "really hard and stressful"). This could mean that the dictation format was what they found difficult, more than listening itself.

A few students commented that it was "just as bad as last time", although one also said that it was "less difficult than last time". 55.6% used the words "hard", "difficult" or "confusing" in their post-test written feedback, and 42.3% did the same at pre-test (see Appendix 5), indicating that students found the post-intervention dictation more difficult than the pre-intervention. It is possible that I inadvertently spoke more quickly or did not repeat as frequently when reading at post-intervention, particularly given that 5 students reported that the dictation was too fast.

*Anxiety and stress in listening.*

After the interventions, the number of students citing 'anxious' as best describing how they feel during listening dropped from 9 (39.1%) to 5 (19.2%). Similarly, the Likert average for students feeling 'calm' during a listening activity increased marginally from 2.5 to 2.4. In addition, 12 students (50%) decided that panicking was the least common reason for not understanding at post-test, compared to 7 (36.8%) at pre-test. The average Likert scale response for the same question ("I panic and stop listening") went from 3.4 at pre-test to 3.9 at post-test (1 = most usual reason; 5 = least usual reason), indicating a decreased sense of panic and anxiety when faced with a listening task. This is further supported by students selecting "calm" as best describing how they feel had also increased from 13% to 34.6%. The post-dictation reactions support this to a mild extent; 32% of students used words relating to "stress" in their worded responses at pre-test, compared to 22% at post-test. My observations also support this sentiment; during the post-intervention dictation, I noticed that students seemed "visibly calmer" than the first time.

*Confidence*

The number of students who said that listening difficulties were most often related to their own abilities and reactions ("I don't know what words mean", "I lose concentration", "I panic and stop listening") all decreased from 89.5% at pre-test to 41.7% at post-test. Conversely, the number of students identifying the options which placed the 'fault' with other people as the most usual reason for not understanding ("speaks too quickly"; "doesn't speak clearly") increased from 63.2% at pre-test to 66.7% at post-test. This suggests that students increasingly felt they were not to blame for not understanding. It is supported by students disagreeing slightly more with the Likert item "If I do



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

not understand 100% of the listening exercise, I feel as if I have failed" at post-test (3.7) than they had at pre-test (3.6).

This decrease in self-blaming is echoed by my observation notes, which state that "disruptions from students all related to my speech speed – students asked me to slow down although I was reading at very measured, unnaturally slow pace". There were also several mentions of speech pace in post-intervention questionnaires; whilst at pre-test many additional comments related to low self-confidence or shortcomings in their listening skills ("I don't know what the words mean"; "I can't understand accents that well") responses at post-test centred more commonly on issues with my speed of delivery ("they speak too quick"; "we don't have enough time").

Finally, the post-test questionnaire additional comments included more positive responses than had been gathered at pre-test: one mid-attainment student commented: "I feel confident in my work and my progress". Interestingly, this student had also increased her dictation score by an impressive 12.14%, indicating that the interventions had served to improve both her listening skills and her confidence. Similarly, additional descriptors were more positive at post-intervention; where at pre-test the only positive descriptor offered was "curious", four positive reactions were recorded at post-test ("Happy", "Ready. To. Learn", "confident" and "fine").

**RQ3: Which LAM activities do students feel are most beneficial?**

To answer this question, I added together all responses for reactions to each activity. I also found percentages for the total positive reactions (selection of "helpful", "fun", "interesting" and "easy") and total negative reactions ("difficult", "boring" and "stressful"). I am counting 'difficult' as a negative response. However, upon reflection and in line with some responses which show that students felt an activity could be both difficult and fun, I acknowledge that students may not always view an activity being difficult as a bad thing. I am also aware that students were presented with more positive options than negative ones. Were the research to be repeated, I would provide an equal number of positive and negative reactions in the interests of achieving balanced results.

Tables 4 and 5 show which activities were most positively-received and most negatively-received overall, in descending order:



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

| Activity | Number of positive responses |
|---|---|
| Trapdoor | 75 |
| Sentence building | 57 |
| Listen and sing along to the lyrics | 42 |
| Add the spaces | 41 |
| Speaking ping-pong | 39 |
| Faulty echo | 34 |
| What have I written? | 33 |
| Count the words and place your bets | 31 |
| Find the rhymes | 28 |
| Spot the intruder | 27 |
| Missing syllables | 23 |

**Table 4: Positive reactions to activities**

| Activity | Number of negative responses |
|---|---|
| Fill in the missing syllables | 31 |
| Find the rhymes | 30 |
| Spot the intruder | 23 |
| Count the words and place your bets | 21 |
| Faulty echo | 20 |
| Add the spaces | 20 |
| Speaking ping-pong | 16 |
| What have I written? | 16 |
| Listen and sing along to the lyrics | 15 |
| Trapdoor | 13 |
| Sentence building | 11 |

**Table 5: Negative reactions to activities**

The results for this part of the questionnaire can be found in full in Appendix 6. A detailed analysis of the results is given below.

*Trapdoor*

This was the most popular activity overall, with 75 positive responses opposite 13 negative responses. It was also considered the most helpful, fun and interesting of the activities. Students were confident about doing it, with 63% saying that it was easy. Conversely, few said that it was either difficult (11.1%) or boring (22.2%). Additionally, several students expressed positive feelings in their additional comments ("amazing", "funny", "loved it"). Many students also used the word "fun" in their individual responses, suggesting that this is a key criterion for what students feel is a good activity. One student said he liked the activity because he could "practise the words over and over again", suggesting that he viewed it more as a speaking activity than a listening one. Interestingly, several students approved of the interactive aspect of the activity, stating this as the reason they enjoyed it ("interactive"; "cooperative"; "get to talk to friends").



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

*Count the words and place your bets*

There were mixed reactions to this activity, with 31 positive responses against 35 negative ones. 63% of students reported that it was fun, but interestingly, they also reported that it was difficult (51.9%). In fact, more students marked this activity as difficult than any other activity. This could indicate that the activity provided challenge but not in a way that was particularly negative. In addition, and unlike all the other activities, this activity was more commonly associated with stress (48.1%), arguably due to the time limits involved.

