JELTAL

AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| RESEARCH ARTICLE

Developing Students' Listening Comprehension and Metacognitive Awareness through Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction

Joanne Echalico-Bermillo[1] ✉ **and Fatima Joy Rana Aradilla[2]**
[1]*Central Mindanao University, Maramag, Bukidnon, Philippines*
[2]*Malaybalay City National Science High School, Malaybalay, Bukidnon, Philippines*
Corresponding Author: Joanne Echalico-Bermillo, **E-mail**: jebermillo@gmail.com

| ABSTRACT

Metacognitive Instruction in Listening is a pedagogical procedure that allows the learners to enhance their awareness of the listening process and, at the same time, helps them develop their listening skills. This is a quasi-experiment study conducted on ninety (90) Grade 10 students to determine the efficacy of Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction on students' listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness. A pretest-posttest quasi-experimental research design consisting of two (2) heterogeneous intact classes were used to establish the effects of the Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction on the level of listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness among the Grade 10 students of Malaybalay City National Science High School for the School Year 2019-2020. The instruments used were: (a) validated teacher-made pretest/posttest and an adopted metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ). Descriptive statistics such as mean, percentage and standard deviation were utilized to identify the level of listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness, while t-test and analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) were used to identify the significant difference between the students' listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness. The results of the study revealed that the listening comprehension level of students in the Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction (MPBLI) was in the Elementary Level (37.60) in the pretest and then became Advanced Level (62.67) in the posttest, while the students in the Non-Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction (NMBLI) were in the Elementary Level (34. 89) in the pretest and then became Upper Intermediate Level (58.15) in the posttest. For the metacognitive awareness level, the students in the MPBLI was Moderately Positive (3.74) in the pretest, which later turned to Positive (4.11) in the posttest. On the other hand, the students who were in NMPBLI had a Moderately Positive (3.62) in the pretest and remained Moderately Positive (3.82) in the posttest. There was also a significant difference in the two groups' listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness with a probability value of 0.00. Generally, the Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction helped the students to improve their listening comprehension level as well as enhanced their metacognitive awareness level.

| KEYWORDS

Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction, listening comprehension, metacognitive awareness

1. Introduction

Listening is a vital skill needed for successful communication. It is known as the process of receiving and responding to the spoken and sometimes the unspoken messages. Listening is not the same as hearing. Hearing refers to the sounds that you hear, whereas listening needs focus. According to Rost (2002), both hearing and listening involve sound perception, and they only differ in terms of the degree of intention. Listening comprehension is more than just hearing what is said; rather, it is a person's ability to understand the meaning of the words he or she hears and to relate to them in some way.

In many parts of the world, knowledge of a foreign language is often very important to academic success professional and personal development, but it is also a bit difficult. This is particularly true of the English language, which is also the universal language that

is widely used all over the world. The ability to listen and understand in English is required for students because most of the subjects use English as a medium of instruction, and English could be used by the students to be globally competitive. According to Adler *et al.* (2001), people spend an average of 70% of their time engaged in some sort of communication. It shows that an average of 45% is spent listening compared to 30% speaking, 16% reading and 9% writing. Gilbert (2005) found that students, like those in the K-12 program, spend around 60% to 90% of their school time listening to their teachers and/or classmates.

One of the aims of the new curriculum of the Department of Education is to produce globally competent individuals in which English is crucial in this perspective. English proficiency is required for intellectual pursuits, international communication, for economic advancement, especially in the current globalizing world environment. This shows the need of developing language skills, most especially the listening skills of the individuals. However, despite being an important skill, it is the most neglected language skill. Gonzaga *et al.* (2017) even stated that the second and foreign language learners have serious problems in understanding spoken English language because universities pay more attention to English grammar, reading and vocabulary. Also, Quijano (2012) stated that the current Philippine education curriculum (K-12) is simultaneously developing both the Filipino and the English language in listening and speaking. As mentioned in the K-12 toolkit of the Department of Education (2012), integrated language arts education at the high school level emphasizes reading comprehension of various texts, writing and composition, study and thinking strategies which are all in support of critical and creative thinking development while listening is not much focused and often neglected.

There are problems that affect the listening comprehension of the students in the Philippines. Calub *et al.* (2018) mentioned seven listening comprehension difficulties, and these are: 1) the listening comprehension process; 2) the texts' linguistic features; 3) concentration; 4) psychological characteristics pertaining to their interest, attitude towards the text, and their confidence; 5) the listener; 6) the speaker/reader; 7) content of the text. These problems affect the overall learning of the students.

