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ABSTRACT

In recent years, there has been a growing body of literature investigating metacognition in second language (L2) listening (e.g. Cross, 2010; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010). The theoretical underpinning of the majority of these studies is that metacognition and listening are individual psychological processes. This led to a limited understanding of metacognition in listening that highlights the regulation of oneself, whilst disregarding the communication partner and the wider context. The present study contributed to the existing body of literature by investigating and re-conceptualising metacognition in L2 listening. Informed by a sociocultural and dialogical perspective on discourse and thought, this thesis offered new insights that recognise L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activities as reciprocal monitoring and control processes.

International students for whom English was a second/foreign language participated in the study. They worked in pairs on a collaborative problem-solving task and their interactions on this task were video-recorded. Directly after the task, individual interviews with each member of the pair were conducted to gain their accounts of how they perceived the task and how they monitored and regulated the interaction. A grounded theory informed approach was used to analyse the interview data, and a conversation analysis informed approach was used to analyse the interaction data.

The findings of this study have established that a wider view of metacognition in L2 listening is required. The re-conceptualisation, underpinned by existing theories and deriving from the study’s empirical data, moved beyond conventional views of metacognition, and argued that the monitoring and control processes in listening are dialogical and reciprocal. This re-conceptualisation was encapsulated in the term Metacognitive Discourse Awareness (MDA). The central tenet of the MDA framework is that metacognition in listening involves the complex regulation of the discourse, thought and social-affective dimensions. This multidimensional framing of MDA entails the listener’s awareness of his/herself as the co-regulator of the other(s) in the reciprocal relationship in which meaning is socially co-constructed and negotiated.

This study thus foregrounded the situatedness of the monitoring and control processes in L2 listening and the connections within, between and across the thought, discourse and social-affective dimensions. The thesis concluded with recommendations for L2 teachers and learners to develop a broader understanding of metacognition in the listening process so
that this understanding can have an impact on practices in the increasingly diverse global higher education context.
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CHAPTER 1  INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

This is a study of second language (L2) learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in the listening process. My own experiences of being an L2 learner and a teacher of modern foreign languages motivated my decision to pursue this topic in this doctoral research project.

Listening, often taken for granted by first language (L1) speakers, frequently proves to be the most challenging skill to acquire and to teach in L2 settings (Graham, 2003). Nevertheless, the importance of listening in relation to other language skills has been underlined by a number of researchers. Vandergrift (1997), for example, states that ‘listening internalises the rules of language and facilitates the emergence of other language skills.’ (1997, p. 387). Rost (2011) even argues that listening is the most important source of L2 acquisition. However, listening remains less well understood and researched compared with the other three conventional language skills, namely reading, writing and speaking (Flowerdew & Miller, 2005, 2010; Vandergrift, 2007b).

Metacognition, one of the key constructs not only in second language acquisition (SLA), but also in education generally, has spawned debates about its definition and components from the late 70s (A. L. Brown, 1978; Flavell, 1976; Kluwe, 1982; Nelson, 1996; Paris & Winograd, 1990; Zimmerman, 1995). The ‘fuzziness’ of the term has since then also given rise to a plethora of conceptual and methodological challenges for studies in this area (Efklides, 2006, 2008; Veenman, Van Hout-Wolters, & Afflerbach, 2006). It is not the intention of this thesis to provide a detailed topography of this disputable concept; Tarricone (2011) offers an extensive discussion of the history and an overview of the various debates on this topic. The present study, however, aims to open up areas of enquiry and interest by framing the investigation of metacognition in L2 listening from a sociocultural and dialogical perspective, in the hope of shedding light on our evolving understanding of this construct.

My examination of the existing literature on metacognition and listening showed that previous research tends to adopt the conventional cognitive approach. Whist it is important to note from the outset that these studies are important and have provided the theoretical and empirical foundations for the present study, I argue that merely viewing metacognition in listening from this perspective confines our understanding of this complex phenomenon. There is thus a need to investigate this construct from a wider perspective which gives
prominence to the role of discourse in the development of higher-order thinking (e.g. Cole, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978, 1986; Wertsch, 1979, 1985).

Developing this agenda, my study gathered empirical data and established findings that captured the complexity of L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in the listening process. Apart from being in accord with what the literature has delineated, my findings foregrounded that L2 listeners’ monitoring and control processes are socially co-constructed and negotiated in a reciprocal manner. In addition, this thesis provided a re-conceptualisation of metacognition in L2 listening termed Metacognitive Discourse Awareness (MDA). The MDA framework is to a large extent informed by the empirical work carried out in my doctoral research, guided by sociocultural theorising and a dialogical view of thought and communication. It underlines that L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity are situated in three interconnected dimensions: the discourse dimension, the thought dimension and the social-affective dimension. This study also outlined the scope of MDA: the listener regulating the reciprocal self and the listener regulating the other(s) in the co-construction and negotiation process (see Sections 6.4 and 6.5).
1.2 Research setting and data collection strategy

Informed by sociocultural theorising and a dialogical approach to communication, this study set to explore L2 listeners’ awareness and activity of the monitoring and control process, and investigated two research questions:

- What elements are L2 learners aware of that contribute to the monitoring and control of the listening process? What connections, if any, can be established between these elements?
- To what extent can L2 listeners’ understanding of the monitoring and control process be exemplified through their discourse?

To answer these research questions, my main study recruited a total of 20 participants. These participants were international students studying in a Scottish university in their L2. At the time of the study, the majority of the participants were pursuing a postgraduate degree in a range of subjects; only a few of them were studying for an undergraduate degree. For this study, they worked in dyads on a problem-solving task first before their individual semi-structured interviews with me. This design allowed me to explore L2 learners’ in-depth understanding of the way in which the regulation of thinking takes place in the listening process, as well as the extent to which this is related to their discourse in the interaction.

I used the retrospective method so that participants had the opportunity not only to verbalise their thought during the interview process, but also to review the video recordings of their problem-solving interaction earlier. For L2 learners, this could be particularly useful as it provided them with more visual resources and helped them to articulate their thought which would otherwise seem abstract and implicit. The retrospective semi-structured interview method offered valuable insights into the phenomenon that this study is concerned with.

The other data collection strategy – problem-solving interaction – allowed me to study what participants actually said and how it was said within the context of a task. This data collection strategy highlighted the pivotal role that discourse plays in mediating between the interpersonal level and the intrapersonal level. As L2 listeners worked on the, they were also engaged in the socially co-constructed and negotiated of meaning. By examining this process in detail, my study was able to reveal trends and patterns in the discourse that contribute to L2 learners’ coordination of cognitive resources. The next section outlines the structure of the thesis.
1.3 Structure of thesis

The thesis consists of six chapters. Chapter 1 provides an introduction to my study. Chapter 2 reviews the literature and comprises five sections. After a brief introduction to the chapter in Section 2.1, Section 2.2 outlines the theoretical lens that underpins this study. This section reviews key constructs in sociocultural theory and the dialogical view of communication that are particularly relevant to the present study. Section 2.3 outlines the theoretical debates on metacognition, self-regulation and co-regulation. I discuss previous studies on the definitions and the components of metacognition, including metacognitive knowledge, metacognitive strategies and metacognitive experiences. This section also briefly extends the discussion to the studies of metacognition in the L2 literature. Section 2.4 goes on to explicate the literature on listening. This section reviews the conventional cognitive approach to listening in L1 and L2 research, and attempts to expand the view by looking at bi-directional listening or listening in interactions. In addition, this section provides an overview of studies on L2 interactions informed by sociocultural theory. Section 2.5 summarises the limitations and gaps in the existing literature on metacognition and listening, and brings together all three strands of the literature. I propose that there is a need to investigate and re-conceptualise L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in the listening process, which moves beyond the individual psychological tradition. Such an understanding situates metacognition and listening in the social world, involving a joint monitoring and control endeavour.

Chapter 3 has seven sections. The first section provides an introduction of the chapter. Section 3.2 outlines the methodological rationale of the study and draws on the methods and methodologies adopted by previous studies on metacognition and L2 listening. Section 3.3 gives the detail about the participants’ profiles and justifies my sampling strategies. Section 3.4 outlines the ethical considerations that this study is concerned with - anonymity, confidentiality, and freedom to withdraw. Section 3.5 elucidates my data collection procedures - problem-solving interactions followed by interviewing. I also provide a brief reflection on the pilot study conducted prior to the main study. Section 3.6 delineates to the analytical framework developed for this study. For the analysis of the interview data, I developed a grounded theory informed method; and for the analysis of the interaction data, I devised a conversation analysis informed approach. Section 3.8 examines the issues regarding research quality – reliability, validity, triangulation and reflexivity. Section 3.9 draws this chapter to a conclusion.
I present my findings in Chapter 4 and 5. Chapter 4 explicates the findings from the interview data in which I explored the complexity within and interconnections between and across dimensions in relation to L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in the listening process. Chapter 4 consists of four sections. Section 4.1 defines and provides exemplifications of the elements and categories identified following my analysis of the interview data. Section 4.2 highlights the interconnectedness between dimensions. The focus is to examine the co-occurrences of the elements between categories. Section 4.3 investigates the interconnections across dimension among dyads. This section offers a side-by-side comparison of code distributions between the two participants in each dyad. This underlines the variability and commonality within participants and the way that they regulate the orchestration of strategies in the listening process. The final part of this chapter summarises the findings discussed in the preceding sections.

Chapter 5 explores these findings presented in Chapter 4 further by explicating the link between L2 learners’ discourse and regulation of thought processes. This chapter aims to exemplify and capture the dialogical complexities of L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity. I discuss the findings in the light of my participants’ interaction data, complemented by extracts from their follow-up interviews. Chapter 5 consists of 6 sections. Section 5.1 examines L2 listeners’ regulation processes during joint creation of shared understanding. Section 5.2 explores the notion of the listener as the co-regulator of discourse. Section 5.3 presents the findings with regard to the regulation processes involved in explicit and implicit negotiation of sequencing and initiation. Section 5.4 looks into the ways that L2 learners manage the unexpected in the listening process. Section 5.5 focuses on expressed and tacit disagreements and the strategies that L2 listeners utilise as they regulate their thought processes. Section 5.6 summarises the findings from the preceding sections of this chapter.

Chapter 6 situates my findings from the interview data and the interaction data into the broader literature. This chapter brings the findings into a coherent and analytical framework, and introduces a re-conceptualisation of L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in the listening process – Metacognitive Discourse Awareness (MDA). After an introduction to the chapter, Section 6.2 provides the definition of MDA. Section 6.3 summarises the findings from Chapter 4, and revisits three interconnected dimensions: the discourse dimension, the thought dimension and the social-affective dimension. This forms the main components of my MDA framework. This section also answers the first research question. Sections 6.4 and 6.5 discuss the scope of MDA, highlighting the understanding that
listening is fundamentally a dialogical process in which the listener monitors and controls a range of discourse, thought and social-affective resources in a reciprocal manner. This reciprocal active listenership not only involves the regulation of the listener as the reciprocal self, but also gives prominence to the process of the listener regulating the other(s) as he or she co-constructs and negotiates shared understanding. These two sections answer the second research question. Section 6.6 summarises my contributions to knowledge. Section 6.7 discusses the implications and future research, and Section 6.8 reflects on the limitations of my study. Section 6.9 draws the thesis to a conclusion.
CHAPTER 2  LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter provides a review of the theoretical underpinnings that inform the present study. The review establishes a theoretical framework that guides the design of the study, the analytical approach, and the findings of the thesis. This chapter examines the following areas of enquiry: a sociocultural and dialogical perspective on thought and communication, metacognition, self-regulation and co-regulation, and listening.

After the introduction, Section 2.2 contextualises this study by reviewing sociocultural theorising and a dialogical view on thought and communication. Section 2.3 discusses the models and debates on metacognition, self-regulation and co-regulation. Section 2.4 visits the literature on the conventional cognitive approach to listening and bi-directional listening. Moreover, the section reviews some of the key constructs in L2 listening research informed by sociocultural theory. Following the close examination of existing bodies of literature, the final section brings together the gaps identified in the preceding sections, and proposes that there is a need to broaden our understanding of metacognition in L2 listening.
2.2 The sociocultural and dialogical view on thought and communication

This section begins by reviewing key constructs in Vygotsky’s sociocultural theory, highlighting the dialectics of the individual and social processes. The dialectical relationship rests on the assumption of a developmental learning trajectory from the interpersonal level to the intrapersonal level. This section then explores the dialogical approach to communication, underlining the embeddedness of meaning in context, intersubjectivity and perspectival relativity. The final part of this section provides a brief summary that brings together these bodies of knowledge.

2.2.1 The dialectics of individual and social processes

The basic premise of the sociocultural approach is that social interactions, cultural resources and semiotic systems not merely constitute the site in which higher-order skills rest; they are, in essence, the source and origin of psychological development, and therefore critical to learning (e.g. Cole, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978, 1986; Wertsch, 1979, 1985). Higher-order skills include a series of mental behaviours, such as selective attention, planning, problem solving, and evaluation of ongoing thought processes. These behaviours, mediated and inextricably tied to social contexts, are crucial to the regulation of cognition. They are developed as outcomes of culturally and socially situated activities (Wertsch, 1991b). Wertsch (1998) posits that in mediated action, an agent utilises a range of cultural tools as meditational means to appropriate and master social interactions. The importance of culturally situated activities was also underlined by Rogoff (1990), who maintains that learners actively draw and develop understandings from others through participation in social interactions. This understanding of the meditational means of cultural and semiotic tools is particularly relevant when this thesis later conceptualises the importance of discourse on the interpersonal level and its link to the regulation of thought processes. This dialectic unity of thought and language indicates that linguistic activities are the manifestation of thoughts (Bakhurst, 1991), and that thought can only be explained through linguistic means (Lantolf, 2000).

According to sociocultural theorising, it is the use of cultural and semiotic tools that mediates the transition between the interpersonal plane (external world) and intrapersonal plane (mind and thought). The initially separate levels of development, social and individual processes, thereby become dynamically interdependent (John-Steiner & Mahn, 1996). Language, as one of the most important cultural and semiotic tools, links the two levels in such a way that it serves two interconnected functions: other-regulation in social
interactions and self-regulation in the organisation of psychological functioning (Bråten, 1991b; A. L. Brown, 1987; K. R. Harris, 1990). Expanding on this understanding, Wertsch (1991b) states that ‘the processes and structures of semiotic mediation provide a crucial link between historical, cultural, and institutional contexts on the one hand and the mental functioning of the individual on the other’ (p. 67). From the perspective of mediated action, Wertsch pointed out the situatedness of the link between individuals’ thoughts and the social world. This particular understanding of the relations between inner-mental functioning and social interactions underpins the theoretical and the analytical framework of the present study. As the following parts of this chapter unfold, metacognition in L2 listening as referred in my study is conceptualised as discursive practices within which the regulation of cognition is embedded.

2.2.1.1 Private speech and inner speech

Having outlined the social genesis of cognitive regulation, I now extend this discussion further by looking at two important cultural and semiotic tools – private speech and inner speech. Derived from social speech, the psychological function of language is reflected in the use of private speech. Investigating the social genesis of private speech in early childhood, Frawley (1997) foregrounds that although private speech appears to be social in form, its function is increasingly psychological. As individuals internalise egocentric speech, they gradually gain better control of their own cognitive processes. This view outlines the developmental trajectory from private speech to inner speech (speech for oneself). It is the structural and functional features shared by private speech and inner speech that distinguish them from social speech (Vygotsky, 1986). Private speech is part of a functional system that synthesises many disparate aspects of cognition, and consequently, mediates the transformation from elementary cognitive processes into higher mental functioning – the key to achieving mastery of one’s own psychological processes (Wertsch, 1985).

In line with this view, John-Steiner and Mahn (1996) state that the dialectical nature of private speech entails that it connects the distinct yet intertwined inner and outer domains of regulation. Therefore, the developmental trajectory of private speech indicates that its linguistic features are increasingly elliptical. In other words, it is often made up of fragmented utterances that are not completely syntactic compared to social speech. It is the loss of formal linguistic properties from social speech to inner speech that indicates the evolving functional change of private speech.

Private speech facilitates the critical stage of internalisation. By planning, organising, and
regulating their own higher mental processes, individuals are able to transform regulations in interpersonal social interactions into intrapersonal cognitive functions. In other words, higher mental functions are first learned and exercised in social domains before they are internalised. Vygotsky (1978) demonstrates that the gradual functional shift of private speech from the end of an activity to the beginning may suggest that the use of private speech for directing and planning activities raises ‘the child’s acts to the level of purposeful behaviour’ (p. 31).

With private speech, individuals no longer act impulsively in social activity; they are more prepared by means of verbal planning, monitoring and evaluating. This allows individuals to better orchestrate their cognitive resources, and thereby adds a layer of cognitive regulation to future behaviours (Vygotsky, 1986). Furthermore, the orchestration of cognitive resources prioritises language as semiotic and cultural tools:

[M]ediation is the key in his [Vygotsky] approach to understanding how human mental functioning is tied to cultural, institutional, and historical settings since these settings shape and provide the cultural tools that are mastered by individuals to form this functioning. In his approach, the meditational means are what might be termed the ‘carriers’ of sociocultural patterns and knowledge (Wertsch, 1994, p. 204).

Linell (1998) echoes this view on the intrinsic relatedness between cognition and social interactions, and states that ‘cognition involves internal and interpersonal communication, and conversely, that any kind of communication has cognitive aspects’ (p. 19). Therefore, the fundamental role of language in relation to thinking lies in the ‘reflexive relations between discourse (and cognition) and contexts of various kinds’ (Linell, 1998, p. 8). However, the close relations that discourse bears to thought also suggest that some of the cognitive functions of discourse are not easily accessible to external audiences. Pertinent to the present study is the regulatory function of discourse. Attending to the regulation of discourse may offer valuable insights into the patterns and dynamics in social interactions and how L2 listeners monitor and control their thinking processes at a higher level. My research design and data analysis, which will be outlined in Chapter 3, are in line with this thinking.

### 2.2.1.2 The Zone of Proximal Development and scaffolding

Having delineated the dialectic unity of thought and discourse, I argue that in order to investigate higher-order thinking, especially metacognition, it is important to study the transformation of speech from other-regulation to self-regulation. According to Vygotsky (1978), the conceptual space between a learner’s individual achievement and his or her potential achievement with support from the others is called the ‘zone of proximal
development’ (ZPD). Vygotsky underlined that ‘what children can do with the assistance of others might be in some sense even more indicative of their mental development than what they can do alone’ (p. 85). This construct of the ZPD elucidates the relationship between learning in social settings and learning in psychological development.