*Sentence building*

This was voted the easiest of the activities, with 88.9% of the class selecting this option. It was also the second most popular option, with 57 positive responses compared to 11 negative ones. A relatively high number of students decided it was both helpful and fun (44.4%). One student said this was his favourite activity, although only because of who he was sitting next to on that day, which serves as a reminder to reach only tentative conclusions with these results due to the wide variety of factors affecting students' decisions beyond the nature of the activities themselves.

*Find the rhymes*

Students were ambivalent about this activity, with 28 positive responses and 29 negative ones. High numbers found it difficult (40.7%) and boring (55.6%). It was also the second least-popular activity overall. This, added to the fact that it scored low in terms of being stressful (14.8%), creates the impression that students were more disinterested in this activity than worried by it. This also indicates that students found sound discrimination difficult. These results are surprising when compared with my observations; students appeared to be enjoying the activity as it allowed them to experiment with sound and work collaboratively, the latter of which their feedback indicates is an important criterion for language activities ("it was very fun, you could work with your partner").

*What have I written?*

There was a generally positive response here, with 33 positive reactions against 16 negative ones. A high number found this fun (40.7%), which is supported by my observations that most students were enthusiastically participating. However, worded responses also indicated that students did not



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

see how it was helping them ("game of luck"; "not helpful"). My observations also confirm that students did not view it as a listening activity, as they often repeated guesses that others had made, indicating that they were not using each other as listening models and therefore missing part of the activity's aim. This may have been my fault for not explicitly instructing them to listen to each other, and students' opinions of the validity of the exercise may therefore be less reliable.

*Spot the intruder*

Responses were generally positive, with 27 positive versus 23 negative responses. Compared to the other activities, there were arguably no strong reactions to this activity, although many felt that it was difficult (40.7%). Other high scores were given for it being helpful (33.3%) and boring (37%).

*Listen and sing*

42 students responded positively to this activity, compared to 15 negative responses, which can be broken down into helpful (33.3%), fun (51.9%) and easy (44.4%). Very few found it difficult, although a high number found it boring (40.7%). This was surprising given that in my observations, most students appeared to be very motivated by the activity: "Students loved this, asked if they could get up and dance". That said, it is possible that the noisiness of those who were very enthusiastic could have prevented me from noticing how many were not participating. Some also used the additional comments to express that they found it "cringy" and "awkward", which could even out the positive/negative ratio from the quantitative data.

*Speaking ping-pong*

This was responded to positively overall, with 39 positive responses compared to 16 negative ones. A significant proportion (55.6%) reported that it was fun. Students were visibly engaged in this activity according to my observations: "got them listening to each other, lots of engagement from usually less confident students".

*Fill in the missing syllables*

This was the most negatively-received activity overall, with 23 positive responses to 31 negative ones. This is supported by several students' use of the addition comments box, in which they



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

reported that the activity was "confusing", "not helpful" and that they "didn't enjoy" it. This is also supported by my observations; students were generally quite disengaged during this activity and seemed uncomfortable and confused, resulting in multiple explanations of what they had to do.

*Add the spaces*

This was received positively, with 41 positive versus 20 negative responses. A particularly high proportion found this activity easy (51.9%), although my observations note that this was because some were completing it by guessing before they had heard the text.

*Faulty echo*

This activity was neither among the most nor the least popular, but was received positively overall with 34 positive responses compared to 24 negative ones. Only two students made additional comments about it, both of which were positive ("competitive"; "beneficial"). Three said that they did not remember it, and the inconclusive response could be partly due to it being the first of the LAM activities students had experienced, making it the furthest back in their memories. My observations support the positive response; I noted that two students who often lack confidence were very engaged. Conversely, I also noted a lot of confusion when the task was presented, possibly because the format was not one with which they were familiar, which could explain some negativity towards it.

## Discussion

### RQ1: To what extent do LAM activities improve students' bottom-up listening skills?

The quantitative data provided by the dictation suggest that LAM activities do improve students' listening skills in general, although they are more likely to be beneficial for lower attainers, in line with Goh (2000). In effect, the intervention appears to have narrowed the gap between higher- and lower-proficiency listeners, and the fact that those at the lower end made significant gains whilst those at the higher end did not suggests that higher-level learners are already employing different bottom-up skills when they listen, and so stood to gain less from the interventions. The data therefore also support Tsui and Fullilove (1998)'s conclusion that listeners must develop bottom-up skills in order to become higher-proficiency learners.



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

Students made notable improvements in their ability to segment sentences and recognise word boundaries, suggesting that Conti (2016)'s recommendations for frequent use of activities such as 'Add the Spaces' are justified. They were also increasingly able to break down the speech flow, as evidenced by the marked decrease in omission at post-test. Sound discrimination was an area in which students made less progress, indicating that activities such as 'Spot the Intruder' and 'Find the Rhymes' may not be as effective as has been claimed by Field (2008) and Hulstijn (2001).

Students demonstrated some improvement in their GPC awareness, as evidenced by spelling improvements, supporting to Conti's suggestion of activities such as 'Find the Rhymes'. However, there were persistent problems in this area, arguably due to the irregularity of French GPC and students' limited prior knowledge. Additionally, this highlights the methodological difficulties with using dictation for assessment, as it remains hard to tell to what extent students improved their scores due to better-trained bottom-up listening skills, or whether they had simply memorised the visual representations of those words and relied upon top-down, context-based compensation strategies instead.

As with many of the errors observed, these issues may have been resolved with increased grammar knowledge and top-down strategies, which would have helped students to eliminate some potential options. Proving this conclusively is beyond the scope of the present study, but the only partial success of the bottom-up listening training received by students during this intervention may support Goh (2000)'s argument that lower-proficiency learners require both top-down and bottom-up training.