The importance of listening comprehension is then again often overlooked and not given attention. The lessons tend to focus more on reading and writing problems without even thinking that it is probably the listening comprehension that is the main cause of the problems. In a classroom setting, the teacher is the source of information and the one who facilitates the class. All the attention of the students is on the teacher, and whatever the teacher says, the students will receive. However, the students might have problems in listening and have low listening comprehension. That, as a matter of fact, will hinder the overall objective of learning because the students will not be able to learn what is intended to be learned.

As observed on the students in a class, most especially during the discussion on a certain story, they tend to have low scores on a quiz despite almost spoon-feeding them with the important details. They answered every time they were asked, and everything seemed okay, but their quizzes result did not match their response during the discussion. Vandergrift (2002) indicates that listening comprehension is an active process in which learners must distinguish between different elements in the context like sound, vocabulary, grammar and intonation to interpret the message and respond immediately. Being exposed to language input, language acquisition is probable. Since it is an active process, metacognition is being used to understand the context being spoken by the interlocutor. Metacognition is simplified as thinking about thinking. It is considered as a higher order of thinking which involves active control over the thinking processes involved in learning. Activities such as planning, monitoring comprehension, and evaluating progress toward a task are metacognitive in nature (An & Shi, 2013). Metacognitive awareness is primarily encouraging students' planning, monitoring and evaluating listening processes, which has been incorporated in the management of classroom activities. This is a way of developing self-regulated learning. Vandergrift *et al.* (2006) pointed out that learners with high degrees of metacognitive awareness are better at processing and storing new information and also in finding the best ways to practice and reinforce what they have learned. Goh (2008) stated that metacognitive instruction mostly focused on language learners' prior knowledge, their use of listening strategies and their strategy training. As a result, Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction (MPBLI) was developed to address the students' mental processes to effective listening comprehension and to show that mental processes could also build up their metacognitive awareness. Goh and Taib (2006) conducted a study similar to this and claimed that MPBLI was effective as the results showed that the experimental group improved their listening comprehension. Likewise, Maftoon and Alamdari (2016) used this intervention to track the changes in metacognitive awareness and listening comprehension of their students. The results of their study show that MPBLI led to considerable variance in the overall listening performance and metacognitive awareness of the students.

This study focused on identifying the listening comprehension and the metacognitive awareness of the Grade 10 students in the MPBLI. This study also explored whether the MPBLI is effective in developing the listening comprehension of the students. By conducting such a study, the results would be helpful to better understand the language process and how valuable is listening competency in learning the English language.

1.1. Research questions

1. What is the listening comprehension level of the students in the Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction (MPBLI) Non-Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction and (NMPBLI) in the pretest and posttest?
2. What is the metacognitive awareness level of the students in the MPBLI and NMPBLI in the pretest and posttest?
3. Is there a significant difference in the listening comprehension level of the students in the MPBLI and NMPBLI? and
4. Is there a significant difference in the metacognitive awareness level of the students in the MPBLI and NMPBLI?

2. Literature Review

2.1. Listening Comprehension

Among the language four language skills, listening is one of the major learning channels in an educational system since lessons are being discussed by the teacher and is considered an important teaching and learning activity. In learning the English language, listening plays a huge part in fully acquiring the language. Even Rost (2002) emphasizes the role of listening as a source for second-language acquisition. The development of listening as a skill is important in second language learning, especially for beginners and young learners who cannot speak, read and write. By listening, they will be able to establish a foundation for productive language skills development and listening, therefore, is the primary channel for language acquisition.

On the other hand, Gur et al. (2013) stated that listening as a comprehension skill provides people with the greatest amount of input during the process of language acquisition and development. He further stated that listening comprehension skills also form the basis of other language skills.

Similarly, Osada (2004) explains that listening is vital for the language learning process and that it is also a complex process. Listening is a complex process because it requires more effort for a learner to understand the input. Such a process includes facilitating what has been said, retaining the information in the memory, and integrating what is being said in relation to the prior knowledge. On the other hand, the most complicated scenario in listening is how the information or input have been heard and sorted out before the speech disappears. Listening is difficult because of the limited capacity of the working memory or the short-term memory of the individual who receives the input and stored it for short periods of time while it is being analyzed and interpreted. Once the message or information in an utterance is understood, the data may become part of the permanent memory or long-term memory of the student.