It is worth noting here, however, that the ZPD does not necessarily involve the interaction between a novice and an expert or a more capable peer in which knowledge is appropriated (Luria, 1979); the understanding of the ZPD can be extended to a broader scope of collaboration amongst equal peers (e.g. Swain & Lapkin, 1998). In line with this view, the notion of scaffolding, a metaphor proposed by Wood, Bruner, and Ross (1976) based on the concept of the ZPD, can be construed as the process in which learners work jointly to co-construct opportunities that facilitate the internalisation and appropriation of knowledge.

Scaffolding originally refers to the support mechanism that teachers and parents provide children with. This guidance mechanism aims to gradually improve children’s current level of knowledge. The process, which requires all parties involved to maintain ‘mutual trust, respect, and communication skills’, is inherently social and often viewed as the prerequisite for learning (Yowell & Smylie, 1999, p. 474). Whilst it is not the primary concern of the present study to elaborate on the pedagogical implications of ZPD and the scaffolding metaphor, it is important to recognise, from the outset, that discourse mediates the development of cognitive regulation. In accord with this thinking, my study foregrounded the role of discourse in L2 listeners’ understanding of metacognitive awareness and activity. As Chapter 3 will argue, the aim of the problem-solving interaction, one of the data collection methods employed in this study, is to allow my participants to engage with each other, creating an environment in which L2 learners’ cognitive resources are regulated through the mediation of discourse.

The fact that learners in collaborative tasks establish and maintain a shared conception of the task or problem was termed ‘interthinking’ by Mercer (2000). Drawing from sociocultural theory, Mercer proposes the notion of ‘exploratory talk’ to refer to discursive practices in which speakers share knowledge, challenge ideas and consider options in a reasoned and equitable way (D. Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Mercer, 2000; Mercer & Howe, 2012; Wegerif & Mercer, 1996). However, one of the key features of exploratory talk is that ideas have to be presented as clearly and as explicitly as necessary for them to become shared and jointly analysed. This conceptualisation of discourse in dialogue, however, does not tend to take
into consideration the sometimes tacit nature of the negotiation process, which is what the present thesis sets out to highlight.

Studies on the discourse aspect of the collaboration processes for second language learners, and the way in which this might contribute to second language development have been explored extensively (e.g. Foster & Ohta, 2005; Swain & Lapkin, 1998, 2002). The second language research underpinned by this strand of sociocultural theory will be reviewed in a later section (see Section 2.4.5).

2.2.2 A dialogical approach

2.2.2.1 Meaning and context

The preceding section, in which some of the key constructs in sociocultural theorising were discussed, has reviewed the dialectical relations between the individual and the social regulatory processes. This section extends this thinking.

A sociocultural view of meaning entails its embeddedness not only in terms of linguistic forms, but also in terms of social and cultural contexts. Rommetveit (1990) adopts a pluralistic approach and maintains that meaning potentials are derived from and contingent upon their contextual settings. This view resonates with Hanks’ (1996) argument regarding the shaping effects of context on meaning. Hanks argues that meaning potentials underscore ‘intersubjective contracts, ongoing discourse and a horizon of background experience’ (p. 86). Thus context, inherent in the negotiation process, is inextricably fused with meaning potentials. Such an understanding of meaning extends beyond what its semantic forms might entail.

In the same vein, Mercer (2000) defines the term ‘context’ as a mental phenomenon that consists of ‘whatever information listeners (or readers) use to make sense of what is said (or written)’ (p. 19). Mercer’s definition highlights the information that listeners bring to the interaction in order to co-construct and adapt contextual information. In other words, earlier parts of the conversation provide shared contextual foundations for the listeners’ understanding of the conversation that follows. Hagtvet and Wold (2003) further elaborate on the relationships between meaning potentials and context:

A word’s context of use in a dialogically established setting determines the foregrounding or activation of specific meaning components to the effect that different aspects of the associative and emotional meaning-mediating potentialities of a word may be foregrounded on different occasions. (p. 191)
Rather than perceiving meaning as a static or fixed entity, the dialogical perspective on meaning recognises the changing nature of meaning situated in context. This view of meaning is to be distinguished from systemic linguists’ understanding of ‘context of use’. Halliday and other systemic linguists’ definition of meaning in context emphasises the forms and functions of the language embedded in the text. Their definition however, as later sections of this thesis argue, only captures certain aspects of the dynamic nature of L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in listening.

Bakhtin (1986) proposes the notion of ‘responsivity’ which underlines the listener’s process of constructing meaning of an utterance in context. The listener’s responsivity in the listening process is to:

> Take an active, responsive attitude towards it [the listening process] … Sooner or later what is heard and actively understood will find its response in the subsequent speech or behaviour of the listener (p. 68-69).

According to Bakhtin, not only should the listener be attentive and actively anticipate the meaning potentiality of an utterance, he or she is also responsible for co-constructing and shaping the ongoing context of the discourse. One of the prominent ways of doing so is through responding, as the listeners’ response ‘prepares the ground for an active and engaged understanding’ (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 282). The continuity between the listener’s understanding of a preceding utterance and his or her subsequent response accentuates the fact that discourse is jointly shaped by its participants. The listener and his or her partner are dependent on each other in that they are both responsible for contributing to the co-construction and negotiation of meaning in context.

### 2.2.2.2 Intersubjectivity, perspectival relativity and dialogical asymmetry

Having established the interrelatedness between meaning and context in discursive practices, this section discusses another key construct in the dialogical approach to thought and communication. Rommetveit (1985) outlines the attainment of states of intersubjectivity in the social world as follows:

> Some basic shared knowledge of the world appears indeed to be embedded as meaning potentials of ordinary words and expressions. Such potentials, we shall claim, reflect at a very abstract level some minimal commonality with respect to experientially founded perspectives on and categorization of our pluralistic social world and may hence be conceived of as a common code of potentially shared cognitive-emotive perspectives on talked-about states of affairs. (p. 187)
Rommetveit’s conception of intersubjectivity stresses the mutual sharedness of meaning potentials in the social world. States of intersubjectivity, as he argues, are based upon the degree to which this sharedness is assumed. Intersubjective understanding in communication is achieved through the mutual assumption of meaning, which often entails the ‘attunement to the attunement of the other’ (Rommetveit, 1974, 1992). This concisely summarises the fundamental pragmatic underpinning of human communication. As individuals work in a joint effort, a temporarily shared world ‘triggers anticipatory comprehension’ of the interlocutor (Rommetveit, 1974, p. 88). The listener, in particular, engages in the dialogue actively while forming a certain expectation of the other(s). The formation of expectation, which may be implicit and sometimes taken for granted, is contingent upon mutually assumed meaning potentials. Such a viewpoint is further noted by Trevarthen (1992): an intersubjective understanding of human interaction can help us to explain ‘how human social and cultural knowledge is created, how language serves a culture and how its transmission from generation to generation is secured’ (p. 102).

Another key construct relevant to the present study is perspectival relativity, an inherent feature of the dialogical approach to thought and communication. Rommetveit (1990) suggests that ‘any given state of affairs is contingent upon the position from which it is viewed’ (p. 87). It can therefore be postulated that to achieve reciprocity and mutuality, both the speaker and the listener will need to afford the other the chance to take perspectives. In other words, to understand a message, the listener has to adopt the speaker’s perspective; reciprocally, the speaker has to adjust his/her positions so that they attune to each other when working towards joint goals. My findings are in line with this thinking (see Chapters 4 and 5 for details).

The dialogical approach to thought and discourse also recognises that communication is often accomplished with asymmetrical knowledge exchange and participation where practical responsibilities for the speaker and the listener are distributed unevenly (Linell, 1998; Linell & Markovà, 1993). This view is a development of the early work by Rommetveit (1985). In his discussion about the asymmetry of dyadic communication control, Rommetveit posits:

The person asking a question has qua speaker the privilege to decide what is being meant, and the conversation partner is qua listener committed to make sense of it by adopting the interrogator’s perspective. The latter’s response constitutes an answer, however, only to the extent that the commitment made when making sense of the question is sustained while responding to it. (p. 191)
Largely influenced by his experimental studies on adult-child dyadic interactions, Rommetveit’s early discussion on the asymmetric patterns of communication control gives prominence to the overriding role of the adult in determining the exchange of meanings in a shared social world. Although he notes the reciprocal acknowledgement of both parties in the dyadic communication control, Rommetveit’s view on the roles of the speaker and the listener is confined by the fact that communication is regarded as successful only when the speaker’s privilege and the listener’s commitment have been fulfilled. In other words, the speaker is always in control of the dyadic interaction: he or she has the privilege to determine the focus of joint attention, and is in the position to decide whether the intended meaning is communicated. The listener’s peripheral role in terms of interpreting and making sense of the message has to be based on the premises and endorsement of the speaker (e.g. Rommetveit, 1972).

In his later works, however, Rommetveit regards the role of the listener to be more influential in communication – a view which reflects greater symmetry between the listener and the speaker (Hagtvet & Wold, 2003). The listener, as Rommetveit contends, is ‘an indispensable contributor to and indeed a main co-author of its [the word] linguistically mediated meaning’ (Rommetveit, 2003, p. 215). The co-authorship role of the listener further entails the notion of epistemic co-responsibility which is ‘the gateway to equality at a macrolevel and to intersubjectivity in dialogues at the microlevel’ (Hagtvet & Wold, 2003, p. 200). The listener’s epistemic co-responsibility, albeit embedded in dialogical asymmetry, can be taken as a premise upon which the negotiation and co-construction process rests. My findings to be delineated in Chapter 5 offer exemplifications that demonstrate the asymmetry and negotiation of L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness in the listening process.

2.2.3 Summary
This first section of the Literature Review chapter has provided a broad conceptual and theoretical overview of sociocultural theorising and of the dialogical view of thought and communication which informs this study. The constructs explored in this section are relevant to the ways in which the listener’s metacognitive awareness and activity are conceptualised throughout the study. The review highlighted the fact that discourse is a semiotic tool that mediates development from social interactions to individual psychological processes. I emphasised to the situatedness of meaning in context in the creation of shared understanding, which involves the co-construction and negotiation of meaning. The following section considers specific areas of metacognition, self-regulation and other-
regulation theories that are relevant to the present study. In addition, I discuss L2 listening research related to metacognition.
2.3 Metacognition

Central to the notion of metacognition is monitoring which is self-regulatory in nature (Baker & Brown, 1984). By tracing its historical roots, Brown concludes that there are four interlinked areas in metacognition: verbal reports as data, executive control, self-regulation, and other-regulation (A. L. Brown, 1987; A. L. Brown, Bransford, Ferrara, & Campione, 1983). She further argues that the transference from other-regulation to self-regulation is central to the developmental theory of Vygotsky (A. L. Brown, 1987, p. 69).

The developmental trajectory from other-regulated social speech in joint activities to self-regulated inner speech in mental functioning reflects an important commonality between sociocultural theorising and metacognition research (Bråten, 1991a, 1991b). This section outlines the definitions and models of metacognition, self-regulation and co-regulation and the debates associated with the fuzziness of these constructs.

2.3.1 Defining metacognition

The important role of metacognition has been foregrounded by researchers in children’s development (Flavell, Miller, & Miller, 1993), academic learning (Dinsmore, Alexander, & Loughlin, 2008) and language learning (Wenden, 1998). Veenman et al. (2006) argue that metacognition accounts for 17% of the variance in learning, compared to intelligence which only accounts for 10%. However, over the last few decades, the notion of what metacognition really entails has remained open-ended.

Wellman (1985) suggests that metacognition is a ‘fuzzy concept’. The multifacetedness of metacognition has given rise to a plethora of conceptual and methodological challenges for studies in this area (Efklides, 2006, 2008; Veenman et al., 2006). It is not the intention of this thesis to provide a detailed topography of this disputable concept (see Tarricone (2011) for the history and overview of the various debates on this topic). In this section, I review some of the key theoretical contributions to the study of metacognition.

2.3.1.1 Metacognitive knowledge

The term ‘metacognition’, initially proposed by Flavell (1976, 1979), is defined as the knowledge that the individual has about thinking and learning and one’s ability to regulate one’s thinking processes. Simply put, it is the cognition of cognition. For Flavell (1976), metacognitive knowledge is ‘one’s knowledge concerning one’s own cognitive processes and products or anything related to them, e.g. the learning-relevant properties of information and data’ (p. 232). It is the declarative knowledge that one has about his/her
cognitive system and its contents. Three key components are further identified: knowledge of person variables, task variables, and strategy variables (Flavell, 1979, 1987). Knowledge of person variables refers to the individual’s beliefs about one’s learning ability and judgements about success or failure in one’s learning. Knowledge of task variables is concerned with the nature of the task (its purpose, demands, and goals). Knowledge of strategy variables indicates the learner’s conscious understanding and effective use of cognitive and metacognitive strategies in achieving learning goals.

2.3.1.2 Executive control

Brown (1987) notes that metacognition is the ‘understanding of knowledge, an understanding that can be reflected in either effective use or overt description of the knowledge in question’ (p. 65). This definition provides a distinction between the ability to control one’s cognitive processes and to verbalise the knowledge. The former refers to the effective regulation and orchestration of cognitive resources; the latter, however, refers to the information that one acquires formally and informally about one’s learning (A. L. Brown et al., 1983).

In Brown’s discussion about the executive control of metacognition, she has delineated four components of metacognitive strategies: planning, monitoring, evaluating and revising (A. L. Brown, 1987). Planning refers to the conscious activities that one engages in to organise the whole learning process. Monitoring and evaluating one’s learning processes involve an assessment of the current progress of learning. Revising refers to modifying previous planning, monitoring and evaluating activities.

Previous research into metacognition has also made the distinction between metacognitive knowledge and skills. As mentioned earlier, the former refers to one’s declarative knowledge about the person, task and strategy and the interaction between the three (Flavell, 1979). The latter, which may be used interchangeably with metacognitive strategies or as part of metacognitive strategies (Lompscher, 1994), refers to one’s procedural knowledge about the actual use of strategies in action that is context dependent (A. L. Brown & DeLoache, 1978; Veenman, 2005). According to Veenman and Elshout (1999), metacognitive skills comprise orientation, planning, monitoring and evaluation of cognitive processing and task processing. Their definition of metacognitive skills is in common with Brown’s (1987) definition of metacognitive strategies. A. L. Brown (1987) argues that knowledge of strategies refers to one’s procedural knowledge for regulating problem-solving and learning tasks.
2.3.1.3 Self-appraisal and self-management

In Paris and Winograd’s (1990) critique of Flavell’s and Brown’s definitions, they state that instead of providing operational definitions, Flavell and Brown used mostly prototypical examples describing aspects of how one monitors one’s own cognition. Therefore, they propose to study the virtues of metacognition, namely self-appraisal and self-management. This line of research underscores the influence that metacognition has on motivation.

Self-appraisal refers to ‘personal reflections about one’s knowledge states and abilities’ (Paris & Winograd, 1990, pp. 17-18). In common with prior discussions about metacognitive knowledge, self-appraisal concerns judgements about personal, task and strategy factors. Self-management, on the other hand, focuses on the orchestration of planning, adjusting and revising cognitive resources as one is engaged in problem-solving tasks, which parallels Flavell and Brown’s account of metacognitive strategies as was outlined earlier. Paris and Winograd also make a distinction between ‘knowledge’ and ‘belief’ by arguing that the latter connotes a more subjective view towards metacognition (Wenden, 1999).

2.3.1.4 Cognition and metacognition: monitoring and control

Nelson, Kruglanski, and Jost (1998) expand on Flavell’s framework, and contend that metacognitive knowledge serves as a framework which the individual refers to. One develops an understanding of oneself as well as the other guided by metacognitive knowledge. Rather than explicating the components of metacognition, in Nelson’s (1996; Nelson & Narens, 1994) model, the hierarchical relationship between cognition and metacognition is portrayed (see Figure 2:1).

Figure 2:1 Nelson and Naren’s model (Nelson & Narens, 1994)
Cognition is defined as the representation of metacognition at the object level, and metacognition is the representation of cognition at the *meta* level. Cognition informs metacognition through the monitoring function, and it is regulated by metacognition through the control function.

This view of cognition and metacognition highlights the two key functions of metacognition: monitoring and control. However, due to the complexities of the nature of metacognition, it is extremely difficult to draw the line between monitoring and control. According to Efklides (2006), metacognitive knowledge and metacognitive experiences belong to the monitoring function; metacognitive skills or strategy use belongs to the control function (A. L. Brown, 1978; Flavell, 1979). Both the monitoring function and the control function are instrumental for the self-regulation and the co-regulation of cognition.

This brief review of the many models and definitions of metacognition suggests the fuzziness of the concept (e.g. Dinsmore et al., 2008; Efklides, 2008; Hacker, Dunlosky, & Graesser, 2009; Tarricone, 2011; Veenman et al., 2006; Whitebread & Pino Pasternak, 2010). Flavell’s (1979) definition outlines the core components of metacognition as an individual’s declarative knowledge. Brown’s (1987) definition focuses on the executive control function of metacognition. Paris and Winograd (1990) emphasise the influence of metacognition on motivation. Finally, Nelson’s (1996) model foregrounds two key functions of the hierarchical relationship between cognition and metacognition – monitoring and control.

Most of the studies under these conceptual frameworks have given prominence to the view that metacognition is an individual psychological phenomenon which only involves the regulation of one’s own thought processes. The present study, however, does not adopt a particular preceding view on metacognition, but rather draws upon a range of perspectives so as to inform my understanding of metacognition in L2 listening. The aim of this study is to develop an understanding of metacognition as regulation in wider dimensions beyond the intrapersonal level. To this end, the next section will highlight one particular aspect of metacognition research, namely metacognitive experiences.

### 2.3.2 Metacognitive experiences

In recent years, there has been a growing body of literature on the nature of metacognitive experiences. Flavell (1979) suggests that the three variables in metacognitive knowledge, person, task and strategy, interact with each other in such a way that constitutes metacognitive experiences. Metacognitive experiences ultimately are in the service of
specific learning goals. Efklides (2008), however, distinguishes metacognitive knowledge from metacognitive experiences, stating that the former is representations of the offline monitoring of cognition, whereas the latter is manifested by the online monitoring of cognition. She further remarks that metacognitive knowledge and experiences are related to the monitoring function, and metacognitive strategies and skills are related to the control function (A. L. Brown, 1978; Flavell, 1979).

Efklides and colleagues have conducted extensive research on metacognitive experiences (Efklides, 2001, 2002, 2006, 2008). She defines metacognitive experiences as ‘what the person is aware of and what she or he feels when coming across a task and processing the information related to it’ (Efklides, 2008, p. 279). According to Efklides, metacognitive experiences comprise metacognitive feelings, metacognitive judgements or estimates, and online task-specific knowledge (Efklides, 2006). One of the metacognitive feelings, feelings of difficulty for example, is crucial for the self-regulation of effort in problem-solving settings. In other words, the more difficulty one feels about a problem, the more effort one is likely to put into solving that problem. Metacognitive judgements or estimates are concerned with estimates of time needed or spent, estimate of solution correctness, and so forth. Online task-specific knowledge refers to one’s attention to the task information as one works on a task, as well as one’s reflection on the prior knowledge related to the task and the comparison of past and present tasks.