**RQ2: To what extent do LAM activities affect students' self-efficacy with listening?**

The results paint a rather mixed overall picture of whether the interventions improved self-efficacy. Questionnaire feedback about reactions associated with self-efficacy (perception of difficulty; anxiety and stress; confidence) revealed decreased levels of anxiety and stress following the interventions, in line with Khuziakhmetov and Porchesku's (2016) findings. However, the data were inconclusive in terms of perceived difficulty, with students finding listening more difficult post-intervention that they had pre-intervention. This was confused further by the fact that, contrary to Graham (2006) and Hasan (2000), students did not rate listening as particularly difficult to begin with. Results related to confidence revealed that LAM activities had served to alleviate some of the issues highlighted by Graham (2006) in relation to self-blaming for lack of listening skills; there



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

was a relatively decisive shift from students blaming themselves to blaming external conditions such as the speed of the speaker, in line with Goh (2000)'s findings. This supports Conti's observation that LAM activities improve students' self-efficacy, although the results are arguably too mixed to be considered conclusive, and this support therefore remains tentative.

It should be borne in mind that some negative reactions could have been provoked by negative feelings towards the dictation format rather than the listening itself. Despite my continual reassurances, many students were uncomfortable with the idea of not getting every word correctly spelled. Conversely, my observation that students had become more confident with listening by the post-intervention dictation could be attributed to students becoming comfortable with the dictation format rather than with the actual listening.

**RQ3: Which LAM activities do students feel are most beneficial?**

Some of the most popular activities were those involving high levels of repetition ('Trapdoor'; 'Listen' and 'Sing'), supporting arguments made by Hulstijn (2003) and Osada (2004) that repetition of the input is an important feature of successful bottom-up listening activities.

Notably, the most popular activity ('Trapdoor') was also an activity that was not new to students, and less popular activities ('Spot the Intruder'; 'Find the Rhymes') were often those which were unfamiliar, resulting in elevated levels of confusion and insecurity. This might suggest that students prefer LAM activities when they are delivered in a familiar format; this may then enable them to complete the task more successfully and with more confidence.

Activities with a dictation component ('Fill in the Spaces'; 'Sentence Building'; 'Speaking Ping-pong') received mixed reviews which seemed to depend largely on the format in which the dictation was presented and whether it was teacher- or student-centric. Student-centric dictation-based activities such as 'Speaking Ping-pong' were received more positively overall than teacher-centric ones such as 'Add the Spaces' and the pre- and post-tests themselves. This does not support Kiany and Shiramiry (2002)'s findings that teacher-centric dictation is particularly beneficial as a listening activity, although this could be attributed to the difference in sample pool demographics of the two studies.



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

Finally, the group's preferred activities were often those that had an interactive component ('Trapdoor'; 'Speaking Ping-pong'; 'What have I written?'). This indicates that the most successful bottom-up listening activities are those in which students are less conscious about listening and are more engaged with "two-way traffic" communication (Field, 2008, p.5) than with practising their listening skills.

## Conclusions and recommendations

Given the limited time-frame and sample pool available for this study, it is difficult to reach concrete conclusions about the impact of LAM activities, both upon students' bottom-up listening skills and upon their self-efficacy. However, the results indicate that students did benefit from the additional training, particularly lower-attaining class members. The fact that the activities succeeded in engaging some of the least confident students, which is reflected in their performances post-intervention, indicates that such activities may hold great potential to narrow the attainment gap within MFL. LAM activities had the most visible impact upon students' segmentation skills and ability to break down the speech stream, with some modest gains in their GPC awareness, and some limited progress with sound discrimination. Whilst encouraging, it is important to acknowledge that not all gains may have been due directly to the intervention, as students continued to receive other forms of listening instruction concurrent to this investigation.

It may also be tentatively suggested that the activities improved students' confidence and went some way to alleviating their listening-related anxiety, which in turn impacted positively upon their self-efficacy. That said, the fact that students continued to comment upon the difficulty of listening after the intervention, and the lack of consensus as to whether they found listening particularly difficult in the first place, plus the disengagement affecting the data collection process, render this conclusion very tentative indeed. The results also suggest that students prefer LAM to be delivered through student-centric, interactive activities, in a format that is familiar and 'safe' for them.

The study has significant implications for both my future teaching and research practice. I have learnt a great deal about how best to extract data from this age group and may in future use individual or small group interviews for qualitative data instead of a questionnaire, as I am unconvinced that students of this age are always mature and self-reflective enough to complete written feedback thoroughly enough to achieve rigorous results. Another solution could be making



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

the completion process much tighter by guiding students through question by question and pilot-testing the questionnaire format in advance. In extension, I would recommend running a similar investigation over a much longer period and with a much larger sample pool to obtain more compelling data than has been possible here. I would also recommend extending the investigation to include the effects of LAM activities upon listening comprehension, given that comprehension is ultimately the goal for all listening instruction. Finally, it would be valuable to carry out similar research using a different means of assessment (such as spelling nonsense words), to get a more accurate impression of improvements exclusively in students' bottom-up skills.

In terms of my teaching practice, the investigation has been illuminating regarding the role of bottom-up listening micro-skills. It has gone some way towards proving to me that these skills are trainable through LAM activities, and that these may be used to render listening a non-threatening, empowering and exciting means of accessing new language, rather than a stressful, high-stakes test of comprehension.

## References

Abedini, A., & Rahimi, A. (2009). The interface between EFL learners' self-efficacy concerning listening comprehension and listening proficiency. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 3(1), 14-28.

Arnold, J. (2000). Seeing through listening comprehension exam anxiety. *TESOL Quarterly*, 34(4), 777–786.

Bandura, A. (1986). *The social foundation of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bell, C., & McLachlan, A. (2010). Studio 1. Harlow: Pearson Education. Retrieved June 26, 2018, from https://www.activeteachonline.com/product/view/id/34/page/0/mode/spftw

British Educational Research Association (BERA). (2011). Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research. Retrieved April 23, 2018, from https://www.bera.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/BERA-Ethical-Guidelines-2011.pdf

Brown, D. H. (2007). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Cohen, L., & Manion, L. (1994). *Research methods in Education*. London: Routledge.