Moreover, there are six levels of listening comprehension according to English First Standard English Test (EF SET). The six levels of listening comprehension are: Proficient, Advanced, Upper Intermediate, Intermediate, Elementary, and Beginner. Learners in the proficient level are already independent learners because they can understand with ease virtually everything they heard and can also summarize information from different spoken sources, which shows that they have fully acquired the listening skills. The learners in advanced level can understand a wide range of demanding, longer clauses and can also distinguish implicit meaning. The learners in the upper intermediate level can comprehend the main ideas of a difficult and complex text on both concrete and abstract topics. The learners in the intermediate level seem to understand the main points on familiar matters regularly encountered, like the stories discussed in the class. Those classified as elementary level are learners who can understand English within a limited range of contexts, so there is still a need for the teacher to guide their learning in the English language. Lastly, the beginner level learners are classified with the lowest ability to understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases. Those who fall in this level can only understand terms and sentences they usually hear or encounter.

It appears, therefore, that the learners' listening comprehension level depends on how much they have acquired the skill. However, as aforementioned, developing and improving listening comprehension is being neglected and not given importance as compared to the other language skills.

2.2. Metacognitive Awareness

Flavell (1979) referred metacognition as the knowledge about and regulation of one's own cognitive activities in learning processes. There are two distinct divisions in metacognition with interrelated areas. John Flavell (1979), one of the first researchers in metacognition and memory, defined these two areas as metacognitive knowledge, which is the awareness of one's thinking and metacognitive regulation, which is the ability to manage one's own thinking processes. These two components are used to inform the learning theory. The metacognitive knowledge of a student reflects the specific learning processes based on different situations that may range from the information that helps them assess their own abilities and intelligence. It is said that metacognitive

regulation involves enhancing learners' ability to think strategically and to solve problems, set goals, organize ideas, and evaluate both the known and unknown. Moreover, it involves the ability to teach others and makes the thinking process visible. When a student has information about his thinking, he is able to use this information to direct or regulate his learning. Successful learners use metacognitive strategies but, in some aspects, may fail to use the best strategy for each type of learning situation.

Moreover, there are three kinds of metacognitive awareness as described by John Flavell (1979): awareness of knowledge, awareness of thinking, and awareness of thinking strategies. First, awareness of knowledge involves understanding what one knows, what one does not know, and what one wants to know. It may also include an awareness of others' knowledge. Second, awareness of thinking means understanding cognitive tasks and the nature of what is required to complete them. Lastly, awareness of thinking strategies is understanding approaches to direct learning.

In the context of listening comprehension, metacognition is regarded as the knowledge of the learners' perception of themselves, their cognitive aims, their understanding of the listening task, their way of approaching the task, and the strategies to be used to solve the task (Vandergrift *et al.*, 2006).

According to Vandergrift (2006) and Al-Alwan, Asassfeh, and Al-Shboul (2013), students with high levels of metacognitive consciousness are better at processing and keeping new information, and learners can practise and strengthen what they have learned. Thus, the importance of metacognitive awareness in listening comprehension is repeatedly emphasized.

Weijing Li (2013) conducted a study on metacognitive awareness of non-English majors in second language listening with one hundred and thirty-eight non-English majors in Zhejiang Gongshang University as respondents of her study. The results revealed that learners lack metacognitive awareness of the subject and that a significant difference was noted between good listeners and poor listeners. She proved that metacognitive awareness influences the listening comprehension of the students. She also suggested establishing a learner-centred listening teaching mode to develop students' autonomous learning ability.

Maftoon and Alamdari (2016), in their study, explored the effect of metacognitive strategy instruction on metacognitive awareness and listening performance through a process-based approach with 60 intermediate EFL listeners as respondents. The results showed that the use of metacognitive strategy instruction revealed to have a significant difference in the overall listening performance and metacognitive awareness of learner-respondents. Analysis of MALQ results revealed that there is a significant impact of metacognitive strategy instruction on the awareness of listeners.

Rahimirad & Shams (2014) had a similar study on the effect of metacognitive strategies on the listening performance and metacognitive awareness of EFL students. There were fifty students of English literature at the state university of Qom, Iran. The experimental group was had metacognitive strategy instruction utilizing the model of Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010). The control group was provided with the listening input only. In that study, the module of International English Language Testing System (IELTS) was used to evaluate the listening performance of the learners. On the other hand, the Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) instrument was used to measure the learners' metacognitive awareness. The results revealed that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group, and based on analysis of the MALQ instrument, a significant improvement was noted in the students' level of metacognitive awareness after the strategy instruction.