Efklides (2008), moreover, is especially interested in the affective aspect of metacognitive experiences. She argues that metacognitive experiences can be affectively charged. In order to explain how they are related to affect, Efklides suggests that there are two feedback loops – the attainment of the goal and the processing fluency (Efklides & Petkaki, 2005). Processing fluency is critical to the formation of metacognitive feelings, such as feelings of difficulty which can be due to a lack of this fluency (Koriat, 2007). The manifestation of affect in metacognitive experiences is linked to expectancy (Efklides, 2006). In other words, when the rate of processing is faster than anticipated, positive affect is experienced; when the rate of processing is slower than anticipated, negative affect is experienced.

Metacognitive experiences are complex inferential processes between affect and cognitive processing. Their components, such as metacognitive feelings and metacognitive judgements, are interrelated. The metacognitive judgements that people make are informed by their metacognitive feelings, such as feelings of knowing, feelings of familiarity, feelings of confidence (Dunlosky & Nelson, 1992; Yzerbyt, Dardenne, & Leyens, 1998). Research has
shown that learners jointly working on problem-solving tasks often seek cues from the metacognitive experiences of their partner (Liskala, Vauras, & Lehtinen, 2004; Salonen, Vauras, & Efklides, 2005). That is to say, the co-construction of shared understanding in communication may be the result of learners’ reciprocal monitoring and control in terms of metacognitive experiences.

The conceptualisation of metacognitive experiences proposed by Efklides and associates offers some new insights into our understanding of metacognition and its link to the dimensions beyond individual cognitive regulation. In the next section, a discussion of metacognition is situated in this broader area of enquiry, namely self-regulation and co-regulation.

2.3.3 Self-regulation

2.3.3.1 Self-regulation and metacognition

The debate on the definition of self-regulation and its relations to metacognition is still ongoing (Veenman et al., 2006). Some researchers believe that self-regulation is the superordinate of metacognition, which also includes social and affective processes (e.g. Winne, 1996; Zimmerman, 1995). Dinsmore et al. (2008), for example, argue that the environmental factor in self-regulation triggers the regulation of oneself. In contrast, others contend that self-regulation is a component of metacognition (e.g. A. L. Brown & DeLoache, 1978; Kluwe, 1987). In the field of education, self-regulation often refers to self-regulated learning, which is defined as:

An active constructive process whereby learners set goals for their learning and then attempt to monitor, regulate, and control their cognition, motivation, and behaviour, guided and constrained by their goals and the contextual features of the environment (Pintrich, 2000, p. 453).

Pintrich’s model sets out self-regulated learning in four stages: planning, self-monitoring, control and evaluation. Moreover, there are four areas of regulation: cognition, motivation/affect, behaviour and context. Each stage has a corresponding area of regulation. In the planning stage of cognition, for example, the individual sets target goals, activates prior content knowledge and metacognitive knowledge (Pintrich, 2004). In Pintrich’s definition, goal-setting and contextual features guide the regulation of cognition, motivation and behaviour.
Since the present study argues for a broader understanding of metacognition, it is important to review the literature on an area of the self-regulation research which is particularly relevant to the discussion here: the contextual aspect of self-regulation.

2.3.3.2 Context in self-regulation

Traditionally, context has been excluded from, or deemed peripheral to, studies on self-regulation in order to suit the experimental designs, resulting in limitations in the findings produced (Weiner, 1996). Similarly, Bruner (1996) concludes that there is little tendency in educational psychology to relate cognition to context.

Zimmerman (1989), for example, originally defines self-regulation as ‘metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviourally active participants in their own learning process’ (p. 4). This definition focuses on the role of the individual’s self-regulatory processes, separating context from the learning process. Individual differences, such as self-efficacy, metacognitive goal-setting, and achievement, are at the centre of this definition (D. H. Schunk, 1990, 1994; Zimmerman, 1990).

Over the years, researchers have begun to view self-regulation as a more complex theoretical notion: ‘triadic reciprocality’ among cognition, behaviour, and environment (D. Schunk & Zimmerman, 1996). Meyer and Turner (2002) argue that studying the contexts in which self-regulation is embedded is crucial for a better understanding of the process. In contrast to traditional studies on self-regulation, which stress individual psychological processes, the examination of self-regulatory processes through the sociocultural conceptual lens emphasises that language is a semiotic and cultural tool that mediates inner thought processes and the outer social, cultural and historical contexts.

Individuals use language to internalise development from the interpersonal level, and to regulate internal higher mental functioning. The mediation of regulation between social interactions and inner thinking situates the individual in wider contexts. The social genesis of self-regulation indicates that not only is self-regulation established in social interactions, but it is also one of the most important functions of social and semiotic tools with which individuals regulate their thought and communication (e.g. McCaslin & Hickey, 2001a; McCaslin & Hickey, 2001b; Yowell & Smylie, 1999).

As Mercer and Howe (2012) put it: sociocultural theory provides a suitable theoretical perspective that allows researchers to study dialogue and learners’ self-regulation. More
specifically, it emphasises the important role of language as a social and psychological tool in mediating the development from other-regulation to self-regulation. If we extend the notion of self-regulation further, it entails the process of co-regulation which recognises the social origin of the regulation process. The next section of this chapter seeks to explore this notion.

### 2.3.4 Co-regulation

Even though there has been an increasing interest in examining the role of context in studies informed by self-regulation theories, little or no attention is paid to the social and affective aspects of metacognition in shaping the awareness of cognitive monitoring and control. The notion of co-regulation emphasises the responsibility shared and the relationship established or maintained between oneself and the other in social interaction (Meyer & Turner, 2002).

Negotiation is deemed the key to the process of co-regulation. Maintaining and re-establishing a common ground of understanding can be achieved through interpersonal negotiations. During the negotiation process, both parties are engaged in communicating content as well as their relational positions (Salonen et al., 2005; Watzlawick, Bavelas, & Jackson, 1967). When learners negotiate the content, they are suggested to be in the semantic mode of co-regulation. When they negotiate their relational positions, they are involved in the pragmatic mode of co-regulation. Whether individuals co-regulate each other in the semantic or pragmatic mode, language use is always essential - language enables one to communicate his or her awareness of the content or relational positions with that of the other (Efklides, 2008; Nelson et al., 1998). The key function of language in the formation of a reciprocal model of cognition entails that as one compares one’s inner thoughts and the other’s social behaviours, one also reflects and draws inferences from this comparison. This view of language in co-regulation offers insights into the ways in which metacognition is socially shared and negotiated. This is, to a certain extent, in line with some of the constructs in sociocultural theorising regarding the dialectics of individual and social processes as well as the dialogical perspective on meaning, context and intersubjectivity discussed in the preceding section (see Section 2.2).

### 2.3.5 Metacognition in second language listening research

In the L2 literature, there is extensive evidence which shows that learners’ metacognitive awareness can lead to language learning (Goh, 2008; Wenden, 1998). Some researchers link this awareness to motivation and self-efficacy of the learners (Dörnyei & Skehan, 2003; Paris
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Wenden (1986, 1991, 1998) first identifies the potential that metacognition has for improving L2 learning. She refers to metacognition as the learners’ ability to ‘manage, direct, regulate, and guide their learning’ (Wenden, 1998, p. 519). In common with Wenden, Chamot (2005) maintains that ‘the good language learners are skilled at matching strategies to the task they are working on, whereas less successful language learners apparently do not have the metacognitive knowledge about task requirements needed to select appropriate strategies’ (p. 116).

Most recently, Vandergrift and Goh (2012) propose a metacognitive framework for L2 listening. In their framework, there are three aspects of metacognitive awareness: metacognitive knowledge, strategy use and metacognitive experience. The term ‘metacognitive awareness’ is defined as ‘a state of consciousness of our own thoughts as we focus on a particular cognitive or learning situation.’ According to Vandergrift and Goh (2012), metacognitive knowledge is at the centre of metacognitive awareness. Their understanding of metacognitive knowledge follows Flavell’s (1979) definition reviewed earlier. This understanding highlights the declarative nature of metacognitive knowledge which may influence the ways in which individuals plan, predict, monitor, attend to and evaluate their learning.

Strategy use is another important component in Vandergrift and Goh (2012)’s framework. They assert that listeners use strategies to facilitate listening comprehension and to cope with comprehension problems. This view resonates with other frameworks about strategy use advanced by earlier researchers (Chamot, 1995; Oxford, 1996).

According to Vandergrift and Goh (2012), the third element is metacognitive experience. It refers to one’s thought or feeling about thinking and learning. Due to the fact that Vandergrift and Goh adopt a cognitive theoretical perspective on listening, the notion of metacognitive experience is considered peripheral. There is little discussion about this component in their framework, and the definition is quite vague. In this regard, the present study takes their discussion about metacognitive awareness further by re-conceptualising metacognitive awareness in L2 listening context. This conceptualisation not only considers the regulation of the listener as self, but also foregrounds the reciprocal nature of the co-construction and negotiation process (see Chapter 6).
In recent years, there has been a growing number of empirical studies on metacognition in L2 listening (Berne, 2004; Goh, 2002; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). A study by Gu, Hu, and Zhang (2009) in Singapore, for example, investigated 18 primary school pupils’ listening strategy use and comprehension. They analysed L2 learners’ self-reports. Their findings suggest that good listeners are able to utilise a range of strategies consciously in order to facilitate their understanding. The weaker ones, however, only rely on their limited linguistic knowledge and focus on decoding the message. A number of other researchers have reported similar findings (Goh, 1998; Graham, Santos, & Vanderplank, 2008; Vandergrift, 1997).

One of the most influential contributions that Vandergrift and colleagues have made in the last decade is the development of the Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ). This questionnaire is aimed at examining L2 listeners’ knowledge of their use of listening strategies as well as their perceptions of themselves as L2 listeners in relation to their listening performance (Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, & Tafaghodtari, 2006). The design of the questionnaire was grounded in Flavell’s (1979) conception of metacognition. The instrument went through a validation process in which exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses were conducted. The final version of the questionnaire consisted of 21 items related to five factors: directed attention, mental translation, planning and evaluation, problem solving and person knowledge.

There have been a number of empirical studies which used MALQ as main instrument and tested L2 listener’s metacognitive awareness (e.g. O’Bryan & Hegelheimer, 2009; Rahimi & Katal, 2012; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010). Most recently, the study by Goh and Hu (2014) concluded that although MALQ provides the researcher with insights into L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness, its scope notwithstanding tends to be limited. They argue that the use of close-ended questionnaires like MALQ confines our understanding of L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness, compared to other introspective methods such as think-aloud protocols, interviews, diaries, etc. They further caution that the use of MALQ as an instrument could risk the possibility of excluding learners’ metacognitive knowledge and the awareness of listening strategies that is not present in the questionnaire. My study echoes this view.
2.3.6 Summary

This section has provided an overview of the issues concerning the definitions of, and debates on, metacognition, self-regulation and other-regulation. My review suggests that the conventional understanding of metacognition is largely informed by the cognitive informational-processing view advanced by A. L. Brown (1987) and Flavell (1979). Some of the key constructs in this tradition, such as metacognitive knowledge and executive control, are still relevant to the current literature on metacognition and L2 listening. The examination of metacognition research in L2 listening context reveals that the majority of the studies in this area is still heavily influenced by this tradition. This finding will be discussed further in the following section in which I outline the theoretical frameworks informing my understanding of listening.
2.4 Listening

The importance of listening for L2 learners has been underlined by researchers such as Feyten (1991), who maintains that listening plays a crucial role in acquisition. Rost (2011) even argues that listening is the ‘primary means of L2 acquisition’ (p. 103). However, L2 listening remains less well understood compared with the other three conventional language skills, namely speaking, reading and writing. (Flowerdew & Miller, 2005; Vandergrift, 2007b). Furthermore, listening is often perceived as the most difficult language skill to acquire for L2 learners (Graham, 2003). One reason could be the implicit nature of the process itself, which cannot be observed or studied directly: listening is such a complex process in which factors such as listener individual differences, background knowledge, linguistic competence, attention, and working memory may potentially affect comprehension (Buck, 2001).

Rubin (1995) suggests that for L2 learners, listening requires the heaviest processing demands compared to the other three skills. It involves the parallel cognitive processing of storing information in short-term memory and interpreting the message at the same time. And as Wolvin (2010) argues, self-regulation in the context of listening involves the listener utilising metacognitive self-monitoring while engaging in the processing of the message. Before looking in depth into L2 listening, however, it is appropriate to start by reviewing some of the key definitions and models of listening in English as a first language (L1) research as they are the foundation for L2 listening research.

2.4.1 Defining listening

As one of the basic human communication skills, an increasing number of research has been conducted in the field of L1 and L2 listening over the past few decades (e.g. Lynch, 2011; Rost, 2011; Wolvin, 2010). The plethora of definitional debates has contributed to our evolving understanding of what listening entails. The perspectives that researchers adopt when conceptualising the process of listening have evolved from viewing listening is merely about receiving aural stimuli and accepting/rejecting them to the more recent view that listening involves complex cognitive processes. A close review of major L1 listening definitions and models reveals that cognition is still given central attention (Barker, 1971; Brownell, 2002; Steil, Barker, & Watson, 1983; Wolvin & Coakley, 1992, 1996).

Barker (1971) remarks that listening is ‘the selective process of attending to, hearing, understanding, and remembering aural symbols’ (p. 17). For Barker, listening consists of four connected activities: sensing, interpreting, evaluating and responding (Steil et al., 1983,
p. 21). Steil, Barker, and Watson (1983) propose the SIER hierarchical model of active listening (see Figure 2:2).

Figure 2:2 Steil, Barker, and Watson's SIER listening model (Steil et al., 1983)

According to their framework, the listener firstly senses the aural and visual stimuli. Then he or she interprets and evaluates the information. Finally, the listener responds to the message and indicates whether the message has been understood. This is a four-stage depiction of the listening process. According to this model, the last stage, responding, is particularly crucial to the success of listening as it connects the listener with the speaker, and reflects the extent to which the listener has successfully understood the message (Rhodes, 1987).

Wolvin and Coakley (1992) initially define listening as ‘the process of receiving, attending to, and assigning meaning to aural and visual stimuli’ (p. 69). Later, they add the response stage to the model (see Wolvin & Coakley, 1996). In accord with the SIER model in viewing the listening process as linear stages, their definition broadens the description of listening, incorporating aural and visual stimuli. Another contribution in Wolvin and Coakley’s definition is that they employ a relatively more neutral term: they use ‘assigning meaning’ rather than ‘evaluating’ as is used in Barker and colleagues’ model mentioned earlier. Wolvin and Coakley also draws a distinction between five different kinds of listening - discriminative listening, comprehensive listening, critical listening, therapeutic listening, and appreciative listening, foregrounding how the purpose of listening may vary depending on the audience, task and context.

Rubin (1995) defines listening as the active process in which the listener selects and interprets information in order to understand what is going on and what the speaker is trying to express. By ‘select’, Rubin means that in the process of making sense of the input,
the listener uses only a part of the incoming information to make sense. In order for the message to make sense, the listener utilises his or her background knowledge in conjunction with the new information to interpret the message based on the speaker’s intention. Rubin therefore maintains that listening is an active process in which the listener receives information (from visual and auditory clues) whilst relating this information to what he or she already knows.

Rubin’s definition highlights the active nature of the listening process which involves the listener relating the ongoing message to his or her prior knowledge. However, this definition, similar to the definitions reviewed earlier, seems to be still speaker centred. In other words, the listener’s strategy to mentally link new information to his or her existing knowledge ultimately serves the purpose of interpreting the speaker’s intention.

The last listening model that will be discussed in this review of L1 listening models is the HURIER model developed by Brownell (1996, 2002). Brownell outlines listening as a six-step process: hearing, understanding, remembering, interpreting, evaluating, and responding (see Figure 2:3).

**Figure 2:3 Brownell’s HURIER listening model (Brownell, 2002)**

What is worthy of note is that the HURIER model pays attention to the ‘total communication context’ (Brownell, 1996, p. 13). Brownell highlights that the listener should be able to
understand the emotional meaning from the speaker’s viewpoint – the ability to empathise, which tends to have been neglected in previous models.

In conclusion, the definitions and models summarised above are in no way all of the theories and conceptual frameworks pertaining to L1 listening to date. However, the summary draws our attention to what have been central in the L1 listening literature. My examination suggests that the majority of preceding models seems to be in favour of depicting listening as an individual psychological process. Moreover, these definitions are often speaker centred – the success of listening is measured by the extent to which the speaker’s message is interpreted.

The view of listening as primarily a speaker centred cognitive endeavour reveals some possible limitations of research in this area. It is therefore the intention of my study to give prominence to the idea that listening does not merely involve individual psychological processes, but also is situated within wider social interactions. As the thesis unfolds, I will propose an understanding of listening as a co-construction and negotiation process which is reciprocal and socially situated. In the next section, I turn the discussion to the notion of ‘the listener’.

2.4.2 The listener

Traditionally, the listener tends to be regarded as non-existent or peripheral in studies in conversation (Bavelas, Coates, & Johnson, 2000). The listener is an abstract entity compared to the speaker and the discourse produced. In other words, the listener is ‘mute or invisible’ as the conversation progresses (Clark & Wilkes-Gibbs, 1986, p. 3). This monologic view of listening argues against the listener as an active agent; the listener awaits his or her turn passively in conversation. Turn taking is often considered as a shift between one speaker’s monologue to the next. Therefore, the emphasis is always on the speaker holding the floor.

Schober and Clark (1989) compared the monologic view of conversation with the collaborative model that they proposed. Their model goes beyond individual turns and utterances and suggests that the speaker and the addressee ‘collaborate with each other moment by moment to try to ensure that what is said is also understood’ (Schober & Clark, 1989, p. 211). Clark and Wilkes-Gibbs (1986) present the principle of ‘least collaborative effort’ on the part of the speaker. The idea of this principle is that in conversation the speaker tries to minimise the effort expended by both the speaker him/herself and the listener. Although the notion of least collaborative effort indicates the extent to which
conversation is a joint endeavour, which involves the coordination between the speaker and the listener (Schober & Brennan, 2003), the role of the listener is considered peripheral.

A dialogical view on listening argues that the listener actively engages him/herself in the listening process. Buck (1995) indicates that the listener plays an active role in the construction of dialogue; he or she monitors the incoming information so that future development can be made. Furthermore, as the listener engages himself or herself in the interaction, responsibility is shared and relationship is fostered. Purdy’s (1997) work provides insights into the critical role that listening plays in sharing responsibility and fostering relationship. Purdy argues that listening ‘serves to build relationships. We build strong links with others by listening to why they are and what they mean’ (p.10). He views listening as a community activity in which individuals share responsibility collectively (Purdy, 2000, 2003).