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in Education*. Oxford: Routledge.

Conti, G. (2016). Eleven intervention strategies for under-achieving L2 listeners. Retrieved April 23, 2018, from https://gianfrancoconti.wordpress.com/category/listening-2/

Conti, G. (2017). Implementing Listening-As-Modelling in the classroom – a report on a 20-week experiment with my year 8 French classes and its impact on their aural comprehension skills. Retrieved April 23, 2018, from https://gianfrancoconti.wordpress.com/2017/05/06/listening-as-modelling-in-action-a-report-on-a-20-week-experiment-with-my-year-8-french-classes/

Denscombe, M. (2007). *Good research guide: for small-scale social research projects* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Department for Education. (2013). The National Curriculum in England: Languages Programmes of Study Key Stage 3. Retrieved April 23, 2018, from https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/239083/SECONDARY_national_curriculum_-_Languages.pdf

Erler, L. (2004). Near-beginner learners of French are reading at a disability level. *Francophonie*, 30, 9-15.

Field, J. (2008). *Listening in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goh, C. (2000). A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems. *System*, 28, 55–75.

Graham, S. (2006) Listening comprehension: The learner's perspective. *System*, 34, 165–182.

Hasan, A.S. (2000). Learners' perceptions of listening comprehension problems. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 13(2), 137–153.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2001). Intentional and incidental second language vocabulary learning: A reappraisal of elaboration, rehearsal and automaticity. In P. Robinson (Ed.), *Cognition and second language instruction* (pp. 258-286). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hulstijn, J. H. (2003). Connectionist models of language processing and the training of listening skills with the aid of multimedia software. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 16, 413–425.



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

Khuziakhmetov, A. N., & Porchesku, G. V. (2016). Teaching listening comprehension: bottom-up approach. *International Journal of Environmental & Science Education*, 11(8), 1989-2001.

Kiany, G. R., & Shiramiry, E. (2002). The effect of frequent dictation on the listening comprehension ability of elementary EFL learners. *TESL Canada Journal*, 20, 57–63.

Krashen, S. (1987). *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. London: Prentice-Hall International.

Lively, S. E., Logan, J. S., & Pisoni, D. B. (1993). Training Japanese listeners to identify English /r/ and /l/: The role of phonetic environment and talker variability in learning new perceptual categories. *Journal of the Acoustic Society of America*. 94 (3, Pt 1): 1242-1255.

Mendelsohn, D. J. (1994). *Learning to listen: A strategy-based approach for second language learners*. Carlsbad, CA: Dominie Press.

Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2006). A re-evaluation of the role of anxiety: self□efficacy, anxiety, and their relation to reading and listening proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals*, 39(2), 276-296.

Morley, J. (2001). Aural comprehension instruction: Principles and practices. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed.) (pp.69 – 85). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Oller, J. (1971). Dictation as a device for testing foreign language proficiency. *English Language Teaching*, 25, 254-259.

O'Malley, J.M., Chamot, A.U., & Kupper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 10(4), 418–437.

Osada, N. (2001). What strategy do less proficient learners employ in listening comprehension? A reappraisal of bottom-up and top-down processing. *Journal of the Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistics*, 5, 73–90.

Osada, N. (2004). Listening Comprehension Research: A Brief Review of the Past Thirty Years. *Dialogue*, 3, 53-66.



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

Pachler, N., Evans, M., Redondo, A., & Fisher, L. (2014). *Learning to Teach Foreign Languages in the Secondary School.* London: Routledge.

Raoofi, S., Tan, B. H., & Chan, S. H. (2012). Self-efficacy in Second/Foreign Language Learning Contexts. *English Language Teaching*, 5(11), 60-73.

Scarcella, R., & Oxford, R. (1992). *The Tapestry of Language Learning: The Individual in the Communicative Classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Taber, K. S. (2013). *Classroom-based research and evidence-based practice: a guide for teachers*. London: SAGE.

Tsui, A., & Fullilove, J. (1998). Bottom-up or top-down processing as a discriminator of L2 listening performance. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 432-451.

Vandergrift, L. (2004). Listening to Learn or Learning to Listen? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 3-25.

Vandergrift, L. (2007). Recent developments in second and foreign language listening comprehension research. *Language Teaching*, 40(3), 191-210.



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

# Appendix 1

## Pre- and post- intervention questionnaire

*Listening Questions:*

1. Read each statement and tick the box which best describes what you think most of the time.

| | **(1) Strongly agree** | **(2) Agree** | **(3) Uncertain** | **(4) Disagree** | **(5) Strongly disagree** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Listening is the most difficult aspect of learning a foreign language | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| Listening is the most important aspect of learning a foreign language | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| If I do not understand 100% of the listening exercise, I feel as if I have failed | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| I find it difficult to understand native speakers because they speak too quickly | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| When I do not understand what someone is saying, I feel frustrated | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| I feel that my speaking, reading, and writing skills are improving more quickly than my listening | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |
| I don't need to understand every word I hear to understand what the speaker means | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

Please provide your answers to the following questions:

2. Number the following feelings in order of how well they describe how you feel when doing a listening exercise in French. (1 = most like how you feel; 5 = least like how you feel)

| Anxious | Angry | Excited | Bored | Calm |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

If there are any other words that describe better how you feel, please write them here:

---

3. Number the four skills in order of difficulty for you (1 = Most difficult; 4 = Least difficult):

| Speaking | Listening | Reading | Writing |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

4. When you don't understand something in French, what do you feel is ***most often*** the reason? Number the following feelings in order of how often you believe each causes you not to understand (1 = Most common reason; 5 = Least common reason):

| The speaker speaks too quickly | The speaker doesn't speak clearly | I can hear the words okay but don't know what they mean | I lose concentration too easily | I panic and stop listening |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

If there are any other reasons that you can think of, please write them here:

---



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

# Appendix 2

## Post-intervention questionnaire – listening activities feedback

**Listening activities feedback**

Think back to the listening activities we did over the past few weeks.