2.3. Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Comprehension

Vandergrift and Goh (2012) mentioned that there are three types of listening instruction in the second language acquisition research. These are Text-oriented, communication-oriented, and learner-oriented. Accordingly, text-oriented and communication-oriented instruction focused mainly on the products of comprehension. The learners are taught how to listen in a learner-oriented instruction which was developed in response to the issue of testing camouflages in listening classes (Mendelsohn, 1998). As a process-based approach, instructors have enough opportunities to provide the learners with effective listening strategies; thus, learners listen more effectively and efficiently through mental processes as they become engaged in the listening process.

Moreover, Goh (2008) and Vandergrift and Goh (2012) said that one of the effective and deeply rooted earner-oriented listening instructions that help listeners with the complexity of listening comprehension is metacognitive instruction. This type of instruction is a process-based approach that deepens the learners' knowledge of themselves as listeners in a second language context. Further, this strategy enhances their understanding of the inherent challenges of L2 listening as well as teaches them the methods to control their listening comprehension (Goh, 2008). Moreover, this process-based approach to listening instruction aims to demystify the skills of learners in listening comprehension, which is vital in human learning. The learners are supported to develop their metacognitive knowledge and be able to listen effectively and not just mere listening without comprehension. Meanwhile, listening lessons include activities that explicitly teach learners how to listen effectively to enhance language development. The learners are provided with every lesson as an opportunity for them to develop greater awareness of themselves as second language

listeners (Moradian & Baharvand, 2017). This process-based approach of teaching listening aims to help learners learn how to listen rather than to test their listening ability using comprehension questions. The approach utilizes the learner's awareness about the strategy used by their peer or their instructors.

Likewise, metacognitive instruction assists learners to become successful learners by making them acquire metacognitive strategies. It could be achieved through the process of listening that involves learners in a 'pedagogical cycle' (Vandergrift, 2004). The pedagogical cycle consists of planning, monitoring, and evaluation that encourage learners to see the flow of their learning, establish and address gaps in their understanding, monitor and evaluate their performance.

Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari (2010) investigated the efficacy of Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction to come up with an outline of how the Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction could be accomplished. They used 106 university French language learners, which were divided into two groups: the experimental group and the control group. There were 59 students in the experimental group and 47 students in the control group. The experimental group received both metacognitive and listening instructions, while the control group did not receive any metacognitive instruction. The same instructors taught both groups, and the same texts were utilized with the use of metacognitive strategies during the listening training. The result shows that Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction was beneficial because the less skilled students from the experimental group had shown great improvement resulting in increased metacognitive awareness in listening.

Goh and Taib (2006), in their study with ten primary school pupils who were subjected to eight designed listening lessons to include traditional listening exercises, individual post-listening reflections and teacher-facilitated discussions that focused on specific aspects of metacognitive knowledge on listening. The metacognitive instruction in young EFL learners' L2 listening development shows that after the eight lessons, all students acquired a deeper understanding of the nature and demands of listening, with their confidence increased as they completed the listening tasks. Further, learners developed better strategies in coping with comprehension difficulties. The result further revealed that the less skilled learners benefitted more from the process-based approach to listening instruction.

Nevertheless, metacognitive learning instruction enables listeners to simultaneously increase their awareness of the process and employ effective strategies in listening comprehension. This approach puts more emphasis on the process rather than a product of instruction to develop learners' metacognitive ability. Moreover, the proficiency level of the learners is developed such that they have self-control over the process of listening comprehension by employing appropriate strategies while practising the listening skills.

3. Methodology
3.1. Participants
The respondents of the study were chosen from the five sections of grade ten this school year 2019-2020. Only two intact classes were utilized, and the researchers assigned them as the experimental group and control group. Students who belonged to the two groups were ages 15-20. For the experimental group, there were 27 males and 18 females. On the other hand, the control group had 25 males and 20 females. The grade ten students were chosen as the participants for this study because they were already in the highest grade in Junior High School and were expected to be good in English compared to the lower grades. It was also the last grade level in Junior High School before moving up to Senior High School.

3.2. Instruments
There were three instruments used in this study: (a) the Listening Comprehension Test developed by the researcher, (b) Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) (Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, & Tafaghodtari, 2006), and (c) Teacher-made Audio Material.

The Listening Comprehension Test (LCT) was developed by the researcher and was made for measuring students' listening comprehension levels. The table of specifications (TOS) was made to ensure well-distributed questions. The test was based on five listening passages purposefully selected from the Grade 10 English textbook. The reason for selecting was to avoid the interference of respondents' lessons and to abide by the curriculum of the Department of Education. The Listening Comprehension Test was pilot-tested in which 60 items were drawn-out from the 120-item test. The test gained a test-reliability of 0.82 (Very Good Test).