Wolvin (2010) observes that due to the central role of the listener in any communication, empathy is essential for meaningful interpretation of any message. Empathic listening requires that listeners attempt to understand not only the meaning of utterances but also the way the speaker formulates utterances (Walker, 1997). Empathy suggests that listening is an interpersonal process in which active engagement and the ability to identify with the other is crucial. Floyd (2010) points out the challenges and difficulties regarding empathic listening. He argues that ‘feeling what another person feels, experiencing with another, while inviting and desirable may be impossible in actual practice’ (p. 132).

2.4.3 The cognitive view of the process of listening

2.4.3.1 Attention and schema in listening

As discussed in the preceding sections, the conventional view of listening gives prominence to the cognitive aspects of the listening process. Central to this view are the listener’s attention and schema. Studies on attention in the listening process tend to focus on the principle of working memory and its link to the listener’s attention (e.g. Baddeley & Hitch, 1974; Janusik, 2005). The process of comparing new information to existing knowledge triggers one’s attention (Smith, 1982).

Wolvin (2010) maintains that attention to a message can also be affected by the listener’s perceptual filter in that the listener’s background, past experience, and mental and physical states may have an influence on the ways that the message is interpreted. In addition, the perceptual filter of the listener could shape the listener’s expectations.
Studies on schema focus on the listener’s long-term memory. According to R. Edwards and McDonald (1993), schema refers to the mental framework and organisation of meanings in the brain. The listener reviews existing knowledge when new information comes in before it is interpreted. Another definition of schema in listening is that it is ‘a mental structure consisting of relevant individual knowledge, memory, and experience, which allows us to incorporate what we hear into what we know’ (A. Anderson & Lynch, 1988, p. 139).

It should be noted that schema itself is the listener’s prior knowledge or background knowledge. This is the declarative knowledge that the listener brings to the conversation (Rubin, 1995). The utilisation of schema, however, requires procedural knowledge to make sense of the information. The listener’s use of prior knowledge in conjunction with the incoming message to form a certain mental image is often called elaboration or a situational model.

In building this mental model of the content and point of the message, we draw on information from long-term memory, using two main types of schema: formal schemata, which reflect knowledge of different text types or genres, and content schemata, consisting of knowledge of the relevant subject matter. Combining these two schema types allows the listener/reader to exploit what they know, either first-hand or second-hand, in order to interpret what they hear/read. (Lynch, 2009, p. 48)

Attention and schema form a loop where the former provides feedback to the latter and vice versa. The link between the effective use of attentional resources (attention) and the successful retrieval of the information from long-term memory (schema) is regulated by the executive control function, which often involves activities such as planning, predicting, monitoring and evaluating (Baddeley, 2003). These higher-level monitoring and control functions are fundamentally what is termed metacognition in the conventional sense.

The importance of using prior knowledge in facilitating L2 listening processes is recognised by D. R. Long (1990), who claims that the activation of prior knowledge helps to develop the conceptual framework for understanding. It frees up attentional resources, which can be particularly useful for less-skilled L2 listeners with insufficient linguistic knowledge about the language (Tyler, 2001).

2.4.3.2 A comprehension processing approach

The comprehension processing approach in listening rests on the assumption that in order for the listener to comprehend spoken language, he or she goes through an inferential process in which the interaction of linguistic knowledge and world knowledge serves to
create a mental representation (Hulstijn, 2003; Rost, 2002). The most widely known models are ‘bottom-up’ processing and ‘top-down’ processing (Flowerdew & Miller, 2010; Lynch & Mendelsohn, 2002; J. C. Richards, 1990).

The bottom-up approach emphasises the listener’s ability to segregate the linguistic features of spoken discourse. Meaning is processed based on the listener’s understanding of utterance from the basic linguistic level such as phonemes and morphemes up to the discourse level. The listener decodes the incoming information by attending to its linguistic and discourse aspects. The top-down model, on the contrary, prioritises the listener’s prior knowledge including the pragmatic knowledge, cultural knowledge and the discourse knowledge embedded in contexts in the comprehension process. The listener interprets the incoming information in which the reflection on prior knowledge and the formation of schema are crucial. In the L2 literature, some researchers also refer to the top-down processing as the ‘compensatory mechanism’ when the listener uses contextual information, world knowledge and common sense strategically in order to compensate for lack of linguistic competence in the target language (Vandergrift, 2007b).

Admittedly, these two approaches apply to both L1 and L2 listeners. But unlike most L1 listeners who can manage the use of bottom-up and top-down approaches effortlessly, L2 listeners tend to find this application challenging and frustrating (Buck, 2001; Graham, 2006). On the one hand, L2 listeners may not have sufficient linguistic knowledge to direct cognitive resources in order to process all lower-level linguistic features. On the other hand, lack of prior knowledge to contextualise the utterance also confines their understanding.

With regard to the issue of L2 language proficiency in relation to processing, Cook and Liddicoat (2002) reported that there are differences in the ability to interpret the intended meanings based on contextual and linguistic information between more-skilled and less-skilled listeners. Lower-proficiency listeners may have trouble allocating sufficient attention to processing the contextual information because they tend to focus primarily on the linguistic information from the bottom-up. These findings are in accord with Tsui and Fullilove’s findings. Tsui and Fullilove (1998) conducted an investigation into the difference in processing skills of less-skilled and more-skilled L2 listeners. They found that only when there is a mismatch between listeners’ schema and expectations, is there a difference between more-proficient and less-proficient listeners. In such situations, the less-proficient listeners are unable to segment utterances in bottom-up processing.
The listener expects the other to understand his or her responses, such as backchannels, paralinguistic cues of uncertainty like ‘um’, or looks of confusion (Schober & Brennan, 2003). Buck (1995) foregrounds the importance of having expectations in the listening process by stating that ‘there was a strong tendency for listeners to have expectations, which usually aided comprehension, and were in fact an integral part of it, but which could interfere with comprehension if they were not met’ (p. 120). Furthermore, listeners from different cultural backgrounds may have different schemata, which means that they may have different expectations and interpretations when it comes to processing the message (Flowerdew & Miller, 2010).

Researchers who adopt a cognitive view on listening also relate the integration of the bottom-up and top-down approach to Anderson’s (1995) three interconnected phases of listening comprehension: perception, parsing and utilisation. In L2 listening, the perception and parsing phases are concerned with the listener attending to and segmenting phonemes and words. Goh (2000), for example, reported the difficulties experienced by L2 listeners during this phase. Unlike the first two phases, the utilisation phase allows the listeners to form a conceptual framework, which is more associated with the top-down approach where the use of prior knowledge is central.

2.4.3.3 **Listening strategies: metacognitive strategies**

‘Learning strategies’ or ‘listening strategies’ is a term used in the cognitive approach to learning. From a cognitive perspective, strategies generally refer to the metal mechanisms which learners employ in order to achieve comprehension (Goh, 2002). Therefore, the development of listening strategies can lead to more efficient management of psychological processes in listening (Thompson & Rubin, 1996).

As was discussed earlier, much of the research on listening strategies has been influenced by the work of Flavell’s (1976) general learning strategy and J. R. Anderson (1995) Information Processing (IP) cognitive model (Lynch, 2009). Listening strategies have been broadly categorised into three types in the literature: cognitive, metacognitive, and social-affective (Cross, 2009; O’Malley & Chamot, 1990; O’Malley, Chamot, & Küpper, 1989; O’Malley, Chamot, Stewener-Manzanares, Russo, & Küpper, 1985; Vandergrift, 1997). The listener uses cognitive strategies to process listening input in order to make sense of what he or she hears. For example, the listener might use cognitive strategies such as deduction, summarization and so on. The listener uses metacognitive strategies to manage cognitive resources, which includes thinking about the listening process, planning, self-monitoring, evaluating,
problem solving and so on. The listener uses social-affective strategies when he or she make an effort to understand other people as well as to manage emotions such as nervousness and anxiety (Elkhafaifi, 2005; Vogely, 1995).

In L2 listening research, Field (1998) claims that strategies are often used when the listener lacks certain syntactic or morphological knowledge of the language. More recent studies on L2 listening strategies have shown that rather than attributing the success of the listener to a specific strategy, the process of choosing which strategies to use is more central (A. D. Cohen, 1998; O’Malley et al., 1989; Vandergrift, 2003b, 2007a). For the purpose of this study, strategies or metacognitive strategies, as is used henceforth, refer to the active monitoring and orchestration of cognitive resources in the listening process. This conception emphasises the regulation of cognition at a meta level.

In recent years, there has been a growing body of research devoted to L2 learners’ metacognitive strategies in listening (e.g. Berne, 2004; Goh, 2002; Vandergrift, 2003a; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). The metacognitive framework for L2 listening proposed by Vandergrift and Goh (2012) was informed by this cognitive view of listening. Their framework, as discussed earlier, prioritises metacognitive knowledge and strategy, while regarding metacognitive experience as peripheral. In fact, they argue that metacognitive experience does not contribute to the positive effects of metacognition.

In her study, Goh (2002) explored how different strategies are operationalised. She used a retrospective verbalisation procedure to collect and analyse data. Building on previous strategy research, she suggests that there are two new strategies that listeners tend to use: fixation and real-time assessment of input. Fixation is a cognitive strategy that learners use when they focus all their attention on a small part of the message. Real-time assessment of input refers to the on-going evaluation of the importance of certain parts of the input, thus it is a metacognitive strategy. Goh also posits that more-proficient L2 listeners demonstrate a more effective use of both cognitive and metacognitive strategies than their less-proficient counterparts. These findings offer some useful insights into the use of metacognitive strategies in classroom-based L2 listening. Goh’s study is in line with the study conducted by Vandergrift (2003b). In his study of adolescent French learners, Vandergrift highlights four statistically significant differences in strategy use between more-skilled and less-skilled listeners: total metacognitive strategy use, comprehension monitoring, questioning elaboration and online translation.
A review of the current metacognitive approach to L2 listening reveals that researchers focus almost exclusively on how the use of metacognitive strategies influences the outcomes of listening in classrooms (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). Listening in non-academic settings has received relatively less attention. This is in accord with Field’s (2011) point: we actually know very little about how strategies are used in real-life encounters.

Whilst previous research on metacognition and L2 listening is valuable in that it contributes to a better understanding of the listening process, it is important to bear in mind that it is largely grounded in a cognitive approach to learning. To study listening in social encounters, there is a need to extend the conventional notion of metacognition in listening so as to capture the dialogic nature of the listening process in situ.

2.4.4 Bi-directional listening
The bottom-up and top-down models reviewed earlier tend to be limited to the study of monologues. In other words, when we refer to these two approaches, our attention is on how utterances are being processed by individuals: the listener segmenting an utterance at a phoneme level or adopting a more holistic view of the utterance.

However, as far as dialogue is concerned, an understanding of listening as a one-way exchange of information seems to be insufficient. Listening, in the context of dialogue, goes beyond the individual psycho-perceptual view. It is very much a social and joint endeavour in which how the listener listens and responds to the message may have an influence on the patterns and dynamics of the dialogue. Rhodes (1993) points out that listening is a relational process in which both parties – the ‘hearer’ and the ‘speaker’ should be looked at together. Pecchioni and Halone (2000) agree with Rhodes’s view and further suggest that while relational listening is being constructed, social and personal relationships are being fostered.

On the one hand, when compared to monological listening where no response is made, listening in a dialogical context may be easier. The contextual information such as facial expressions, the freedom to clarify or ask the interlocutor to repeat can help the listener make better sense of the ongoing message. On the other hand, however, cognitive and metacognitive demands can be heavier as the listener also has the responsibility to respond in real time and interact with the interlocutor (T. Harris, 2003). Moreover, there might be the issue of role-taking and the negotiation of dynamic relationships: one can take control where appropriate or be dominant throughout the entire interaction (Carrier, 1999).
Over the years, there has been a growing number of studies which investigated second language peer interactions (Dipper, Black, & Bryan, 2005; Dobao, 2012; Swain & Deters, 2007). These studies are particularly relevant to a dialogic understanding of second language listening (Flowerdew & Miller, 2010; Rost, 2002). To this end, the listener is no longer viewed as the passive recipient of the message, who only interprets the meaning of the utterance. Instead, the listener is regarded as an active participant in the interaction. He or she may use a variety of strategies (verbal and nonverbal) in order to signal temporary confusion, to acknowledge the receipt of the message, to negotiate meaning and so on.

When discussing bi-directional listening, Buck (1995) outlines the ‘unspoken rules’, which involve the listener and the speaker cooperating to manage the conversation.

[The] listener must provide appropriate back channelling. These are the obligatory responses and feedback that reassure speakers that listeners are still following, and they offer encouragement to continue… Listeners must also help organise turn-taking and shift to the speaker’s role as appropriate. It is also necessary to coordinate the discourse purpose generally, recognise transitions to a new topic, check understanding, identify any lack of comprehension, and ask for any necessary clarification so that speakers are able to identify the problem and provide the clarification necessary. (p. 116)

The ‘unspoken rules’ in bi-directional listening delineated in Buck’s definition highlight the important role that the listener plays in the co-construction of a successful conversation. The listener as agent thinks beyond language processing for comprehension: he or she interacts with the interlocutor in a dialogical manner. To this end, the verbal interaction in bi-directional listening shares a degree of commonality with what is termed ‘languaging’ by Swain (2000, 2006). Languaging is defined as ‘the process of making meaning and shaping knowledge and experience through language’ (Swain, 2006, p. 98). It generally refers to instances where learners verbalise their language use when encountering linguistic problems in order to negotiate the solution(s) to problem-solving tasks. According to Swain and colleagues, the verbalisation process is crucial as it shows how learners work collaboratively. Languaging, along with concepts such as collaborative dialogue and language-related episodes (see Section 2.4.5), are derived from sociocultural theory. As was argued earlier, the sociocultural view of thought and communication foregrounds the insight that learners’ development of higher mental processes (cognition and metacognition) is made accessible through talk in interaction (see Section 2.2). Therefore the notion of languaging recognises the ‘dynamic, never-ending process of using language to make meaning’ (Swain, 2006, p. 96). In particular, the emphasis is placed on the shaping and reshaping effect of speaking (and writing) on cognition with respect to learning. The focus of
my investigation, however, is not on the study of language production; but rather, how metacognition in listening is mediated by language use. In other words, my examination of L2 learners’ discourse, which will be outlined in Chapter 3, is a way to operationalise the study of their metacognition and listening. The following section will review L2 interaction studies informed by sociocultural theory.

2.4.5 Studies of L2 interaction informed by sociocultural theory

2.4.5.1 ZPD and mediation

Despite the fact that sociocultural theory was originally conceptualised to study the cognitive development of children, the theory is applicable to all learning situations (van Lier, 1996). One strand of L2 research underpinned by sociocultural theory is the studies on private speech, ZPD and self-regulation. These studies looked at how speech-mediated cognition contributes to overall L2 development. They were guided by the assumption that the developmental trajectory from other-regulated social speech to self-regulated inner speech is mediated by the individual’s private speech (Wertsch, 1979). Collaboration in social interactions allows learners to be able to gradually gain control in their learning. This ultimately leads to self-regulation and automaticity.

As pioneers of bringing sociocultural theory to L2 research, Frawley and Lantolf (1985) investigated the interaction between L1 adult speakers of English and children as well as L2 speakers. Their study was based on the notion that the discourse within the ZPD mediates the language development of L1 children and L2 novices. By using a story narration task, they examined the use of discursive devices and how they gradually moved from other regulation to self-regulation. They concluded that compared to L1 children and L2 novices, L1 adults and advanced L2 speakers have better control of the discourse devices employed during the task. The construction of ZPD was adapted by Ohta (2001) for L2 learning as:

The distance between the actual developmental level as determined by individual linguistic production, and the level of potential development as determined through language produced collaboratively with a teacher or peer. (p. 9)

Derived from Vygotsky’s original definition, Ohta’s definition suggests that language development occurs as learners work collaboratively with each other or with an expert. The gap between independent and collaborative learning is narrowed as the learner’s linguistic knowledge increases. According to this definition, ‘language production’ is the key measurement of the linguistic development. However, this understanding seems to be
confined by not acknowledging the fact that language learning is process based, which is what my study tends to highlight.

More recent work which follows this theoretical perspective but adopts a more process-based view of language learning is represented by a series of studies on collaborative dialogue, language related episodes and languaging (e.g. Donato, 1994; Swain, 2000; Swain, Brook, & Tocalli-Beller, 2002; Swain & Lapkin, 1998, 2002). These studies are considered relevant to the present study. The next section of this chapter outlines some of the key findings from this area of enquiry.

### 2.4.5.2 Collaborative dialogue

The examination of cognitive activities in dialogue has its origin in sociocultural theory (e.g. Lantolf & Appel, 1994; Newman, Griffin, & Cole, 1989; Wertsch, 1991b). Donato (1994), for example, argues that dialogically derived cognitive processes ‘can be observed directly in the linguistic interactions that arise among speakers as they participate in problem-solving tasks’ (p. 85). In other words, when learners work collaboratively on a problem-solving task they are engaged in knowledge-building activities which are mediated by language. In the same vein, Swain and Lapkin (1998) suggest that the dialogue between learners is ‘an enactment of cognitive activity’ (p. 322). Swain and Lapkin also highlight that the building of linguistic knowledge takes place as learners collaborate with each other through social interactions. This involves the gradual internalisation of cognitive skills situated in the wider social context to be displayed in the future independent thinking in language learning. Collaborative dialogue is thus defined by Swain (2000) as the dialogue co-constructed by learners as they solve linguistic problems collaboratively. In the context of L2 learning, it is the site where ‘language use and language learning co-occur’ (Swain, 2000, p. 97).

In one of the studies on this topic, Swain and Lapkin (2002) examined L2 French learners’ internalisation of the corrective feedback provided by a native speaker in a collaborative writing task. They analysed the interactions between the L2 dyads and the native speaker when they discussed language problems in the writing draft. Swain and Lapkin concluded that through discussions, L2 learners are able to notice and internalise solutions which are later applied to future writing tasks independently. The affordance of the opportunity to talk about language problems explicitly or ‘collaborative dialogue’, they argue, facilitates the effective internalisation of corrective feedback.
It is important to point out that what is co-constructed during the process of internalisation through socially situated cognitive activities is not just linguistic knowledge: cognitive knowledge, discourse knowledge, and affective knowledge are also internalised along with linguistic knowledge. As will be outlined in Chapter 3, the participants in the present study were not solving linguistic problems per se, but rather they were solving genuine flat-sharing issues, in which linguistic problems might occur.