Tick the box next to each word that you would use to describe how you felt about each activity (tick all that apply):

***Faulty echo:***

| Helpful ☐ | Fun ☐ | Interesting ☐ | Easy ☐ | Difficult ☐ | Boring ☐ | Stressful ☐ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| I don't remember doing this activity ☐ | Other: _____ ☐ |
|---|---|

***Add the spaces:***

| Helpful ☐ | Fun ☐ | Interesting ☐ | Easy ☐ | Difficult ☐ | Boring ☐ | Stressful ☐ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| I don't remember doing this activity ☐ | Other: _____ ☐ |
|---|---|

***Fill in missing syllables:***

| Helpful ☐ | Fun ☐ | Interesting ☐ | Easy ☐ | Difficult ☐ | Boring ☐ | Stressful ☐ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| I don't remember doing this activity ☐ | Other: _____ ☐ |
|---|---|

***Speaking ping pong:***

| Helpful ☐ | Fun ☐ | Interesting ☐ | Easy ☐ | Difficult ☐ | Boring ☐ | Stressful ☐ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| I don't remember doing this activity ☐ | Other: _____ ☐ |
|---|---|

***Listen and sing as you follow the lyrics :***

| Helpful ☐ | Fun ☐ | Interesting ☐ | Easy ☐ | Difficult ☐ | Boring ☐ | Stressful ☐ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| I don't remember doing this activity ☐ | Other: _____ ☐ |
|---|---|

***Spot the intruder:***

| Helpful ☐ | Fun ☐ | Interesting ☐ | Easy ☐ | Difficult ☐ | Boring ☐ | Stressful ☐ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| I don't remember doing this activity ☐ | Other: _____ ☐ |
|---|---|

***What have I written on my mini whiteboard ?:***

| Helpful ☐ | Fun ☐ | Interesting ☐ | Easy ☐ | Difficult ☐ | Boring ☐ | Stressful ☐ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| I don't remember doing this activity ☐ | Other: _____ ☐ |
|---|---|



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

***Find the rhymes :***

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Helpful ☐** | **Fun ☐** | **Interesting ☐** | **Easy ☐** | **Difficult ☐** | **Boring ☐** | **Stressful ☐** |

| | |
|---|---|
| **I don't remember doing this activity ☐** | **Other: _____ ☐** |

***Sentence building:***

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Helpful ☐** | **Fun ☐** | **Interesting ☐** | **Easy ☐** | **Difficult ☐** | **Boring ☐** | **Stressful ☐** |

| | |
|---|---|
| **I don't remember doing this activity ☐** | **Other: _____ ☐** |

***Count the words and place your bets:***

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Helpful ☐** | **Fun ☐** | **Interesting ☐** | **Easy ☐** | **Difficult ☐** | **Boring ☐** | **Stressful ☐** |

| | |
|---|---|
| **I don't remember doing this activity ☐** | **Other: _____ ☐** |

***Trapdoor:***

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Helpful ☐** | **Fun ☐** | **Interesting ☐** | **Easy ☐** | **Difficult ☐** | **Boring ☐** | **Stressful ☐** |

| | |
|---|---|
| **I don't remember doing this activity ☐** | **Other: _____ ☐** |



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

# Appendix 3

## Intervention observation notes

| Date | Activity | Observations |
|---|---|---|
| 1/3/18 | Pre-test | *Bad behavior today, students very distracted and fussy (S1, S2, S3 sent out for restorative conversations)*<br>*Very uncomfortable with dictation, one student visibly upset and nervous*<br>*Continual requests to repeat sections, lots of frustration*<br>*Students struggled with questionnaire format, should have demonstrated more clearly* |
| 7/3/18 | Faulty echo | *Students responding really well. Particularly students who don't usually have a lot of confidence*<br>*A lot of students confused about what to do initially as had never done this kind of exercise before. Lots of questions and repeating explanation.*<br>*Could have given them visual clarification of answers + asked them to write down the word that was wrong in each case – was relying on them remembering where the error had been when they replied.*<br>*Did feel a bit teacher-centric, could be boring from students' POV.* |
| 7/3/18 | Add the spaces | *Less successful – some students completed before listening*<br>*Some confusion with marking a space in middle of person/nes.*<br>*Students seemed more confident with this but not sure it helped their segmentation as many did it from memory of how the words look* |
| 8/3/18 | Find the missing syllables | *Ss responded more confidently to dictation than before, especially usually less confident students (S3, S4).*<br>*Lots of +ve feedback, more than yesterday when asked how confident about the exercise (only 3 thumbs down).*<br>*Elicited knowledge about how French doesn't look as it sounds – awareness raising.*<br>*Drawing students' attention to common patterns with vowel sounds (normaleMONT = normalement)* |
| 8/3/18 | Speaking ping-pong | *Students got a lot out of speaking ping pong, lots of production + enjoyment.*<br>*Less teacher-centric*<br>*Got them listening to each other, lots of engagement with usually less confident students*<br>*Could have assessed for learning more thoroughly: assessed through monitoring but didn't check how many they got accurately* |
| 12/3/18 | Listen and sing following the lyrics | *Students loved this, asked if they could get up and dance too*<br>*Could have delivered it better, had them read through before hearing the music as they got overexcited and were not following the words properly*<br>*Used the rhythm to figure out syllables in each line, listened twice, drew attention to sound separation, second time production sounded more accurate*<br>*Difficult to AfL, very noisy and some people were not singing along, also difficult to assess as I was guiding them through the lyrics.*<br>*Many students had difficulty following lyrics when I asked for feedback at end ("went too fast… I got lost")* → *weak GPC still* |
| 14/3/18 | Spot the intruder | *Very successful activity. Students were engaged and attentive which is rare for this Weds period 5 slot. Usually unconfident students participating (S1, S3)*<br>*Over half the class got all answers correct.*<br>*Did require a lot of scaffolding – needed to stop song after every error line to give a clue. Then played it all through and pointed to each line as they followed the words.* |
| 15/3/18 | What have I written on my whiteboard? | *Very successful – good way to re-harvest vocab from yesterday – students very engaged and got competitive in 2 class teams. Remodelled pronunciation where there were errors and had them reproduce correctly before accepting their response*<br>*Good potential for high TL - teacher modelling* |