The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ) was adopted from Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, & Tafaghodtari (2006) with test-retest reliability of 0.81. It was designed to assess the extent and level to which language learners were aware of and would regulate the process of second language listening comprehension. According to Vandergrift *et al.* (2006), the

metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ) uses a six-point Likert scale without a neutral point so that the respondents would really get an exact and honest answer, described as follows:

1 – Strongly Disagree	4 – Partly Agree
2 – Disagree	5 – Agree
3 – Slightly Disagree	6 – Strongly Agree

The audio materials used were made by the researcher. The recording was done inside the booth of the DXMU Radio Station of Central Mindanao University in Musuan, Bukidnon, to ensure a noise-free output. On the other hand, the stories were chosen from the English 10 learner's material of the Department of Education. The audio materials were also validated by three (3) English teachers who were from a public secondary school. They were guided by rubrics in which each audio material was rated as follows: 10-Exemplary, 7-Proficient, 4-Partially Proficient and 1-Unsatisfactory.

3.3. Data Collection Procedure
The researcher followed the protocol in gathering data. Communicating with the respondent school was done first. After getting permission from the school and Division Office, the researcher made an arrangement with the English 10 teachers and the principal of the school so that the conduct of the study on the desired respondents was made possible. The students were verbally informed about the conduct of the study and were given a letter of consent to participate in the study.

The researcher then created the assessment tool on the listening comprehension of students. The listening comprehension test was based on the texts used in both interventions. The test was first pilot-tested at Managok National High School, a public school located at Managok, Malaybalay City, Bukidnon. Thirty-seven (37) Grade 11 Humanities and Social Science (HUMSS) students of the said school answered the 110-item listening comprehension test. After the item analysis, 60 items were retained, and the metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire was adopted from Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, and Tafaghodtari (2006).

The Listening Comprehension Test (LCT) and the metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ) were first administered to the learners of the two groups of the study to check their listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness, respectively. It was worth mentioning that the students took the pretest prior to the metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ) to reduce the practice effect of the MALQ on raising the students' metacognitive awareness of the listening skill. To ensure understanding of the questionnaire by students, the teacher also explained clearly each item on the questionnaire before answering. Next, the two intact classes were taught the same lessons but had differed in teaching strategy or instruction. The experimental group was exposed to MPBLI, while the control group was exposed to NMPBLI. It was used to assess the effectiveness of the MPBLI to the experimental group and to compare it with the control group that had only undergone listening input and traditional instruction method. Every after each listening session, script-sound recognition was done in which the students were provided with a transcript of the recording so that they could match sounds to print and vice versa for difficult words or phrases. A personal reflection was also done by the students through making short entries into their listening diaries about the lesson. The MPBLI lasted for 15 sessions, with each session of about one hour within a time span of eight weeks. The posttest was then administered to both groups to compare the significant difference in students' listening comprehension. The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ) was also administered after the intervention period to identify the significant difference between their scores.

3.4. Data Analysis
The level of listening comprehension of the respondents was determined using descriptive statistics such as frequency counts, means, percentages, and standard deviation in analyzing the results in the pretest and posttest, the level of listening comprehension and the metacognitive awareness of the students before and after exposure of Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction.

The t-test for paired samples and Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) were used as statistical tools to analyze the data gathered from results in the pretest and posttest in listening comprehension. SPSS was used to analyze the data gathered from the Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire to get the students' level of metacognitive awareness.

4. Findings and Discussion
4.1 Comprehension level of the students
The level of listening comprehension of the Grade 10 students of Malaybalay City National Science High School was determined through their pretest and posttest scores.

Table 1 presents the listening comprehension level of students in the MPBLI and NMPBLI. Students were identified to what level they belong using the Education First Standard English Test (EF SET) Scoring Scale (EF Education First, 2020). It shows the results of the pretest and posttest as well as reflects the frequency and percentage scores of the groups: MPBLI and NMPBLI.

Table 1. Listening comprehension level of students

Scale	Descriptive Level	Experimental Group				Control Group			
		Pretest		Posttest		Pretest		Posttest	
		f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
71% - 100%	Proficient	0	0	14	31.11%	0	0	9	20.00%
61% - 70%	Advanced	1	2.22%	14	31.11%	1	2.22%	13	28.89%
51% - 60%	Upper Intermediate	3	6.67%	12	26.67%	9	20.00%	10	22.22%
41% - 50%	Intermediate	11	24.44%	5	11.11%	10	22.22%	10	22.22%
31% - 40%	Elementary	19	42.22%	0	0	17	37.78%	3	6.67%
30% and below	Beginner	10	22.22%	0	0	8	17.78%	0	0

Table 1 shows the result of the pretests and posttests of the students in the MPBLI and NMPBLI. For the MPBLI group in the pretest, there were 22.22% of the students in the beginner level, and the majority of the group fell under the elementary level with 42.22%. Unfortunately, no one even reached the proficient level in this group. However, the same group showed improvement after the intervention based on the posttest results. No one was already in the beginner level and also in the elementary level. 11.11% of the total number of students were in the intermediate level, and 26.67% of them were in the upper intermediate level. Surprisingly, 31.11% were already in the advanced level, and another 31.11% were also in the proficient level. The said increase is determined by the actual number of students who improved in their listening comprehension after the intervention.