### 2.4.5.3 Language-related episodes and negotiation for meaning

A concept that is derived from the studies of collaborative dialogue is language-related episodes (LREs). LREs are conceptualised to operationalise the investigation into collaborative dialogue. Swain and Lapkin (1998) define LRE as ‘any part of a dialogue where the students talk about the language they are producing, question their language use, or correct themselves or others’ (p. 326). According to the findings from this line of research, LREs are essential for the analysis of L2 learners’ language use as they are the building blocks of collaborative dialogue. Analysing learners’ LRE in interactions focuses the explicit verbalisation of language use and corrections.

LREs are subdivided into form-based LREs and lexis-based LREs. The former looks at learners’ focus on grammar during the negotiation process whereas the latter looks at learners’ lexical choice during the negotiation process. Swain and Lapkin (1998) also recommend that the study of learners’ collaborative dialogue should be complemented by follow-up interviews so that more in-depth understanding of their mental processes can be achieved. Moreover, they suggest that affective variables may have an important impact on the patterns and dynamics of the dialogue.

Another construct which informs the present study is Negotiation for Meaning (NfM). Researchers indicate that the language input can be brought to the learners’ current level of understanding given the opportunity to negotiate meaning, thereby contributing to language learning (Lightbown & Spada, 2006; Pica, 1994). Over the years, there have been a lot of debates on what negotiation for meaning actually entails.

According to Long (1985, 1996), learners use interactional adjustments in order to overcome difficulties in listening comprehension. The interactional adjustments are called NfM, which may include confirmation check, clarification request, comprehension check, repetition and so on. Pica (1992, p. 200) defines NfM as ‘an activity that occurs when a listener signals to the speaker that the speaker’s message is not clear and the speaker and the listener work
linguistically to resolve this impasse.’ This definition emphasises the collaborative
devour of both parties when there is a linguistic misunderstanding.

This line of research is based on Krashen’s (1981, 1982, 1985) approach to second language
acquisition. Krashen coined the notion of comprehensive input which refers to the linguistic
input at the ‘i+1’ level – the new knowledge embedded in the input and the fact that it is
understandable for the leaners. M. H. Long (1996) argues that:

_Negotiation for meaning, and especially negotiation work that triggers interactional_
_adjustments by the NS (native speaker) or more competent interlocutor, facilitates_
_acquisition because it connects input, internal learner capacities, particularly_
_selective attention, and output in productive ways. (pp. 451-452)_

In his discussion of interaction adjustments during negotiation for meaning, Long points out
the importance of NfM in connecting the input and language learning. Moreover, he
foregrounds selective attention which is metacognitive in nature. According to M. H. Long
(1996), attentional resources are directed to the misuse of particular linguistic forms so that
they can be identified and adjusted (M. H. Long, 1996).

According to Long, negotiation for meaning, the strategy to solve linguistic
misunderstanding, makes the learners aware of linguistic problems. This point of
misunderstanding is often called ‘communication breakdown’. Mackey, Gass, and
McDonough (2000) states that communication breakdowns occur when ‘something
incomprehensible becomes the impetus for learners to recognise an inadequacy in their own
rule system’ (p. 476). Similarly, Ellis, Basturkmen, and Loewen (2001) echo the relationship
between negotiation for meaning and communication breakdowns suggesting that the
former is the explicit resolution of the latter. However, Foster (1998) claims that some
learners may choose to avoid face-threatening acts to minimise overt communication
breakdowns. In the same vein, Vandergrift (2007b) points out comprehension can break
down even if the listener understands the meaning of the message. Factors such as affect
might also contribute to the listening process.

Studies have shown that learners resort to NfM when there is a lexical ‘hole’ – the lexical
item that is not shared with the interlocutor (M. H. Long, 1996; Mackey, 2007; Pica, 1992).
Admittedly, they can choose to avoid using this lexical item. But when they attempt to use
an alternative way to compensate for their lack of linguistic knowledge by using a synonym,
gestures and so on, they are focusing on the meaning and successful communication of the
message. The collaborative process of learners negotiating for meaning in a lexical LRE is crucial to achieving successful communication (Dobao, 2012; Storch, 2002a, 2002b).

Whilst acknowledging the useful insights that the preceding literature on collaborative dialogue, language related episodes, and negotiation for meaning has offered, this thesis argues that there are some limitations in this line of research. Most LRE and NfM research relies on the analysis of language forms by merely counting instances of particular structures and comparing their frequencies across participants (e.g. Dobao, 2012; Storch, 2002a, 2002b). These studies may run the risk of over-simplifying the negotiation process, and therefore fail to capture its complexities situated in the wider social and affective contexts.

2.4.6 Summary

In this section I have reviewed listening models in L1 research and the dominant cognitive view of the listening process. In addition, I examined L2 interaction research informed by sociocultural theory, and explored some of the key concepts relevant to the present study.

My approach towards L2 listening has been influenced by researchers who draw on sociocultural theory in their investigation of L2 learning and teaching (Cross, 2010; Lantolf, 2000, 2006; Swain et al., 2002). However, the aim of the present thesis is to take this discussion further by adopting a sociocultural and dialogical lens and re-conceptualising metacognition in L2 listening. The present study develops an understanding of L2 learners’ listening process which not only takes into account the regulation of thoughts, but also highlights the social nature of this regulation. This accords with the broader understanding of metacognition proposed in Section 2.3 of this chapter. The next section summarises the findings discussed in the preceding sections, and sets out the way forward.
2.5 Towards a sociocultural and dialogical understanding of metacognitive awareness and activity in L2 listening

In this chapter, I have drawn on the literature and suggested that our current understanding of metacognition and listening is largely influenced by a cognitive viewpoint that focuses on the psychological regulation of the listener him/herself. While acknowledging that this tradition provided important insights into this phenomenon, my review indicates that listening can be regarded a joint venture which involves regulation beyond the individual.

Having identified the gaps in the existing literature, this section proposes that there is a need to investigate and re-conceptualise L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in listening. Guided by the sociocultural perspective on communication (Wertsch, 1985; Wertsch, 1991b) and a dialogical view on discourse and thought (Linell, 1998; Rommetveit, 1990, 1992), my investigation assumes that listening involves a complex process of monitoring and control. This monitoring and control is situated in the social world where the listening process entails that the listener and his or her partners jointly co-construct and negotiate meaning. Following my presentation of the findings (see Chapters 4 and 5), Chapter 6 will outline my re-conceptualisation.

The following chapter provides a rationale for, and discussion of, the methodology used when planning and conducting data collection and data analysis for my study. My data were derived from semi-structured interviews and problem-solving interactions. Broadly speaking, my analytical procedures for the interview data and for the interaction data were informed by grounded theory and conversation analysis respectively.
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

Chapter 2 has concluded that this thesis situates the study of metacognition in L2 listening in wider social and interpersonal contexts. I foregrounded the relevant theoretical constructs of a sociocultural and dialogical understanding of thought and communication. These ontological and epistemological assumptions provided the base for the methodological issues that the present research is concerned with.

My research design sets to explore L2 listeners’ awareness of and activity in the monitoring and control process. The study investigated two research questions:

- What elements are L2 learners aware of that contribute to the monitoring and control of the listening process? What connections, if any, can be established between these elements?
- To what extent can L2 listeners’ understanding of the monitoring and control process be exemplified through their discourse?

To answer these research questions, my main study recruited a total of 20 participants. They worked in dyads first on a problem-solving task before taking part in individual semi-structured retrospective interviews with me. The aim of the design was to explore L2 learners’ in-depth understanding of the ways in which the regulation takes place in the listening process, and the extent to which this is related to their discourse in the interaction.

This chapter outlines my rationale for the research design, the participants, ethical considerations, data collection procedures, approaches to data analysis and research quality. After this brief introduction to the chapter, section 3.2 discusses the methodological rationale of the present study. I draw on the methods and methodologies adopted in the existing literature on metacognition and L2 listening. Section 3.3 gives details of the participants’ profiles and my sampling strategies. The next section outlines the ethical considerations related to this study such as anonymity, confidentiality, and freedom to withdraw. Section 3.5 delineates my data collection procedures, problem-solving interaction and interviewing, as well as a brief reflection on the pilot study I conducted prior to the main study. Section 3.6 draws attention to the analytical framework I developed for this study – the grounded theory informed analysis of the interview data and the conversation analysis informed three-level analysis of the interaction data. Section 3.8 examines the issues regarding research
quality – reliability and validity. The final section draws this chapter to a conclusion. I present the findings of my study in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.
3.2 Rationale

This section provides the rationale for my research design. The aim of this section is to discuss my understanding of the research paradigms related to this study in order to justify my choices regarding the overall design. The methodology that this study adopted is informed by sociocultural and dialogical theorising and existing studies on metacognition and L2 listening that I have summarised in Chapter 2. The section starts with a review of the current debates with regard to how previous researchers investigated metacognition in general education studies. Then my discussion extends to the methodologies used by L2 researchers.

Veenman (2005) conducted an exhaustive review of the methods commonly used to investigate or assess metacognition in the literature. According to Veenman, these methods include retrospective self-reports (questionnaires and interviews), think-aloud protocols and observations amongst others. Whitebread et al. (2009) question the threat to validity for studies using retrospective self-report and concurrent think-aloud protocol methods to measure metacognition and self-regulation. They argue that the reliance on verbal reports requires a high level of verbal understanding and fluency. Think-aloud protocols, they maintain, may result in working memory overload, which may subsequently have an impact on task performance. This viewpoint is in line with the foundation laid by Nisbett and Wilson (1977) who suggest that omissions and intentions during verbal reports can distort the validity of the data. Following this line of reasoning, the investigation of metacognition in L2 listening seems even trickier: L2 learners’ language knowledge and ability could add more constraints to their verbalisation of thoughts and understandings in these commonly used retrospective methods. However, as this chapter unfolds, I argue that these challenges notwithstanding, L2 learners’ verbalisation of their thinking process offers invaluable insights into the phenomenon that this study is based on.

To address some of the issues in retrospective methods, Winne and Perry (2000) advocate that systematic observational methods are more suitable for the study of metacognition and self-regulation. According to them, these methods allow researchers to study what learners actually do within the context of the task instead of relying on their verbal abilities. Whitebread et al. (2009) echo this view and further suggest that it allows researchers to observe non-verbal behaviours which play a crucial role in the development of learners’ understanding of self-regulation. Another benefit afforded by observational methods is that social processes can be incorporated in the study of metacognition and self-regulation (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001). This is especially useful for studies on collaborative and peer
learning under the sociocultural framework which foregrounds the development through mediation and internalisation (see Section 2.2).

In the L2 listening literature, studies on metacognition have focused on investigations into the use of strategies and the development of metacognitive awareness. While research in this area has increased in recent years, this area still does not receive enough attention (Flowerdew & Miller, 2010; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). The research tools that L2 researchers have adopted are similar to those that metacognition researchers have adopted: diaries (Goh, 1997, 2000), think-aloud protocols (Vandergrift, 2003b), questionnaires (Goh & Hu, 2014; Vandergrift et al., 2006; Zhang & Goh, 2006) and strategy instruction (Cross, 2011; Goh, 2008; Goh & Taib, 2006; Vandergrift, 2003a). As was argued in Chapter 2, the focus of the present study was to investigate and re-conceptualise L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity, informed by the sociocultural and dialogical perspective on thought and communication. The main concern therefore regarding the design of the study is to decide whether to choose one method or a combination of methods so that the investigation can be situated in this broader understanding, highlighting its dialogical and discursive nature.

In order to fulfil the aims of the study and answer the research questions, I selected retrospective semi-structured interviews and problem-solving interactions in order to collect data. It should be noted that the retrospective interview method used in my study differs from the retrospective self-reports or concurrent think-aloud protocols discussed earlier in this section. In this study, retrospective interviews involved participants and me watching video recordings of interactions on a one-on-one basis. The interview topics were semi-structured, and both the participants and I had the freedom to pause or rewind the video. This method therefore allowed the participants and me to contribute to the interviews in a dialogical manner, facilitating the exploration of participants’ otherwise tacit understanding of the thought processes.

The other research method – problem-solving interactions – was informed by the systematic observational methods that Winne and Perry (2000) and Whitebread et al. (2009) have outlined earlier. Recognising the pivotal role that discourse plays as a psychological, semiotic and cultural tool in mediating the development from the interpersonal level to the intrapersonal level, the purpose of this method was that L2 learners’ discourse, as they worked on the problem-solving task, offers important insights into the ways in which their thinking is socially regulated. The combination of the interview method and the interaction method provided this study with complex and rich data which went beyond the depth of
only using one single method as was utilised in the majority of L2 literature in this area. Section 3.8 will deal with issues related to the constraints of this combined approach.

This section has outlined the rationale for my research design. The next section discusses the sampling issues and the participants.
3.3 Participants

This section outlines the participant recruitment process and their demographic information. My study employed the term ‘participants’ when referring to the volunteers who participated in my study. This should be distinguished from using words such as ‘subjects’ or ‘respondents’, which may imply a degree of exploitation and is not suitable in the context of this study (Robson, 2011).

My selection of the participants followed ‘purposive sampling’ or ‘theoretical sampling’ in order to reflect a wide range of metacognitive awareness and activity in the listening process. Silverman (2011) suggests that two commonly used sampling strategies to address generalisability issues in qualitative research are purposive sampling and theoretical sampling (see also Denzin & Lincoln, 1998; Holstein & Gubrium, 2004). There is broad overlap in the way in which these terms are used in the literature. The former is also termed ‘purposeful sampling’ by Bryant and Charmaz (2010) who claim that it allows the research to ‘maximise variation of meaning, thus determining the scope of the phenomena or concepts’ (p. 236). Theoretical sampling is defined by Mason (1996) as:

Selecting groups or categories to study on the basis of their relevance to your research questions, your theoretical position … and most importantly the explanation or account which you are developing. Theoretical sampling is concerned with constructing a sample … which is meaningful theoretically. (p. 93-94)

Both techniques involve the ‘purposive’ element in which the researcher’s selection of the sample is based on a certain rationale. As was delineated earlier, the present study aimed to investigate metacognition in L2 listening, thus my sampling strategy was to recruit students who were speakers of English as L2, and who were from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds. This strategy not only ensured the variation of meaning in the data, but also allowed me to explain the phenomenon in a wider scope, contributing to the re-conceptualisation. Furthermore, as the study was not to test a particular hypothesis, my participants were not limited to a specific gender or age range. Upon examination of existing research on metacognition in L2 listening, no empirical studies related to the topic of this thesis had been carried out this way (see my review in Chapter 2).

My participants’ recruitment process mainly involved the following methods:

- Social media: Facebook groups (Tandem [The university language exchange programme] and International Student Centre)
- Email circulation across different schools within the university
• Poster display on student notice boards in public areas around the university.

Basic information about the research was advertised in the ‘Call for Participants’ social media page, emails and flyers. This information included: my name, contact details, year of study, participants’ requirement, a brief description of the project and timing (see Appendix 1 for the flyer and email template). This was to ensure that prior to the data collection session, students were provided with sufficient information about my study so that they could make informed decisions about whether to participate. These participant recruitment strategies were effective as a good number of students expressed their interest in the research project only a few days after the recruiting process had begun. In the end 20 participants were recruited within the first two weeks.

Following the advertising stage, I contacted university students who were speakers of English as a second or foreign language. Once I confirmed the information about their first language and availability, I paired the participants in such a way that the participants in each dyad spoke different first languages. I then liaised with the two participants in each dyad and scheduled a mutually convenient time for them to come in. I also reminded all the participants that they could withdraw from the process at any time if they felt uncomfortable to continue. The participants were not given any financial or material benefits for this study.

### 3.3.1 Participant details

I recruited a total of twenty university students from a Scottish university. The participants were fully briefed that their real identities would be not disclosed, and that a pseudonym or a number would be assigned to each student. Section 3.4 discusses issues related to confidentiality and informed consent in detail.

The participants in this study were international students (3 males and 17 females), aged 19 to 37 (mean 26.02), from diverse language and cultural backgrounds. The table below outlines the participants’ pseudonym, age, gender, country of origin and first language:
Table 3:1 Participants' pseudonym, age, gender, country of origin and first language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Country of Origin</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuzuki</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bosnia</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailee</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Romanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>Hindi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Basque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norah</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Belarus</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Malay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Slovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mara</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Polish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table indicates that the participants’ first languages ranged from European languages and Asian languages to African languages. A Demographic Form (See Appendix 2) was used to gain basic information on the participants. This information included:

- Age;
- Gender;
- IELTS/TOEFL scores (if applicable);
- Level of English;
- Country of origin (first language);
- Length of study in the UK (and other English-speaking countries);
- Degree area.

The table below outlines the participants’ length of stay in English Speaking countries, degree area and perceived linguistic competence:
Table 3:2 Participants' length of stay, degree and perceived linguistic competence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Length of stay</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Perceived linguistic competence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Savannah</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>MSc Linguistics</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yuzuuki</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MSc TESOL</td>
<td>IELTS 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MSc Education: Language</td>
<td>Advanced, TOEFL 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MSc Psychology</td>
<td>Advanced, CPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachael</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>MSc Education: Language</td>
<td>Upper-intermediate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanner</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>MSc International Development</td>
<td>Upper-intermediate, TOEFL 113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicole</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>PhD Biology</td>
<td>Intermediate, IELTS 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>PhD Genetics</td>
<td>Advanced, TOEFL 280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>PhD Education</td>
<td>N/A²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>MSc Film Directing</td>
<td>Upper-intermediate, TOEFL 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>MSc Business</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PhD Evolutionary Biology</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norah</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>MSc TESOL</td>
<td>Advanced, IELTS 7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>PhD Landscape Architecture</td>
<td>Intermediate, IELTS 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>BSc Geoscience</td>
<td>Advanced, IELTS 6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caitlin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MSc Translation Studies</td>
<td>Advanced, IELTS 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harry</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>MSc Philosophy</td>
<td>Advanced, IELTS 8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mara</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>BSc Law</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>MSc Applied Linguistics</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>BSc Literature and Languages</td>
<td>Advanced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows that some of the participants have lived in English Speaking countries for a significant period of time. This table also shows that two participants had enrolled in an undergraduate degree, whereas 18 were postgraduate students at the time of the study. They come from diverse academic backgrounds, ranging from Humanities and Social Science to Natural Science. The participants’ perceived levels of English were generally from upper-intermediate to advanced levels. It should be noted that participants’ perceived levels of English linguistic competence can be subjective. For example, although both Nicole and Lena achieved 6.5 in IELTS, Nicole categorised her English level as Intermediate, whereas Lena categorised her English level as Advanced. In addition to this, since the information regarding the years that these participants had taken the English proficiency exams were not given, it was difficult to compare their language proficiency.