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

| **Date** | **Activity** | **Observations** |
|---|---|---|
| 15/3/18 | Find the rhymes | *Successful in drawing students' attention to vowel sounds.*<br>*Many thought 'aller' rhymed with 'super', brief discussion that words spelt the same don't always sound the same*<br>*Used rhyming pairs to write a song together – new knowledge was applied to a task quickly after*<br>*Also increased sound awareness as students practised making sounds in pairs and having a conversation about which rhymed by listening to the sounds they were making* |
| 19/3/18 | Sentence building | *Students responded very positively to this. All students showed confidence with the task, and lots of potential for differentiation (some folded over the words). Many said was too easy. Students who have been struggling fully able access (S5, S6)*<br>*Conj + inf successfully identified by vast majority. Needs more consolidation but good start. Students also showing impressive improvement in pronunciation as evidenced when reading phrases back to me.* |
| 22/3/18 | Count the words and place your bets | *Students VERY engaged in this activity. Full participation*<br>*I repeated sentences several times and challenged ss by getting them to write down what they heard as well as counting*<br>*Dressing it up as 'place your bets' created a lot of excitement*<br>*Could have AfLed it better, but having them engage with the sounds was more important than how many words they counted*<br>*Comprehension measured secondarily via translation into EN of sentences.* |
| 22/3/18 | Trapdoor | *Students respond very positively to this. Gives opportunity to use each other as models, v student centric, opportunity for lots of repetition of target structure.*<br>*Doesn't require comprehension; only recognition.*<br>*Students asking to carry on for longer*<br>*Pronunciation much improved (monitoring)* |
| 26/3/18 | Post-test | *Students visibly calmer than last time*<br>*Disruptions from students all related to my speech pace – students asked me to slow down although I was reading at very measured, unnaturally slow pace.*<br>*Questionnaires completed much more sensibly (my delivery was better).*<br>*Reminding them of activities on PowerPoint worked well.* |



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

# Appendix 4

## Pre-intervention and post-intervention dictation results

| Pupil | Reaction to pre-intervention dictation | Accuracy /88 | Accuracy % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Some words I forgot how to spell under pressure. | 56 | 63.64% |
| 2 | I wasn't stressed or anything because we are writing what we heard. | 21 | 23.86% |
| 3 | I felt it was easy. I was OK. | 12 | 13.64% |
| 4 | I was a bit confused on some of it. Some of it my mind didn't process. | 38 | 43.18% |
| 5 | I felt like I spelt most of the words wrong. I also felt confused about the words because some of the words don't make sense and I felt like I was under pressure because I had to write all of the words. And I felt like I was going to get it wrong and it was boring and stressful. | 16 | 18.18% |
| 6 | I felt hesitant because in case I got it wrong. | 41 | 46.59% |
| 7 | It was hard I enjoyed it though but I don't spell well soo! that was annoying. | 37 | 42.05% |
| 8 | I don't like this. I don't like French. Stressful. Boring. | 6 | 6.82% |
| 9 | Made me feel a little stressed. | 11 | 12.50% |
| 10 | OK. | 47 | 53.41% |
| 11 | I found it easy on a scale of 1 to 10 I would put 7/10 (10 being easy). | 45 | 51.14% |
| 12 | Confused, Stress stress stress confused head hurting head and hand hurt. | 11 | 12.50% |
| 13 | Hated it. Not fun. Can't spell. Didn't like it. Confusing. Couldn't process. | 22 | 25.00% |
| 14 | | 48 | 54.55% |
| 15 | I understood most of it, but I had to guess a few words. | 52 | 59.09% |
| 16 | I was really stressed and I couldn't process the information. | 64 | 72.73% |
| 17 | I found it very very very hard and I couldn't keep up. | 4 | 4.55% |
| 18 | Rushed. Hard. Confusing. | 31 | 35.23% |
| 19 | I understood most of the words just spelt them wrong. | 35 | 39.77% |
| 20 | I found it quite confusing because some French words sound completely different to how they're spelt and bored. I like it that you said it twice. | 24 | 27.27% |
| 21 | Stressed. Quite hard. | 30 | 34.09% |
| 22 | I was not worried at all about it. I did any French but it was like a walk in the park! | 20 | 22.73% |
| 23 | I found it difficultish. Bored. | 34 | 38.64% |
| 24 | It was too fast. I hardly got any of it. I am a slow writer so I tried to write quick and made mistakes. | 42 | 47.73% |
| 25 | I was really bored. | 18 | 20.45% |
| 26 | I felt very scared because I started to fall behind by the end. | 58 | 65.91% |
| | | **M: 31.65** | **35.97%** |