On the other hand, the students in the NMPBLI in the pretest showed that 17.78% of them fell under beginner level, and the majority of the group, with 37.78%, was in the elementary level. None of them was at the proficient level. In the posttest, the results showed that no one was already at beginner level, yet there were still 6.67% who remained in the elementary level. 22.22% were in the intermediate level, and the upper intermediate also had the same number of students with 22.22%. The highest percentage was in the advanced level with 28.89%, and 20% of them reached the proficient level.

Interestingly, the students in the NMPBLI also showed improvement over time; however, their increase was not enough to outperform the students in the MPBLI. It was noteworthy that MPBLI had a positive effect on the students, which led to a higher level of listening comprehension of the students as compared to the level of listening comprehension of students in the NMPBLI.

Generally, most of the students in the MPBLI were at the proficient, advanced and upper-intermediate levels. These students were those who were able to understand the stories through audio material with the help of Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction. They benefitted from the intervention, thus resulting in improved listening comprehension. Nonetheless, students in the NMPBLI had a higher percentage that was rated below the proficient, advanced and upper-intermediate levels. They showed difficulty in understanding the spoken text on their own. They also did not take silent reading seriously during the reading sessions and did not show any interest during the discussion, which explains why they did not improve much in their comprehension ability.

The listening comprehension of students implies that the use of MPBLI improved the comprehension level of students. Most of the students who were exposed to the intervention moved to a higher level of listening comprehension from 10 at beginner level, 19 in the elementary level and 11 in intermediate level while in the posttest, no more students were under beginner and elementary levels, with only 5 remained in the intermediate level. Although the control group was not exposed to Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction, it has 9 proficient listeners with 13 advanced listeners who performed better, although the increased number of proficient listeners did not surpass the performance of the experimental group who were exposed to the intervention.

4.2. Metacognitive Awareness
The metacognitive awareness of students was determined through the metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ), which was administered before and after the intervention, as adapted from Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, & Tafaghodtari (2006).

Table 2. Pretest and Posttest scores on metacognitive awareness of the students

	MPBLI		NMPBLI	
	Pretest	Posttest	Pretest	Posttest
OVERALL MEAN	3.74	4.11	3.62	3.82

Legend:

Range	*Qualitative Description*	*Interpretation*
5.01-6.0	*Strongly Agree*	*Highly Positive*
4.01-5.0	*Agree*	*Positive*
3.01-4.0	*Partly Agree*	*Moderately Positive*
2.01-3.0	*Slightly Disagree*	*Moderately Negative*
1.01-2.0	*Disagree*	*Negative*
0.01-1.0	*Strongly Disagree*	*Highly Negative*

In the pretest, the students in the MPBLI had an overall mean score of 3.74 (Moderately Positive), while the students in the NMPBLI had an overall mean score of 3.62 (Moderately Positive) in the pretest results. The overall means revealed that the students in both the MPBLI and NMPBLI had a moderately positive metacognitive awareness before the intervention. Therefore, the indicators of both the highest mean scores and lowest mean scores for the two groups showed that there was a need of developing and improving in the students' metacognitive awareness. Both groups got Moderately Positive in their metacognitive awareness in the pretest.

On the other hand, during the posttest, the overall mean score of students in the MPBLI was 4.11 (Positive), and the overall mean score of the students in the NMPBLI was 3.82 (Moderately Positive). The overall mean scores show that the metacognitive awareness of the students in the MPBLI increased from being Moderately Positive in the pretest to Positive in the posttest, while the metacognitive awareness of the students in the NMPBLI remained Moderately Positive in the post-test. The results of this study revealed that generally, the students' metacognitive awareness improved after the intervention on Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction. The findings of this study conform to that of Goh and Hu (2013) in their study on exploring the relationship between metacognitive awareness and listening performance with questionnaire data. Their study has the same result as the present study as it yields a positive relationship between learners' metacognitive awareness scores and listening comprehension.