1 Savannah spent 1 year and 8 months in the UK and 10 months in the US. All numbers in Column 2 refer to months.

2 The participants have the freedom to withhold any information if they wish. In this case, Megan did not provide any information concerning her perceived English level or language exam results.
only based on this table. As was discussed in the preceding sections, the participants’ English levels were not the primary concern of this study, the information in this table therefore were only collected as a reference.

In contrast to most previous research on metacognition in L2 listening, which tended to sample adolescent L2 learners or learners from one linguistic origin, the participants in the present study were adults from mixed linguistic origins (e.g. Cross, 2011; Goh, 2008; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). In this regard, my study therefore not only furthered our existing understanding of metacognition in L2 listening, but also explored L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in an intercultural context.

In this section, I have outlined my sampling strategies and the profiles of the participants in this study. The next section discusses the ethical considerations that my study was concerned with.
3.4 Ethical considerations

This section outlines some of the key ethical considerations involved in the planning, data collection as well as data analysis stages of my research. My study followed the ethical requirements of The Moray House School of Education and The University of Edinburgh.

Having the foreknowledge of the ethical issues that might arise is important as it enables the researcher to reflect on the choices at the different stages of an investigation and be sensitive about potential moral issues (Kvale, 2007; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). In line with this view, I considered the ethics of my research to be an ongoing concern. Kvale (2007) argues that ethical issues permeate the seven research stages of interview studies: thematising, designing, interview situation, transcription, analysis, verification and reporting. He further points out that:

The knowledge produced depends on the social relationship of interviewer and interviewee, which again rests on the interviewer’s ability to create a stage where the subject is free and safe to talk of private events for later public use. (p. 8)

In both stages of my data collection (problem-solving interaction and interview), I considered the building of social relationship between participants and myself, and how this might have an impact on the knowledge produced. Prior to the problem-solving interaction stage, I gave the participants two to five minutes to build rapport. They could use the time to get to know each other a little better; they could also use the time to ask me any questions about the study. In addition, prior to the interview stage, I asked the participants how they had been getting on with the study so far. I also prepared some warm-up questions as the transition to the formal interview. All of these steps contributed to the creation of a natural and trustworthy environment between the participants and me.

The Informed Consent Form (see Appendix 3) provided the participants with information about the study, including the aim and purpose of the process, the procedures, confidentiality, risks, and the freedom to withdraw. The form was devised following consultation of the existing literature and the relevant ethical guidelines. The form was subsequently approved by the Ethics Committee at the Moray House School of Education. I took into consideration the issues such as ‘privacy, consent, confidentiality, deceit, deception and harm’ in my research (Bryant & Charmaz, 2010, p. 425). This not only ensured that the identity of the participants was protected, but also justified the transparency and trustworthiness of my research. Any difficulties during the data collection process and the subsequent data analysis process are discussed openly within this section and other
appropriate sections and chapters. These challenges are elaborated both from the researcher’s perspective and from the participants’ perspective. In order to keep L2 learners’ interactions and interviews confidential, participants were assigned pseudonyms before the transcription of the data (see Table 3:1). Their pseudonyms were used in the transcripts, this thesis and other dissemination platforms of this research. Information about confidentiality and accessibility of my research findings was also included in the Informed Consent form.

Due to the fact that the participants of this study were international students from non-English speaking countries, they were given sufficient time to read through the forms and the problem-solving task on the day of data collection, and any queries regarding the documents were answered truthfully to the best of my knowledge. Also, I gave further considerations to my research topic itself – the challenging nature of discussing metacognition and listening in L2. For some participants, this could cause potential stress and anxiety. In order to mitigate this, I attempted to ask open-ended questions and follow-up questions in a clear manner with further clarifications if necessary. Section 3.5.2 outlines the areas that were covered in the interview and sample follow-up questions. At the end of each interview, I asked the participants their general feelings toward the task and the interview. The comments from most of them were positive. Overall, they felt that they had learnt a lot about themselves, the other participant and the listening process. Some of the participants even reported the transformation of their self-understanding – the formation of a new perception of the listening process.
3.5 Data collection procedures

In line with the aims of the study and in order to answer the research questions, semi-structured interviews and problem-solving interactions were considered suitable methods. I have delineated my rationale for choosing these methods in Section 3.2. The use of both methods reflected different aspects of L2 listener’s metacognitive awareness and activity: the former highlighted L2 learners’ understanding and the latter portrayed the ways in which this understanding was reflected in the discourse. While recognising the implicit nature of metacognition, the design of the present study was not aimed at capturing all aspects of metacognition; rather, the data collection procedures employed in this study was aimed at providing insights into the complexity of the regulation of thought and discourse. Veenman et al. (2006) suggest that:

Metacognition, however, is not always explicitly heard or seen during task performance. Instead, it has often to be inferred from certain cognitive activities. For instance, doing things step-by-step may be indicative of planned behaviour, although self-instructions for planning are not explicitly verbalized. (p. 6)

As Section 3.6 will indicate, the analyses of interviews and interactions were linked so that they formed an overall coherent and analytical framework. One of the key issues in relation to combining different methods is the validity of the method(s). Silverman (2010) states that social research is more than choosing an appropriate methodology and analytical framework; it is about the relationships of different stages within the research. The research quality section of this chapter (see Section 3.8) will discuss this issue in the light of the literature.

Challenges prior to data collection included the negotiation of timing. The time had to be suitable for both participants and myself. Although a number of students had expressed interest at the beginning, due to timetable conflicts, seven of them were not able to come in the end. In addition to this, the heavy snow resulted in one of the pairs having to cancel the appointment in the last minute. As a result, I collected data from 20 participants. There were therefore a total of 20 audio-recorded interviews and 10 video-recorded interactions. The data collection took place over a period of three weeks in March 2013.

Before the data collection officially began, I reviewed the forms (Demographic Form and Informed Consent Form) for completion, and if any item was not completed, the participants were reminded to complete as they wished. But they were never forced to give information. Having collected the forms, I restated the purpose of the study, and re-emphasised that this was not a test of any kind.
As the study was the first time that the participants met each other and, establishing rapport was considered important. This ensured that they were able to carry out the problem-solving task and follow-up interview in a comfortable environment. Participants were given three to five minutes to introduce themselves to each other. They were also reminded that they could use the time to ask me questions related to this study, should there be any.

Table 3.3 provides an overview of the activity, people involved and time in the two stages in which I gathered my data. I will discuss the relationships of these two stages as the sections unfold.

**Table 3.3 Main study data collection procedures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>People involved</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Problem-solving interaction</td>
<td>Both participants</td>
<td>8-10 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Semi-structured interview</td>
<td>Participant A or B and the researcher</td>
<td>30 minutes (approx.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the table above shows, participants first worked on a flat-sharing task in dyads, which lasted for eight to ten minutes. This stage was video recorded. For the second stage, one of the participants remained in the room with me to continue with the retrospective semi-structured interview which lasted for approximately 30 minutes. This stage was audio recorded. The other participant waited in a room nearby, and was called back when the interview with the first participant had finished.

### 3.5.1 The interaction

Having presented an overview of the data collection procedures, this section discusses the details of each stage. For Stage 1, participants worked in dyads on a problem-solving task. The interactions were video recorded by means of the Photo Booth Application on a Macbook Pro (Mid-2010 model) running Mac OSX 10.7 Lion. Photo Booth captures videos with the resolution of 640 X 480 at 15 frames per second using H264 compression. Later, the files were exported in .mov format in preparation for the transcription.

Wells (1999), Swain et al. (2002) and Mitchell and Myles (2004) maintains that cognitive development can be achieved through collaboration among peers where they have the chance to negotiate meaning. This view is in accord with Donato and Lantolf (1990) who state that dialogically derived developmental processes ‘can be observed directly in the linguistic interactions that arise among speakers as they participate in problem-solving.
tasks’ (p. 85). The aim of the task therefore was to facilitate the co-construction and negotiation of meaning between L2 listeners without being too prescriptive (see Appendix 4 for details of the task). According to Duff (1986), there are two common types of tasks in L2 classrooms: convergent tasks and divergent tasks. The former refers to tasks in which participants share the same goal and mutual exchange of information is essential. The latter refers to tasks which are more open-ended: there is no correct solution in this kind of task. Based on this distinction, the task designed for this study could be considered as a divergent task.

The task design took into consideration the fact that my participants were from diverse cultural and language backgrounds, the topic of the task therefore should be based on something that most of them felt comfortable talking about and could easily relate to. In other words, in order to complete the task, participants should be less concerned with having expertise cultural and background knowledge but focus on the communication process. Flat sharing seemed to be a suitable topic since from my personal experience, most international students would have had some experience of sharing flats with either local residents or other international students. People without this personal experience might have friends or family members who had a similar experience. The task did not specify the order in which the flat-sharing issues should be discussed. It was thus my intention to also observe the way in which the participants negotiated their approach to the task (see my findings regarding the negotiation of sequencing and transitions in Section 5.3).

3.5.2 Interviewing

Having outlined the first stage of my data collection procedures, this section provides a discussion of the second stage of data collection and my general approach to interviewing. Both the interview and the interaction were crucial to my study. The aim of the interview stage was to investigate how L2 listeners understand metacognitive awareness and activity. My study adopted a retrospective semi-structured approach to interviewing.

3.5.2.1 The interview

I positioned the interview process as interactional and interpretative. Holstein and Gubrium (1995, 2004) note that active interviews involve the co-construction process between the interviewer and the interviewee in which attention should be paid not only to what is constructed, but also how it is constructed. Brinkmann (2007) builds on this understanding and argues that during the interview process, both the interviewer and the interviewee should be able to develop knowledge in a dialogical manner. Holstein and Gubrium’s and
Brinkmann’s conceptualisations of the interview process move away from more conventional views on interviewing where the interviewee merely describes his or her experience in a monological manner. Tanggaard (2007, 2008) further asserts that the dialogue between the interviewer and the interviewee facilitates the production of more objective understandings of the topic under investigation. My approach to planning, conducting the interview and analysing the interview data echoed this thinking.

Having outlined my approach to interviewing, this section now turns to a detailed description of the interview process specific to my study. As Table 3.3 suggests, after the participants had finished the problem-solving task, one of the participants in the dyad remained in the room with me for the interview, while the other participant waited in an office next door to relax before coming back later for the interview. Each interview lasted for approximately 30 minutes, and was audio recorded. The Memo application on the iPhone 4s running iOS 6 was used for recording purposes. Attached to the device was the Tascam iM2 stereo microphone which captures voices in high-quality stereo. The recordings were converted to MP3 files for transcription.

Before I started the interview process, I offered the participants refreshments and gave them sufficient time to get ready. I also used this period to check the video recording of the interaction and prepare the MOV file for playback as it would be used in the interview. During the interview, the participants reviewed the video recording of the earlier interaction with me. The retrospective method with the help of video recordings provided the participant with the opportunity to reflect on his or her understanding of the way in which cognitive resources were regulated in the listening process. I stated the procedure for this stage and re-iterated that they should feel free to pause the video at any time and to discuss what was happening in the interaction. The interview followed the temporal sequence of the interaction as well as the participants’ flow of thoughts. I started each interview with two general questions:

- What did you think of the task in general?
- How did you find working with your partner?

The purpose of these two questions was to facilitate a smooth transition from the break to the interview, helping me to gauge participants’ overall experience which I believe is pertinent to their subsequent discussion of thoughts.
All interview questions were framed in such a way that the participants could elaborate on their understanding of the interaction and their thought processes. The purpose of interviewing was to investigate the complexity of L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in listening. The interview topics were designed following my close examination of relevant literature on sociocultural theorising and the dialogical view on thought and communication, metacognition and L2 listening (see my review in Chapter 2). Appropriate amendments had been made according to the feedback from the pilot study. These amendments will be discussed in Section 3.5.3. As this study adopted a semi-structured approach to interviewing, an outline of the topic areas that I explored with the participants is provided below:

- General thoughts while listening to the other person,
- Interpretations of the partner’s response,
- The relation between personal experience and the listening process,
- The use of strategy (shifting attention, repetition, prediction, etc.),
- Silence and topic shift,
- Expectations.

The open-ended ways in which the questions were posed and the dialogical style that I adopted during the interview process allowed L2 listeners to reflect on their understandings as they discussed the regulation of thought and discourse. Participants drew actively on a repertoire of personal knowledge and experience as well as their evolving understanding throughout the course of the interaction. My effort to establish a good rapport with the participants also helped them to overcome any initial uncomfortable feelings. Moreover, I asked the following tag questions when necessary:

- Can you say a little bit more on that?
- What is it that s/he did that helps you understand?
- Is there anything else you would like to add?
- What were you thinking when you/he/she said/did this?

A list of sample questions that I asked during the interview can be found in Appendix 5. As was mentioned earlier, the interview questions were open ended. This was to increase the flexibility of the content of the interview and to follow participants’ stream of thoughts. The primary purpose of conducting a one-on-one interview was to encourage participants to
reflect consciously on how they monitor and control cognitive resources situated in the discourse.

The self-initiated replay in which the participants chose segments allowed them to take control, which is in accord with my general approach to interviewing outlined earlier. Besides voluntarily pausing the video and articulating their thoughts, the participants also answered questions based on the extracts selected by me. The selection of extracts highlighted aspects in the listening process of which participants were more aware.

### 3.5.2.2 The retrospective approach and verbalisations

This study employed a specific approach to semi-structured interviewing – the retrospective approach. This approach belongs to verbal report as a method of data collection, which was originally developed in psychological research (Bowles, 2010; Ericsson & Simon, 1993). In Section 2.4.5, I have reviewed some of the recent L2 studies using this method (e.g. DiCamilla & Antón, 2004; Swain et al., 2002). They investigated L2 learners’ cognitive processes through the analysis of LREs in collaborations.

As a form of retrospective approach, verbal reports are often used by L2 researchers to collect verbalisations of participants’ thought processes (A. D. Cohen, 1998, 2012; Gass & Mackey, 2000). According to Bowles (2010), there are two approaches to collecting and analysing verbal reports based on temporal frame – concurrent reports and retrospective reports. Concurrent reports which are also called think-aloud protocols, require participants to reflect on their thought process during the task. This enables the researchers to tap into the thought processes whilst the listener can still trace the information in his or her short-term memory (e.g. Vandergrift, 2007b). However, there are disadvantages in this technique. On the one hand, it disrupts the flow of the thoughts as participants are engaged in the task. Admittedly, sufficient training prior to the main task might reduce the feeling of disruption; nevertheless, it can still be challenging for L2 learners. On the other hand, the fact that the participants have to articulate their thoughts adds cognitive and metacognitive strains to the listening process. In other words, the listeners not only have to attend to the regulation of cognition in order to complete the task, but they have to reflect on and articulate the thought processes. Hence, there might be the potential that verbalisations interfere with the performance of the task. This is often referred to as reactivity (Ellis, 2001; Jourdenais, 2001).

Retrospective reports are collected when participants have finished the task. Participants are asked to reflect on their thought processes. In terms of the validity of this post-task method,
there is the potential for veridicality - issues with regard to the participants’ loss of short-term memory (Bowles, 2010). In response to these issues, the present study was designed so that there was only a brief delay between the completion of the task and the follow-up interview. Moreover, as the participants were provided with the video recording of their interaction earlier, this would help to keep veridicality to the minimum (Gass & Mackey, 2000). Another reason for opting for retrospective interviews was the advantage of having two distinct data sets - this allowed me to compare and contrast the data in the data analysis stage: Chapter 4 mainly presents my findings from the interview data, and Chapter 5 mainly presents my findings from the interaction data.

Verbal reports can also be categorised based on the content of the verbalisation - whether the data only consist of information about the thought processes or include explanations. In L2 research, the former is called non-metalinguistic verbal reports, and the latter is referred to as meta-linguistic verbal reports. This categorisation is discussed in detail in Bowles (2008). Given the focus of the present study, the investigation of metacognition in L2 listening, my design followed the meta-linguistic verbal report approach. This allowed participants to not only describe their thought processes on the surface level (A. D. Cohen, 1998), but also explain or justify their decisions and understandings, which is in line with Brown’s (1987) view on metacognition (see Section 3.8). Moreover, as I argued earlier, in this study the retrospective verbal report method was combined with participants’ interaction data, which aimed to uncover the cognitive processes in L2 learners’ listening process – in particular, the ways in which they plan, monitor and evaluate their thought and utterances (Woodfield, 2012).

3.5.3 Piloting the study

Given that the present study was aimed at exploring and establishing a novel conceptualisation, it was important to determine whether the design would successfully investigate this specific aspect of L2 listening before embarking on the main study. Weber (1990) remarks that it is a good practice to carry out a study on a small scale in the first instance: this is to test out both the data collection procedures and the analytical approach so that further amendments can be made if necessary (p. 21-24).

I carried out a small-scale pilot study in May 2012 prior to the main study. Four university students volunteered to participate, two of whom were native speakers of Mandarin and the other two native speaker of French and Spanish respectively. Their average age was 24. All four participants were postgraduate students with a degree area in TESOL (N=2), Education
Language (N=1) and Environmental Studies (N=1) at the time of the study. They had a maximum of six months and a minimum of three months living and studying in the UK. Their level of English was upper-intermediate (IELTS 6.5 to 7).

Overall, the pilot study was informative in developing my research focus, testing out the suitability of the research design including the interview topic sets and the timing of each stage, as well as gaining valuable feedback from the participants. My pilot study participants commented on how helpful they found the questions and that they had not reflected on such topics before. In addition to this, I was able to analyse bits of the data using my analytical approach which was modified before applying it to the main study data (see Section 3.6 for my analytical framework).

The original data collection procedures followed three stages: 1) problem-solving interactions; 2) retrospective semi-structured interviews; 3) diaries. The details of the procedure are outlined in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>People involved</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Problem-solving interaction</td>
<td>Both participants</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Retrospective semi-structured interview</td>
<td>Participant (A or B) and the researcher</td>
<td>40-50 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td>Participant (B or A)</td>
<td>40-50 minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 presents the three stages in the pilot study data collection. These procedures were amended prior to the main study. From the table above, we can see that in the pilot study, the participants first worked on a problem-solving task in dyads. They then completed individual retrospective semi-structured interviews with me. Different from the main study design, the participants in the pilot study also had to write reflective diaries.

The problem-solving interaction lasted for 12 and 21 minutes for each dyad, and was video recorded. The semi-structured interview lasted for approximately 40 minutes for all four participants, and was audio recorded. Both the interaction and the interview recordings were transcribed by me following the data collection for preliminary analysis.

The interaction-interview-diary design enabled the participants to review their performance and to reflect on their thoughts either with or without the help of the visual support and the researcher upon completion of the interaction. Similar to the main study, both the participants and I had the opportunity to select episodes in the interview process. The
episodes were highly selective due to the length of the interaction recording. The interview topic areas were developed so as to elicit the participants’ understanding and perception of the regulation of thought and discourse in the listening process. Similar to the main study, the pilot study employed a semi-structured format for the interview, which was set out to cover the following topic areas:

- learners’ beliefs and attitude towards L2 listening;
- learners’ understanding of the L2 listening process;
- learners’ perceptions of difficulties in L2 listening;
- ways to overcome these difficulties;
- learners’ assessment of their counterparts in the interaction.