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

| Pupil | Reactions to post-intervention dictation | Mark /95 | Percentage | Difference pre-test/post-test |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | I found this very difficult because they spoke too fast and some words I didn't understand. | 57 | 60.00% | -3.64% |
| 2 | I wrote what I heard. I found it boring. | 33 | 34.74% | 10.87% |
| 3 | I found it difficult and I don't think I spelt anything right. | 34 | 35.79% | n/a |
| 4 | Normal. | 40 | 42.11% | 28.47% |
| 5 | I felt OK but I'm not sure if I got many right, but I felt better than the first time. Last time I felt stressed but I wasn't this time, I'm just curious to see what I got. | 47 | 49.47% | 6.29% |
| 6 | I found it really hard and stressful because I couldn't really understand what she was saying. All the words don't sound the same as they spell. | 28 | 29.47% | 11.29% |
| 7 | I found this hard. | 48 | 50.53% | 3.94% |
| 8 | Fun but stressful. I was unsure about lots of the words & that it was slightly harder. This was fun and stressful at the same time but it was helpful. | 50 | 52.63% | 10.59% |
| 9 | I don't like French. Never want to do this again. I hate it. | 6 | 6.32% | -0.50% |
| 10 | I found this very difficult and quite boring as some of the words I don't know how to spell in French so I guess | 31 | 32.63% | n/a |
| 11 | Boring, difficult. | 27 | 28.42% | 15.92% |
| 12 | Hard, read too fast, not enough time to write. Harder than last time. | 40 | 42.11% | -11.30% |
| 13 | That was quite easy as I wrote down what I heard. | 44 | 46.32% | -4.82% |
| 14 | Difficult, fast, stressful. I have a headache. Incredibly hard. | 17 | 17.89% | 5.39% |
| 15 | Can't spell. Not fun. Just as bad as first time. Can't keep up. The accent I can't understand. | 44 | 46.32% | 21.32% |
| 16 | Boring | 48 | 50.53% | -4.02% |
| 17 | I was able to work out some of the words, but others I wrote it how I heard it, so the spellings might be incorrect. | 46 | 48.42% | -10.67% |
| 18 | I was really stressed and not very confident. I made up half of the words and I feel quite ashamed. | 55 | 57.89% | -14.83% |
| 19 | Really really really really difficult. | 9 | 9.47% | 4.93% |
| 20 | I found it quite difficult but I managed to understand it more than the first time. | 45 | 47.37% | 12.14% |
| 21 | It was boring just like last time. | 42 | 44.21% | 4.44% |
| 22 | I found it alright easier than the last one. | 40 | 42.11% | 14.83% |
| 23 | I found it hard and stressful and it was just as bad as the first one. | 38 | 40.00% | 5.91% |
| 24 | Quite difficult but easy in a way. It was easier [than] the last one though. | 38 | 40.00% | 1.36% |
| 25 | I thought this activity was terrible as I got to a point where I couldn't keep up and didn't get any of it. It was boring and very stressful. It was also spoken too fast. It was very difficult. | 34 | 35.79% | -11.94% |
| 26 | I felt fine! | 32 | 33.68% | 13.23% |
| 27 | I found this quite hard. | 49 | 51.58% | -14.33% |
| | | **M: 37.85** | **39.84%** | **3.87%** |



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

# Appendix 5

## Pre-and post-intervention questionnaire results

1. Read each statement and tick the box which best describes what you think most of the time.

| | (1) Strongly agree | | (2) Agree | | (3) Uncertain | | (4) Disagree | | (5) Strongly disagree | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Listening is the most difficult aspect of learning a foreign language | 2 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 5 | 3 |
| Listening is the most important aspect of learning a foreign language | 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 11 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 2 |
| If I do not understand 100% of the listening exercise, I feel as if I have failed | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 9 |
| I find it difficult to understand native speakers because they speak too quickly | 12 | 6 | 6 | 14 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| When I do not understand what someone is saying, I feel frustrated | 6 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 9 | 2 | 2 |
| I feel that my speaking, reading, and writing skills are improving more quickly than my listening | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 2 | 7 | 6 | 4 |
| I don't need to understand every word I hear to understand what the speaker means | 3 | 4 | 11 | 12 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 |

Pre-test n=24
Post-test n=27

Likert scale averages

| | Pre test | Post test |
|---|---|---|
| Listening is the most difficult aspect of learning a foreign language | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| Listening is the most important aspect of learning a foreign language | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| If I do not understand 100% of the listening exercise, I feel as if I have failed | 3.6 | 3.7 |
| I find it difficult to understand native speakers because they speak too quickly | 1.9 | 2.3 |
| When I do not understand what someone is saying, I feel frustrated | 2.6 | 3.1 |
| I feel that my speaking, reading, and writing skills are improving more quickly than my listening | 3.3 | 3.2 |
| I don't need to understand every word I hear to understand what the speaker means | 2.5 | 2.5 |



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

2. Number the following feelings in order of how well they describe how you feel when doing a listening exercise in French. (1 = most like how you feel; 5 = least like how you feel)

| | 1 (most like how you feel) | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 (least like how you feel) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Anxious** | 9 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 4 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 0 |
| **Angry** | 2 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 12 |
| **Excited** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 6 | 13 | 12 |
| **Bored** | 11 | 10 | 4 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| **Calm** | 3 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 1 |

Pre-test = _(n = 23)___ Post-test = __(n = 26)__

Likert scale averages:

| | Pre test | Post test |
|---|---|---|
| Anxious | 2.4 | 2.6 |
| Angry | 3.9 | 4.0 |
| Excited | 4.0 | 3.9 |
| Bored | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| Calm | 2.5 | 2.4 |

If there are any other words that describe better how you feel, please write them here:

| Student | Pre-test response | Post-test response |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | | Happy because I prefer listening to writing and speaking |
| 2. | Curious | Ready. To. Learn. |
| 3. | Confused sometimes | I feel confident in my work and my progress |
| 4. | | Stressed |
| 5. | | Worried, fine |
| 6. | | Bored/normal school type |
| 7. | | I feel frustrated |
| 8. | A bit frustrated | Annoyed |
| 9. | I hate learning foreign language | I don't like French. Frustrated. |
| 10. | Overwhelmed | |
| 11. | Tell me the answer | |
| 12. | De-stressed, not worried at all, totally normal | |
| 13. | I sometimes feel a bit confused | |
| 14. | Sometimes I feel bored because I may already know it. But mostly I'm excited to learn something new. | |
| 15. | Stressed/annoyed | Frustrated |



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

3. Number the four skills in order of difficulty for you (1 = Most difficult; 4 = Least difficult):

| | 1 (most difficult) | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 (least difficult) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Speaking** | 11 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 7 | 2 | 8 |
| **Listening** | 3 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 11 | 11 |
| **Reading** | 6 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 5 | 6 |
| **Writing** | 7 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 2 |

Pre-test = (n = 23) Post-test = (n = 27)

| | Pre test | Post test |
|---|---|---|
| Speaking | 1.9 | 2.7 |
| Listening | 3.0 | 2.7 |
| Reading | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| Writing | 2.2 | 2.0 |

4. When you don't understand something in French, what do you feel is ***most often*** the reason?

Number the following feelings in order of how often you believe each causes you not to understand (1 = Most common reason; 5 = Least common reason):

| | 1 (most often the reason for not understanding) | | 2 | | 3 | | 4 | | 5 (least often the reason for not understanding) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **The speaker speaks too quickly** | 9 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| **The speaker doesn't speak clearly** | 3 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 3 |
| **I can hear the words okay but don't know what they mean** | 8 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 3 |
| **I lose concentration too easily** | 4 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 4 |
| **I panic and stop listening** | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 12 |

Pre-test n=19 (4 responses were not included due to not following directions).