Similarly, Tavakoli, Shahraki, and Rezazadeh (2012) examined the relationship between the metacognitive awareness of proficient and less proficient Iranian learners using their performance on the listening part of IELTS. They noted a positive relationship between metacognitive awareness and the learners' listening performance. Moreover, Rahimi and Katal (2012), in their study on the impact of metacognitive instruction on learners' awareness of listening strategies, listening comprehension, and oral proficiency, stated that learners who had metacognitive instruction obtained higher gains in metacognitive awareness and speaking proficiency than those with conventional listening instruction without strategy training. They also concluded that metacognitive awareness was formed by metacognitive instruction, which results in better performance in the listening comprehension of students.

4.3. Significant Difference in the Listening Comprehension Level of the Students
Table 4 shows the comparison of the posttest scores of the students in the Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction and Non-Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction. This table also reveals whether the intervention made an impact on the scores of the students.

Table 4. Comparison of posttest scores in listening comprehension test of groups MPBLI and NMPBLI.

GROUP	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Experimental	62.67	11.08	45
Control	58.15	12.68	45
Total	60.41	12.06	90

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	334149.56[a]	3	111383.19	1344.76	.000

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Pretest (Covariate)	5275.24	1	5275.24	63.69	.000
GROUP	7490.06	2	3745.03	45.21	.000
Error	7205.10	87	82.83		
Total	341355.56	90			

a. R Squared = .979 (Adjusted R Squared = .978)

The result shows that the students in the MPBLI have a mean score of 62.67 while the students in the NMPBLI have a mean score of 58.15. The scores revealed the effectiveness of MPBLI in improving the students' listening comprehension. The students in the MPBLI outscored the students in the NMPBLI.

Table 4 further presents the f-value of the test, which is 45.21 with a probability value of 0.00. This probability value means that the hypothesis "there is no significant difference in the level of listening comprehension of the students in the Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction and Non-Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction" is rejected. It means that students in the MPBLI outscored the students in the NMPBLI and proves that there was a significant difference in the level of listening comprehension of both groups. It also attests that MPBLI was effective in improving the level of listening comprehension of the students.

4.4. Significant Difference in the Metacognitive Awareness Level of the Students

Table 5 shows the comparison of metacognitive awareness based on the posttest scores of the groups exposed and not exposed to Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction. This table also reveals how the metacognitive awareness of the two groups differed.

Table 5. Comparison of posttest scores in metacognitive awareness of students in MPBLI and NMPBLI

GROUP	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Experimental	3.96	.58	90
Control	3.81	.36	45
Total	3.96	.58	90

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Model	1415.24ª	3	471.75	1559.20	.000
Posttest (Covariate)	1.77	1	1.77	5.85	.018
GROUP	33.89	2	16.95	56.01	.000
Error	26.32	87	.30		
Total	1441.57	90			

a. R Squared = .982 (Adjusted R Squared = .981)

The above table shows the overall mean score of the group in the MPBLI (3.96) and the group in the NMPBLI (3.81). The f-value of the test was 56.01, with a probability value of 0.00. The result implies that there was a significant difference between the scores of the two test groups. This means that the hypothesis, "there is no significant difference in the metacognitive awareness of the students in the Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction and Non-Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction", is rejected. The significant difference entails that the variance in scores between the groups was observable and was enough to claim that the intervention improved the metacognitive awareness of the students.

5. Conclusion

From the data gathered in the study, the following conclusions were made:

First, the group exposed to Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction performed better in their listening comprehension compared to the group not exposed to Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction. The average growth of students' performance in the unexposed group did not increase as much as that of the exposed group. It was observed that more students from the exposed group improved their scores compared to the students from the unexposed group. This is a manifestation of the effectiveness of Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction in improving students' listening comprehension. It was then determined that the level of listening comprehension of the students from the group exposed to Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction is at "Advanced Level" while the group unexposed to Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction is at "Upper Intermediate Level".

Second, the group exposed to Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction has a positive metacognitive awareness, while the group not exposed to Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction remained to have a moderately positive metacognitive awareness in listening at the end of the intervention. It can be inferred that Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction improved the students' metacognitive awareness.

Third, there was a significant difference between the listening comprehension posttest scores of the two groups. Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction had a significant effect on the listening comprehension of the students. Hence, Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction was then considered an effective teaching method in uplifting students' listening comprehension.

Lastly, there was a significant difference between the two groups' metacognitive awareness. Metacognitive Process-Based Listening Instruction had a significant effect on the metacognitive awareness of the students. The intervention was then effective in improving the metacognitive awareness of students.