At the diary stage, participants were asked to write their thoughts on regulation during the interaction. Taking into account of their linguistic knowledge, a writing framework was devised to facilitate this session. 40 to 50 minutes were allocated so that the participants would not feel pressurised in the writing about their thought processes. The writing framework contained the following questions:

- Are you happy with the Roommate Agreement Draft? How did you and your partner reach this agreement?
- Did you have any problems with the language in your conversation? Can you write down some examples? What did you do to overcome these problems?
- Did you use any conversation strategies when communicating with your partner? What are they? Why did you use these strategies?
- What do you find is the most challenging thing about the task? Why?
- Can you comment on your partner’s performance? What strikes you the most?
- Would you do/say things differently next time? Why?

In developing the writing frame, the wording was made as clear as possible. The timing was very generous (40 to 50 minutes), giving the participants enough time to reflect on their listening process. The participants were also reminded that they did not have to adhere strictly to the questions for the diary, and that they should feel comfortable to write about aspects of the listening process in general.

All four interviews from the pilot study were transcribed in full verbatim. The transcripts were manually coded, compared and summarised before preliminary categories and
emerging themes were identified. The analysis of the interview explored the learners’ perceptions and understanding of L2 learners’ thought processes in the listening process.

The video-recorded interactions were transcribed selectively and analysed using a discourse analytic approach (Liddicoat, 2007; Schegloff, 1996). In common with a conventional conversation analysis approach, the annotation of the recorded extracts revealed verbal behaviours (e.g. turn taking, hesitations, and repairs) as well as nonverbal behaviours (e.g. nodding, eye contact) in detail. An adapted transcription convention (see Appendix 6) was developed to mark subtle features in each utterance. The pilot findings from the interviews, the interactions and the diaries were corroborated.

3.5.3.1 Amendments
As a result of the pilot study, I gained confidence in interviewing participants and had the opportunity to test the equipment, data collection and analysis methods. The pilot study also helped me to reflect on and refine my design and the overall analytical framework. The revision of the original data collection procedures was based on careful consideration of practicality, feasibility, and the participants’ feedback. Now I will provide a summary of these amendments.

With regard to the timing, some participants pointed out that the session was too long. The main reason was that in the pilot study, the problem-solving task was not subject to a time limit. Hence, one interaction lasted for 12 minutes, whereas the other lasted for 21 minutes. The longer interaction subsequently led to much longer interviews and diary writing sessions. With this in mind, I revised the timing in the main study. The problem-solving task was limited to eight to ten minutes. Consequently, the time for the retrospective interview was also reduced (see Table 3.3). While acknowledging that some dyads might not be able to finish the task (going through all the issues on the list), whereas others might prioritise certain issues over others, the primary purpose of the task was to foster a natural environment in which the participants could communicate effectively. By reducing the time allocated to the problem-solving interaction, the participants would have to negotiate how they would approach the task, which contributed to the regulation process.

The pilot study task consisted of nine flat-sharing issues, and some of these issues overlapped with each other. The revised task (see Appendix 4), however, only covered five areas in flat-sharing situations. This was to encourage the participants to negotiate for shared understanding and open up possibilities for discussion about issues that are more
relevant to their personal experience. Moreover, as the participants no longer had to draft the Flat-sharing Nuts and Bolts or Agreement in the main study, they were able to focus on the listening process without the interference of having to write.

Informed by my preliminary analysis of the pilot study data, the interview topic sets were also refined. Rather than investigating L2 listeners’ beliefs and attitudes in general, the semi-structured interview questions in the main study were contingent upon the episodes that the participants chose to reflect upon. The aim of the new topic sets was to elicit L2 learners’ understanding and perceptions of metacognitive awareness in the listening process.

Finally, the diary stage was removed for the following reasons. My study set out to investigate L2 listeners’ understanding of the regulation process embedded in the ongoing interaction; the diary section, mainly serving the purpose of delayed reflection, lacked contextual cues or the situatedness of the discourse and thought regulations. Furthermore, some participants in my pilot study indicated that sometimes they felt that they primarily relied on their memory capacity when writing the diary. In addition to this, the participants’ feedback from the pilot study suggested that it could be confusing or even challenging for them to reflect the regulation process on their own, especially without the help of the researcher and the visual aspects of the interaction.

This section has discussed my approach to data collection both in the main study as well as in the pilot study. The focus was to delineate and justify my decisions during the data collection of my study. In the next section, I outline my approaches to data analysis.
3.6 Approaches to data analysis

The preceding section has discussed the data collection procedures adopted for my study: retrospective semi-structured interviewing and problem-solving interactions. This section illustrates the analytical framework. Chapter 2 has reviewed sociocultural theory which foregrounds the notion of mediation (Wertsch, 1991a) and a dialogical view of the construction of meanings (Linell, 1998; Rommetveit, 1992). These perspectives informed my thinking as I explored L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in the data. Furthermore, the review of metacognition research and L2 listening research influenced my thoughts on choosing a suitable approach to analyse my data. The development of my analytical framework was guided by the research questions and was in line with the data collection procedures provided in the preceding section.

3.6.1 Analysis of the interviews

From the outset my approach to analysing the interview data was informed by grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Strauss & Corbin, 1990, 1994). Strauss and Corbin (1994) define grounded theory as ‘a general methodology for developing theory that is grounded in data systematically gathered and analysed’ (p. 273). In line with this definition, Charmaz (2006) remarks that grounded theory is a set of methods that ‘consist of systematic, yet flexible guidelines for collecting and analysing qualitative data to construct theories “grounded” in the data themselves’ (p. 2). In grounded theory, the process in which the researcher develops a theory following careful inspection of the data is called ‘analytic induction’ (Silverman, 2011). Generally speaking, two techniques are involved in analytic induction: the use of the constant comparative method and the search for deviant or negative cases (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). The goal of constant comparative methods is to establish analytic distinction by ‘making comparisons at each level of analytic work’ (Charmaz, 2006, p. 54). The researcher first formulates a hypothesis following his or her scrutiny of a data fragment. He or she then examines more data segments against the hypothesis. If the hypothesis is not confirmed by the new data, it is revised. The iterative process continues until a relationship is shown. The search for deviant cases permeates throughout the process of constant comparison. Silverman (2011) argues that ‘the comparative method implies actively seeking out and addressing deviant cases’ (p. 378). However, Silverman also notes that ‘pieces of data are never intrinsically “deviant” but rather become so in relation to the approach used’ (ibid.).

Whilst recognising that my analytical approach to the interview data was informed by such an inductive oriented grounded theory stance, the analysis was, to a certain extent, also
deductive. Not only were the codes and categories in my study grounded in the data, but they were underpinned by the existing literature on sociocultural theorising, metacognition and listening. As Chapter 2 established to date very little attention has been paid to the investigation of metacognition in L2 listening from the sociocultural and dialogical perspective; the present study aimed to address this gap and contribute to the relevant debates. Silverman (2010) observes that data should be theory saturated: the literature guides the researcher from the design process to the data analysis process. In this study, the emergence of codes and categories were also theoretically informed. At the same time. I took into consideration Charmaz’s (2006) advice, and tried to look for how my participants understood their situations instead of judging their attitudes and actions by imposing my repertoire of theoretical concepts. This enabled me to understand the logic of my participants’ experiences by situating their understanding within the existing literature. In my study, as I read the interview transcripts and assigned codes to meaningful chunks of the text, I ensured that these codes were based on the content and organisation of the data, representing the data at a more abstract level. The theoretical and empirical intertwinement in the analysis is referred to as ‘abduction’ by some researchers (e.g. Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2009; Charmaz, 2006). According to Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009), abduction is a method that combines induction and deduction:

Abduction starts from an empirical basis, just like induction, but does not reject theoretical preconceptions and is in that respect closer to deduction. The analysis of the empirical fact(s) may very well be combined with, or preceded by, studies of previous theory in the literature; not as a mechanical application on single cases but as a source of inspiration for the discovery of patterns that bring understanding. The research process, therefore, alternates between (previous) theory and empirical facts whereby both are successively reinterpreted in the light of each other. (p. 4)

Alvesson and Sköldberg succinctly summarised the abductive method in the extract above. Using this approach, emerging themes and patterns from my interview data were not confined by existing models and theories; they were constantly being adjusted and refined in order to reflect my evolving understanding of the data and its relationship with the theories. Alvesson and Sköldberg (2009) maintain that the exploration of theory and the empirical data promotes reflexivity which will be discussed in Section 3.8.

Rather than following distinctly differentiated phases, my approach to analysing the interview data was iterative and recursive. I coded and recoded the data so that meaning potentials embedded within could be explored extensively. Roulston (2010) defines ‘codes’ as ‘labels that researchers apply to sections of data. Applied to interview data, codes might refer to the topics of talk developed by interviewer and interviewee, as well as how the talk
has been produced’ (p. 151). Coding, recoding, comparing and summarising helped me to find trends and patterns as well as the nuances in the data (Dey, 1993). As I read and reread the data, new codes were added, modified or removed; new categories were created and refined. Going back and forth with coding and recoding ensured that the emerging codes and categories were empirically based on the data, closely related to my theoretically informed conceptualisation.

In my study, some of the earlier codes were clearly linked to the theories related to metacognition and listening. Preliminary codes constituted general categories - ‘context’, ‘affect’, ‘discourse’, ‘social’ and ‘metacognition’. Roulston (2010) notes that ‘through methodological, thorough and exhaustive coding, researchers reduce a data set to conceptual elements that may then be sorted into “categories” (p. 153).’ Guided by this understanding, earlier codes and preliminary categories in the analytical process were checked for consistencies, additions or modifications. Dey (1993) shares this view and suggests that ‘classifying the data is an integral part of the analysis: it lays the conceptual foundations upon which interpretation and explanation are based (p. 41).’ In other words, classifying the data was considered to be essential in preparation for meaningful comparisons, which could result in a more in-depth understanding of the data. Dey further argues that as the number and meanings of codes becomes relatively stable, the connections and patterns can be examined. The classification, embedded in the iterative process of analysing my interview data, helped me to build the conceptual framework by refining the boundaries between categories.

Kelle (2004) observes that difficulties might arise due to the large amount of data as researchers assign and compare codes. Indeed, the use of qualitative software, which will be discussed further in Section 3.7, was helpful as it allowed me to keep track of the interview data codes, categories and their definitions in a systematic way. However, this process could still be quite challenging. For example, some codes were subsumed under one or more codes, whilst others were created as new codes; some codes referred to more specific ideas, whereas others referred to more general or vague concepts (L. Cohen, Manion, & Morrison, 2007). To a certain extent, the defining, revising and re-defining of the codes and categories during my analysis of the interview data was informed by the constant comparative method in grounded theory. In line with this strategy, I inspected and attempted to find another case through which to test out the initial definitions by comparing data bits that arise in each interview transcript.
Regarding overlaps in the codes, Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) note that chunks of data assigned to more than one codes is desirable as it maintains the complexities and richness of the data. This is in line with what Lincoln and Guba (1985) term the ‘categorisation’ process where descriptive and inferential information is identified so that meaningful units in the data are represented. In the analysis of my interview data, overlaps of data bits were allowed. This also entailed that the interconnectedness between codes and categories could be explored (see Section 4.2).

Following the initial rounds of reading and coding, the frequency of the codes was counted in order to identify patterns and trends. Silverman (2011) maintains that:

> Simple counting techniques, theoretically derived and ideally based on participants’ own categories, can offer a means to survey the whole corpus of data ordinarily lost in intensive qualitative research. Instead of taking the researchers’ word for it, the reader has a chance to gain a sense of the flavour of the data as a whole. In turn, researchers are able to test and revise their generalisations, removing nagging doubts about the accuracy of their impressions about the data. (p. 382)

In my study, counting code occurrences and co-occurrences helped me to identify key codes and categories in the data so that I could maintain the focus of the analytical process. To this end, it is important to recognise that codes that were higher in frequency did not necessarily equate significance. Furthermore, in order to compare the code distribution between each dyad and across all 20 participants, percentages rather than absolute instances were computed. The calculation of relative frequency compensates for the variability in the number and type of codes across participants (Swain, Huang, Barkaoui, Brook, & Lapkin, 2009). In Chapter 4, I will re-visit this issue.

Through the re-iterative process of examining code definitions, category definitions and code frequency, my overall conceptual framework was refined. My fine-grained analysis of the interview data revealed that, L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in the listening process could be represented by five categories: the local discourse category, the global discourse category, the thought category, the social category and the affective category. The definitions and examples of the codes in each of these categories as well as the interconnections within, between and across these categories are discussed in Chapter 4.

### 3.6.2 Analysis of the interaction

The analysis of the interaction data aimed at capturing a degree of participants’ awareness of metacognitive activities through their discursive practices as well as their reflection on the
listening process. It served to corroborate the findings from the interview data, circumventing some of the fundamental shortcomings when analysing retrospective data (Samuda & Bygate, 2008). My approach to analysing the problem-solving interaction data was informed by Conversation Analysis (CA). Guided by the assumption that human interaction was fundamentally dialogic rather than individualist, this analytical framework focused on the interdependence of the speaker and the listener. Moving beyond the analysis of what had been said and how it had been said, my analytical framework set out to investigate how L2 learners’ understanding of the regulation of discourse and thought was jointly constructed and negotiated as is exemplified in their discourse.

CA is one of the most widely used methods for analysing spoken discourse. This method is primarily concerned with the identification of organised and recurrent features of naturally occurring data, and such features include turn taking, overlap, interruption, repair, etc. According to this tradition, social actions are accomplished in and through talk-in-interaction (Schegloff & Sacks, 1974). CA is open to discovering the order that emerges from the data, which is often called ‘unmotivated looking’ (Hopper, 1988; Pasthas, 1995). The key analytical orientation in CA relevant to my study is the notion of the ‘context sensitive-context renewing’ character of the interaction (Heritage, 1984, p. 254). Each utterance displays an understanding of prior, present and subsequent utterances, which may be subject to strategies such as clarification or repair. Moreover, as the speakers develop an understanding of the ongoing interaction, mutual understanding can be achieved. The development of such a mutual understanding, which applies to both the comprehension and the production of utterances, is termed by Heritage (1984) as the building of the ‘architecture of intersubjectivity’ (Potter, 2004).

Several notions in CA literature are considered to be relevant to the present study. In their discussion of the turn taking system, Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson (1974) propose the notion of ‘projectability’ which refers to the trajectory of any unit of talk and the monitoring of the unit until its completion. The listener monitors the syntax, prosody and pragmatics of the talk in order to predict possible completion of an on-going utterance, also known as turn constructional unit. In other words, in order for the listener to produce an appropriate response, joint monitoring and prediction of the discourse are essential.

Moreover, CA-informed methods also underscore how utterances are situated in the immediately preceding and subsequent action or activity. For instance, collaborative completion (or anticipatory completion), as a breach of the turn-taking model, indicates
instances where the interlocutor starts to talk before the speaker reaches the end of his/her turn (e.g. Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 2011). However, unlike interruption where the interlocutor often adds something new or irrelevant to the preceding utterance, the utterance in collaborative completion builds on the preceding incomplete utterance. Learner (2004) argues that the second speaker’s utterance is limited in the sense that it is still within the context of the first speaker’s utterance, therefore the completion still ‘belongs’ to the first speaker. The first speaker then evaluates the second speaker’s utterance, and may or may not provide confirmation or rejection of the completion in the next turn. Collaborative completion is relevant to the co-regulation process in that the co-construction and negotiation of meaning require both participants to be attentive while listening to the other speaking. Ellipsis, for example, can be considered as the more abstract level of collaborative completion, in which the omitted part of an utterance is not articulated explicitly, but rather is assumed. As far as metacognition is concerned, an array of actions is needed, such as monitoring, predicting and evaluating. Specific examples from my study will be provided in Chapter 4 and Chapter 5.

While acknowledging the merits of using conventional CA methods for analysing spoken discourse, the framework I developed for analysing the problem-solving interaction data went beyond the scope of merely explicating discourse features and patterns. As is outlined below, my analytical method for the interaction data not only helped to capture L2 learners’ discourse, but also tapped into how L2 listeners’ understanding of metacognition is socially constructed and negotiated. This particular method enabled me to closely examine the local nuances in the discourse, such as responses, turn taking and pauses. In addition, it enabled me to explore L2 listeners’ evolving understanding of how cognitive resources were orchestrated in relation to their use of language. The interaction data was corroborated by linking it to participants’ retrospective comments. To this end, my approach for analysing the problem-solving interaction data set out to examine and interpret the data from three levels:

- The discourse level - language use, such as turn taking, pauses, repetition and other discourse features, were identified;
- The pragmatic level - pragmatic function such as: clarification, dis/agreement, politeness, and so on;
- The retrospective level – linking the findings from the preceding levels to the retrospective interview data.
At the discourse level, I examined discourse features of the interaction. These features included turn taking, turn allocation, overlap, interruption, silence, repetition, types of question and response, communication breakdown, topic shift and progression. This level of analysis ‘mapped’ the discursive patterns that may potentially indicate cognitive monitoring and control or its absence.

The next level of analysis inspects the data from the pragmatic perspective: the multiple functions and interpretations of utterances as they were being constructed and understood by the participants. The interdependence and complementarity of the discourse were explicated, not only in terms of their linguistic features but also of their social implications such as role obligations and responsibilities, relationship formation, politeness and role negotiation (see Chapter 5 for exemplifications). The examination of the complementarities of the discourse is considered to be important in communication. Linell and Luckmann (1991) suggest, ‘if communicatively relevant inequalities of knowledge were non-existing, there would be little or no need for most kinds of communication’ (p. 4). In line with this view, meaning and context were explored in such a way that they reflected the temporary mutuality which was shared, and the dynamic thought processes which were accommodated in the discourse (see Chapters 4 and 5).

Finally, taking the discussion of the interaction data to a higher level, I linked the analysis of discourse patterns to participants’ retrospective comments. L2 learners’ discourse was thus cross examined with understandings of the regulation of thought and discourse in the listening process.

In this section, I have outlined my approaches to data analysis. I presented the framework that I developed for the analysis of the interview data and for the analysis of the interaction data. The next section reflects on how I managed the data I gathered for this study.
3.7 Management of data

In this section I elaborate on how I managed the data. I discuss issues concerning the storage of my data, the tool that I used to support my analysis of the data, and transcription.

As was mentioned in the preceding sections, there were two types of data in this study: audio recording of the interview data and video recording of the interaction data. Regarding the safe storage of the data, I used the Dropbox file hosting service. This is a personal cloud storage service, which enabled me to access the data files from home computer and office computer easily. The access is restricted by username and password protection.