Post-test n=24 (3 responses were not included due to not following directions).

| | Pre test | Post test |
|---|---|---|
| The speaker speaks too quickly | 2.1 | 2 |
| The speaker doesn't speak clearly | 2.7 | 2.8 |
| I can hear the words okay but don't know what they mean | 2.1 | 3.1 |
| I lose concentration too easily | 3.2 | 3.1 |
| I panic and stop listening | 3.4 | 3.9 |

If there are any other reasons that you can think of, please write them here:



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

| Student | Pre-test response | Post-test response |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | | Because I don't know what the words mean sometimes but other times it's because they speak too quick |
| 2. | | We don't have enough time to acknowledge the words/speaker |
| 3. | I can't understand accents that well | I can't understand the accent and the way they say the words |
| 4. | | Other people distract me |
| 5. | | It is mainly that I panic but once I panic I don't process information |
| 6. | I don't like the lesson. I don't like the teacher | I just don't understand |
| 7. | It's in a different language and I'm English. ENGLISH. | |
| 8. | I get bored | |
| 9. | Because it's hard and makes no sense at all! | |
| 10. | I get frustrated if I don't know what they mean | |
| 11. | I don't know what the words mean so I get stressed | |



© Katrina Barnes, 2019

# Appendix 6

## Post-intervention questionnaire – listening activities feedback

| | Helpful | Fun | Interesting | Easy | Difficult | Boring | Stressful | Don't remember activity |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Faulty echo** | 11 (40.7%) | 4 (14.8%) | 7 (25.9%) | 12 (44.4%) | 8 (29.6%) | 6 (22.2%) | 6 (22.2%) | 3 (11.1%) |
| **Add the spaces** | 11 (40.7%) | 11 (40.7%) | 5 (18.5%) | 14 (51.9%) | 6 (22.2%) | 7 (25.9%) | 7 (25.9%) | 4 (14.8%) |
| **Fill in missing syllables** | 8 (29.6%) | 5 (18.5%) | 4 (14.8%) | 6 (22.2%) | 13 (48.1%) | 10 (37%) | 8 (29.6%) | 2 (7.4%) |
| **Speaking ping-pong** | 10 (37%) | 15 (55.6%) | 6 (22.2%) | 8 (29.6%) | 7 (25.9%) | 8 (29.6%) | 1 (3.7%) | 2 (7.4%) |
| **Listen and sing as you follow the lyrics** | 9 (33.3%) | 14 (51.9%) | 7 (25.9%) | 12 (44.4%) | 3 (11.1%) | 11 (40.7%) | 1 (3.7%) | 0 |
| **Spot the intruder** | 9 (33.3%) | 5 (18.5%) | 6 (22.2%) | 7 (25.9%) | 11 (40.7%) | 10 (37%) | 2 (7.4%) | 3 (11.1%) |
| **What have I written?** | 7 (25.9%) | 11 (40.7%) | 9 (33.3%) | 6 (22.2%) | 7 (25.9%) | 8 (29.6%) | 1 (3.7%) | 5 (18.5%) |
| **Find the rhymes** | 10 (37%) | 6 (22.2%) | 6 (22.2%) | 6 (22.2%) | 11 (40.7%) | 15 (55.6%) | 4 (14.8%) | 1 (3.7%) |
| **Sentence building** | 12 (44.4%) | 12 (44.4%) | 9 (33.3%) | 24 (88.9%) | 2 (7.4%) | 7 (25.9%) | 2 (7.4%) | 1 (3.7%) |
| **Count the words and place your bets** | 5 (18.5%) | 17 (63%) | 4 (14.8%) | 5 (18.5%) | 14 (51.9%) | 8 (29.6%) | 13 (48.1%) | 1 (3.7%) |
| **Trapdoor** | 17 (63%) | 21 (77.8%) | 20 (74.1%) | 17 (63%) | 3 (11.1%) | 6 (22.2%) | 4 (14.8%) | 0 |

N = 27

| Activity | Additional descriptors |
|---|---|
| Faulty echo | I felt it to be beneficial to my learning; Competitive |
| Add the spaces | Both easy and difficult; Quick to do |
| Fill in missing syllables | Confusing; Not helpful; Didn't enjoy, can't spell; Confusing; Exciting |
| Speaking ping-pong | I found it hard as I was communicating with someone in English; Good (I likey) |
| Listen and sing as you follow the lyrics | Annoying. I had a headache afterwards; Funny; Found some parts easy some parts difficult; Funny; It really stuck in my head; Sort of fun. Very awkward because singing; Don't like singing, funny/cringey; funny/cringey; Lovin' it (McDo) |
| Spot the intruder | I didn't understand any of them; exhilarating |
| What have I written? | Unhelpful; Not helpful; Game of luck; Kind of fun; Annoying when you get it wrong; Annoying, confusing, sad |
| Find the rhymes | Confusing; I found it confusing; Didn't get most words; Funny; Kind of boring; Uninteresting, didn't make sense |
| Sentence building | Confident; Fun because I sat with people not on my table; Confident; Fun because easy, boring because too easy; Funny |
| Count the words and place your bets | Not helpful |
| Trapdoor | Didn't finish this one; Not fun; Only boring after a while of it though; Funny; Annoying you had to go to the bottom; Loved it absolute fave; It was OK; Not helpful; Amazing do it very very very more often; Amazing; Game of luck, funny; Get to talk to friends, makes French fun; Interactive; Cooperative |



© Katrina Barnes, 2019