References

[1] Abdalhamid, F. (2012). *Listening Comprehension Strategies of Arabic-Speaking ESL Learners*. Retrieved https://dspace.library.colostatefrom.edu/bitstream/handle/10217/65198/Abdalhamid_colostate_0053N_11014.pdf;sequence=1.

[2] Adler, R., Rosenfeld, L., & Proctor, R. (2001). *Interplay: The Process of Interpersonal Communication*. Retrieved: ttps://evocuzy.files.WordPresscom/2014/09/interplay-the-process-of-interpersonalcommunication.pdf.

[3] Al-Alwan, A., Asassfeh, S., & Al-Shboul, Y. (2013). *EFL Learners' Listening Comprehension and Awareness of Metacognitive Strategies: How Are They Related?*. *International Education Studies, 6*(9), 31-39. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v6n9p31.

[4] An, X., & Shi, Z. (2013). *Does Metacognitive Improve Listening Comprehension?*. Retrieved from http://www.academypublication.com/issues/past/tpls/vol03/04/11.pdf.

[5] Department of Education Order 42, s. (2012). *Policy Guidelines on Daily Lesson Preparation for the K to 12 Basic Education Program*. Retrieved from: https://www.deped.gov.ph/2016/06/17/do-42-s-2016-policy-guidelines-on-daily-lesson-preparation-for-the-k-to-12-basic-education-program/.

[6] Flavell, J.H. (1979). *Metacognitive aspects of problem-solving. In L. B. Resnick (Ed.), The nature of intelligence (231-235)*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Retrieved from http://www.lifecircles-inc.com/Learning theories/constructivism/flavell.html.

[7] Goh, C. & Taib, Y. (2006). *Metacognitive instruction in listening for young learners*. *ELT Journal, 60*(3), 222- 232. Retrieved from http://203.72.145.166/elt/files/603-2.pdf.

[8] Goh, C. (2008). *How learners with different listening abilities use comprehension strategies and tactics*. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/136216889800200203.

[9] Goh, C. (2000). *A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems*. Retrieved from: http://www/sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X99000603.

[10] Gur, T., Dilci, T., Coskun, I., & Delican, B. (2013). *The impact of note-taking while listening on listening comprehension in a higher education context*. *International Journal of Academic Research, 5*(1), 93-97. Doi:10.7813/2075-4124.2013/51/B.16.

[11] Li, W. (2013). *A Study of Metacognitive Awareness of Non-English Majors in L2 Listening*. Retrieved from: http://www/academypublication.com/issues/past/jltr/vol04/03/08.pdf.

[12] Osada, N. (2004). *Listening comprehension research: A brief review of the past thirty years*. Dialogue, 3(1), 53-66. Retrieved from http://www.talkwaseda.net/dialogue/no03_2004/2004dialogue03_k4.Pdf.

[13] Rahimi, M., & Katal, M. (2012a). *Metacognitive listening strategies awareness in learning English as a foreign language: A comparison between the university and high-school students. Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences, 31,* 82-89.

[14] Rost, M. (2002). *Listening Task and Language Acquisition*. Retrieved from: http://jalt-publications.org/archive/proceedings/2002/018.pdf.

[15] Tavakoli, M., Shahraki, S., & Rezazadeh, M. (2012). *The Relationship between Metacognitive Awareness and EFL Listening Performance: Focusing on IELTS Higher and Lower Scorers. The Journal of Language Teaching and Learning, 2,* 24-37.

[16] Vandergrift, L. & Tafaghodtari, M, H. (2010). *Teaching L2 learners how to listen does make a difference: an empirical study*. Language Learning 60(2), 470-497. Retrieved from: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00559.x/pdf

[17] Vandergrift, L. (1999). *Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring successful strategies*. ELT Journal, 53 (3): 168-176.

[18] Vandergrift, L. (2002). *It was nice to see that our predictions were right: Developing metacognition in L2 listening*. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 58*, 555-575.

[19] Vandergrift, L. (2003). *Orchestrating strategy use: Toward a model of the skilled second language listener. Language Learning, 53*, 463-496.

[20] Vandergrift, L. (2004). *Listening to learn or learn to listen?*. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 24, 3-25. Retrieved from: http://resourcesfortefl teachers.pbworks.com/f/Listening+to+Learn+or+Learning+toListen.pdf.

[21] Vandergrift, L. (2006). *The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ): Development and validation*. Retrieved from: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2006.00373.x/abstract

[22] Yang, N. (2009). *A Study of Metacognitive Strategies Employed by English Listeners*. *International Education Studies*, *2*(4), 134-139. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ies.v2n4p134.