In terms of the analysis of the data I used Computer Assisted Qualitative Data Analysis Software (CASQDAS) to support the process (Dey, 1993; L. Richards, 2005). Although there is a number of programmes for qualitative data analysis, NVivo, Atlas/ti, and HyprResearch, to name a few, TAMS Analyzer (TA) is one of the very few programmes that are open source and native to Mac OSX, which is the main operating system that I used. TAMS stand for Text Analysis Mark-up System. TA was created by Matthew Weinstein for coding and analysing qualitative data. As Weinstein (2010) notes, TA ‘keeps track of (actually embeds) the information you indicate’ (p. 1). The audio and video recordings of the main study were transcribed and the interview data was analysed using TA (version 4.45).

Before transcribing the interviews, new files were created in TA. To help me easily identify the participants, the first file was named ‘Interview 1-1’, the second one ‘Interview 1-2’, the third one ‘Interview 2-1’, and the last one ‘Interview 10-2’. Due to the fact that TA works with Rich Text Format (RTF) files by default, all documents created were in this file format. The built-in function in TA for transcribing audio/visual data in each document was very convenient. It allowed me to play, pause, rewind and fast-forward by just using keyboard shortcuts. Hence, switching between transcribing, reviewing, and playing the media files was extremely easy.

I assigned codes to the data as they were being transcribed. Symbols were used to tag codes assigned to the data segments, which form the units of analysis (Miles & Huberman, 1994). In TA, marking codes was done by selecting the relevant word(s), sentence(s), or paragraph(s), and double-clicking the code list on the left side of the document window. For example,
I know my friends have problems that they like hear the people like next to them.

In the example above, the name of the code was ‘priorK’ which stands for the reflection on prior knowledge (see Appendix 7 for Coding Scheme and Section 4.1 for exemplifications). The start and the finish of an extract were clearly marked by the code name – in this case ‘priorK’. Compared to managing hundreds of codes manually, TA was efficient in that as new codes were created, their definitions were provided. A list of codes always appears on the left side of the document window, which reminded me of the definitions should I intend to reuse them.

Besides checking individual code definitions, the ‘Search’ function in TA returned instances of the code assigned to all selected transcripts with its co-text so that the results were situated in the immediate context in the original data. This allowed me to study the complex codes closely without referring back and forth to separate documents, which is not only time consuming but also less reliable. Miles and Huberman (1994) and others indicate that coding is part of the analysis process. By studying instances of complex codes, I was able to further classify codes into categories or modify the assignment of codes to specific parts of the data. In other words, comparison and contrast of codes helped me to refine the conceptual parameters of the coding system, thereby identifying key elements under particular codes. In addition, TA allowed me to chart or graph co-coding frequency, generate code counts, create code sets (categories), and chart co-occurrences.

### 3.7.1 Transcription

According to Mishler (2003), the process of transcription a mechanical process as well as an interpretive one. This especially applies to the transcription from oral language to its written form in which the relationships between language and meaning are complex. Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) resonate this view by stating that the exact same written words may be interpreted differently depending on the researcher and that even the use of punctuation can have an impact on the way in which the transcription is interpreted.

Silverman (2010) notes that most researchers see the process of transcription as an important part of the research process. The repeated watching of, and listening to, the data help the researcher establish a picture by recognising patterns which may differ from reading printed transcripts. I concur with this view. Both my interview data and the interaction were
transcribed verbatim, producing a piece of qualitative research with high reliability. Seale (1999) underlines that this involves:

> Recording observations in terms that are as concrete as possible, including verbatim accounts of what people say, for example, rather than researchers’ reconstructions of the general sense of what a person said, which would allow researchers’ personal perspectives to influence the reporting. (p. 148)

My transcription process started after the first dyad. As I watched, listened to and transcribed the video and audio recordings, I also marked emerging codes and made initial comments. Kvale (1996) observes that this process demonstrates that the researcher begins to engage with the data, and that ‘analysis begins during transcription’ (p. 166). As was discussed in Section 3.4, pseudonyms were randomly selected for confidentiality purposes.

Similar to the distinction between the analysis of the interview and the interaction as was explicated in the preceding sections of this chapter, this study distinguished the transcription of the interview data and the interaction data. Because the main purpose of the interview was to explore L2 listeners’ awareness of the regulation process, I believed that it was important to reflect the participants’ understanding. Pauses, laughter, sighing and other features were not considered to be of the primary concern here. In contrast, the subtleties of communication between the participants in the problem-solving interaction data were marked: discourse features such as pauses, overlaps, interruptions, and latching were identified. Relatively more detailed transcription of the interactions allowed me to analyse the data in a way that went beyond its content and surface meanings, and to examine how each utterance was produced and its local and global contexts. For my transcription convention, see Appendix 6. The transcription convention is an adaptation of the guidance notation developed by Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Atkinson and Heritage (1984).

In this section, I have briefly outlined the use of CASQDAS as a tool to manage my data and facilitate the process of data analysis. This section also discussed my approach to transcribing the interview data and the interaction data. The next section examines the issue of research quality that my study is concerned with.
3.8 Research quality

This section reflects on the credibility of this study. In Chapter 2, I have reviewed the existing literature and guiding principles that the present study is based on. My understanding of these theoretical assumptions and values influenced the decision making during the design process as well as the development of my analytical framework. Issues related to research quality has been set out throughout the preceding sections of this chapter. This section brings together my discussion of these issues and justifies my methodological and analytical decisions.

Silverman (2011) states that ‘the two central concepts in any discussion of the credibility of scientific research are “validity” and “reliability”’ (p. 360). Hammersley (1992) defines reliability as ‘the degree of consistency with which instances are assigned to the same category by different observers or by the same observer on different occasions’ (p. 67). In other words, reliability in interpreting qualitative data places an emphasis on the stability of findings. As was noted in Section 3.7.1, my transcription of both the interview and the interaction data were verbatim. The transcription and analysis of the interaction data in particular, revealed subtle discourse features which, not only portrayed what my participants said, but offered further insights into how they said it. This way of recording empirical data ensured that they were presented in as concrete a way as possible, minimising the researcher’s personal influence when analysing the data (Seale, 1999).

Another key means of allowing reliability and validity to be assessed is transparency. This involves making the methodological and theoretical stance that the research is based upon as open as possible (Moisander & Valtonen, 2006; Silverman, 2011). In the preceding sections, I have delineated my strategies at each stage of the study. In my analysis of the interview data, the codes and categories were derived from the empirical data, yet they were also underpinned by my understanding of a range of theoretical debates on metacognition and listening. The links and underlying structures between codes and categories were clearly defined and revised (see Section 3.6.1). The definitions of individual codes and categories will be explicitly discussed with exemplifications provided from the source data in Section 4.1. In my analysis of the interaction data, I devised a three-layer approach: analysis of the data from the linguistic perspective, analysis of the data from the pragmatic perspective and analysis of the data from the retrospective perspective. Moreover, I presented the sequential ordering of the discourse on a turn-by-turn basis, ensuring the full text was displayed to other researchers to provide transparency (see Chapter 5).
Validity, according to Hammersley (1990), is concerned with ‘the extent to which an account accurately represents the social phenomena to which it refers’ (p. 57). However, as Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) argue, ‘data in themselves cannot be valid or invalid; what is at issue is the inferences drawn from them’ (p. 191). This view is in accord with Mishler (1990) who posits that ‘trustworthiness’ in qualitative research is a property of inferences. Mishler (1990) further observes that that the evaluation of the ‘trustworthiness’ of a piece of research lies in ‘the degree to which we can rely on the concepts, methods, and inferences’ (p. 419). Mishler therefore prioritises the validation of the range of ongoing activities and their relations with findings and interpretations of the data, which is situated within certain social contexts and values. He subsequently concludes that rather than fixating on the validity of the methodology as a static property, validation in enquiry-based research should highlight:

The role played by scientists’ working knowledge and experience, aligning the process more closely with what scientists actually do than with what they are assumed to be and supposed to do (Mishler, 1990, pp. 419-420).

I find this way of looking at validity in qualitative research particularly relevant. It is in line with the sociocultural and dialogical theoretical lens that I adopted throughout the study, giving prominence to the fact that trustworthiness is constructed through social practices. Informed by this understanding, I did not view my participants’ retrospective account as ‘distortion’ of the only ‘truth’; but rather, my analytical process underlined the ways in which the participants produced narratives and interpreted their experiences. In doing so, codes, categories and dimensions reflected various degrees of inferences depending on the context in which they were derived from (see Chapter 4). As Chapters 4 and 5 will illustrate, my analysis also identified and scrutinised discrepant data and negative cases. Being open to both instances that supported or contradicted my theoretical framing and interpretation of the data helped me to develop a better understanding of the data so that coherence and continuity between data, analysis and findings could be achieved.

From a realist perspective, Maxwell (2013) argues that the key concept for validity in research design is the researcher’s conceptualisation of threats to validity and his or her strategies to deal with these threats. Here the term threat refers to specific processes that may potentially lead to invalid conclusions. Maxwell also points out the importance of the subjectivity of the researcher and its impact on the validity of qualitative studies. Researcher bias such as particular values and expectations may have an influence on the decision making process during the different stages of a study. The researcher’s alertness to, and
attempts to mitigate, this subjectivity is often also referred to as reflexivity, which is to understand and justify the researcher’s influence on the research process (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). It may include the researcher’s experience, decisions and interpretations of the enquiry. Rommetveit (1992) states that ‘human cognition is inherently dual, in the sense that its product is informative about the observer as well as about the observed’ (p. 21). Therefore, I argue that whilst it is impossible to eliminate the researcher’s bias, explaining how I conducted my research, related to the participants, and represented them in my findings, which is what I have done throughout this chapter, is my key strategy to address this issue.

The construct with which the validity of research designs is often associated is triangulation. Triangulation involves the use of multiple theories, methods and sources of data to improve the credibility of the findings (Denzin, 1978; Silverman, 2011). The assumption is that through triangulation, the researcher is able to gain more accurate and comprehensive interpretations of the research problem. Analysing the data from different angles helps to create varying representations of the participants’ views, feelings and actions; the researcher’s understanding and interpretations of the data can therefore be enhanced (Charmaz, 2006; Roulston, 2010). As a result, there is a need for my research design to ensure that findings are based on different data sources/methods in order to allow for cross-checking. However, Fielding and Fielding (1986) warn that the use of triangulation does not necessarily increase validity. They accentuate that ‘the accuracy of a method comes from its systematic application, but rarely does the inaccuracy of one approach to the data complement the accuracies of another’ (p. 35). Similarly, Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) caution that ‘one should not adopt a naively “optimistic” view that the aggregation of data from different sources will unproblematically add up to produce a more complete picture’ (p. 199). Therefore, triangulation, as is understood in the present study, is not a simple combination of methods or data sources, but rather ‘a strategy that adds rigour, breadth, complexity, richness and depth to any inquiry’ (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 5).

My study drew from different first-hand data sources (interviews and problem-solving interactions). Retrospective interviewing aimed at obtaining participants’ understanding of metacognition in the listening process; problem-solving interactions aimed at exploring L2 listeners’ discourse in action. The analyses of the interview and the interaction data were compared and linked in such a way that they corroborated and complemented each other. The analytical framework that I developed for this study therefore is a reflection of my striving for greater validity.
Finally, I consider the balance between the researcher’s pursuit of scientific knowledge and his or her ethical responsibility towards the participants’ integrity in the research process (Kvale, 2007). Section 3.4 has discussed the ethical issues arising from this study. In interviews, the researcher may be faced with the dilemma of wanting to probe into the interviewees’ personal understanding in order to get the in-depth empirical data on the one hand, whilst there might be the risk of intruding upon the interviewees. Given the implicit nature of metacognition and listening, I found that maintaining this balance to be particularly challenging. Not only did I have to be able to co-construct knowledge with the participants during the interviews, but my questions and manner of interaction should be sensitive to the social relationship formed in the whole process. Notwithstanding the confidence that the pilot study had given me, it is important to acknowledge that there is still room for me to improve my interview skills so that the pursuit of scientific knowledge and various ethical considerations can be properly balanced.

In this section, I have discussed several key issues pertaining to quality of research, and related to my discussion the context and purpose of my research. I took into consideration these issues as I planned, conducted the research as well as analysed and reported my data. The next section draws this chapter to a conclusion.
### 3.9 Summary

This chapter has discussed my methodological approach to this study and justified the decision-making processes in my research. The sampling, data collection procedures and analytical framework outlined here were in line with the theoretical lens that I have advanced in Chapter 2. The link between my theoretical underpinnings and methodological frameworks were explicated so as to establish a coherent and transparent account of my study. This research design allowed me to explore L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in such a way that foregrounds the regulation of thought and discourse. The following two chapters report the findings of my study. Chapter 4 focuses on the findings from the interview data. Chapter 5 focuses on the findings from the interaction data. Chapter 6 outlines my re-conceptualisation of metacognition in L2 listening.
CHAPTER 4   FINDINGS – PART I

This chapter sets out to delineate the monitoring and control elements of L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity. The findings were derived from the interview data, guided by the methodological approach that was provided in Chapter 3, and shaped by my understanding of the theoretical underpinnings outlined in Chapter 2. This chapter aims to address the first research question:

- What elements are L2 learners aware of that contribute to the monitoring and control of the listening process? What connections, if any, can be established between these elements?

This chapter presents the findings with regard to L2 learners’ understanding of the regulation processes in listening. Whilst these findings reflects the trends and patterns from the interview data, they are also informed by the sociocultural and dialogical approach to thought and communication. Following my analysis of the interview data, three dimensions emerged: the discourse dimension, the thought dimension, and the social-affective dimension. These dimensions were sub-divided into five categories: the local discourse category, the global discourse category, the thought category, the social category and the affective category. Figure 4:1 provides an overview of the dimensions, categories and their hierarchical relationship.

Figure 4:1 Dimensions and categories

It has been concluded in the Literature Review chapter that this study views L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity as dialogical and discursive processes. Therefore, not only does my analysis focus on the exploration of the elements under the each
category/dimension, but it also gives prominence to the inherent interdependence of these elements and offers possible interpretations of their interactions. The findings discussed in this chapter form the building blocks towards the development of my re-conceptualisation which will be outlined in full in Chapter 6.

The first section of this chapter explores each category in detail: its definition, components and exemplifications. The second section examines the interconnectedness between dimensions. The focus is looking at the co-occurrences of the elements between categories. The third section investigates the interconnections across dimensions among dyads. The presentation of the findings provides a side-by-side comparison of code distributions between the two participants in each of the ten dyads. By presenting the findings in this way, this section allows me to compare and contrast codes across all three dimensions. It should be noted from the outset that even though Sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3 have all presented the interview findings by means of careful counting and frequency analysis, the frequencies of occurrences and co-occurrences are not necessarily indications of weight of importance (see also Section 3.6.1 in the Methodology chapter). The quantitative analysis of the findings is part of my in-depth analysis of the interview data, and therefore should be interpreted and understood in conjunction with qualitative illustrations and interpretations. The final part of this chapter provides a brief summary of the findings discussed in the preceding sections.
4.1 The five categories

This section explores the many facets of the reciprocal monitoring and control process in L2 listening: definitions, functions and exemplifications. The discussion follows three hierarchical levels: codes, categories and dimensions, which are grounded in the data and guided by the existing literature reviewed in Chapter 2. The analysis, drawn on the interview data, reveals that L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in listening can be conceptualised under three broad dimensions: the discourse dimension, the thought dimension and the social-affective dimension (see Figure 4:1). Moreover, the discourse dimension can be sub-divided into two categories: the local discourse category (see Section 4.1.1) and the global discourse category (see Section 4.1.2). The thought dimension and the thought category are synonymous as there are no subcategories (see Section 4.1.3). Finally, the social-affective dimension can be sub-divided into the social category (see Section 4.1.4) and the affective category (see Section 4.1.5). An overview of the elements in each category is presented in Figure 4:2. For the detailed coding scheme including the code names and definitions, see Appendix 7. The following section presents the findings on the local discourse category which is a subcategory of the discourse dimension.
Figure 4.2: Elements of metacognitive awareness in L2 listening

- **Metacognitive awareness in L2 listening**
  - **Thought dimension (category)**
    - Attention
    - Co-construction
    - Confusion
    - Elaboration
    - Expectation
    - Prior knowledge
    - Waiting
  - **Social-affective dimension**
    - Culture
    - Dominance
    - Formality
    - Personality
    - Politeness
    - Relationship
    - Role
    - Responsibility
    - Comfort
    - Difficulty
    - Encouragement
    - Interest
    - Nervousness
    - Patience
    - Worry
  - **Social category**
    - Backchannel
    - Clarification
    - Completion
    - Eye contact
    - Hand gestures
    - Hesitation
    - Nodding
    - Overlap
    - Questioning
    - Repetition
    - Silence
    - Adjustment
    - Agreement
    - Coherence
    - Communication breakdown
    - Contribution
    - Demand
    - Flow
    - Initiation
    - Language use
    - Sequencing
    - Timing
4.1.1 The local discourse category

The Local Discourse category (LD) refers to the listener’s strategic awareness of the discourse at a local level. Here ‘local’ suggests that it is concerned with the listener’s awareness of the discourse features in the immediate interaction context, which aids, or hinders understanding. The listener’s awareness of LD is crucial in order for the interaction to make sense and flow. It involves the listener monitoring, planning, predicting, and evaluating the ongoing messages and reflecting on prior knowledge while formulating a response. The following table presents a summary of the components that are included in the local discourse category.

Table 4:1 The local discourse category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eye contact</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>completion</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand gestures</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>hesitation</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>backchannel</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nodding</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>overlap</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:1 outlines the frequency distributions of the codes within LD. The listener’s awareness of the monitoring and control of local discourse features is crucial to the creation of shared understanding and effective communication. The table indicates that the participants in this study tended to be more aware of the monitoring and control of asking questions (21%), silence (13%) and clarification (11%). In comparison, they may be less aware of nodding (4%) and hesitation (4%). In the discussion that follows, I present a more in-depth analysis of the components in the listener’s awareness of the local discourse.

The awareness of eye contact, hand gestures, and nodding are all associated with the awareness of body language. Eye contact refers to the instances in which participants report either making or avoiding eye contact. The analysis shows that the awareness of eye contact contributes to the discourse at a local level. Some participants commented on the importance of making eye contact as the listener’s responsibility to show respect, sincerity, engagement, understanding or agreement. The analysis of the interview data also reveals that listeners may avoid making eye contact due to nervousness, amongst other things. The following comment illustrates the importance of maintaining eye contact. Here, Jamie discusses her partner’s expectation of her formulating a response:

---

3 The percentage shown here is relative to the occurrences of the other codes in the same category.
I didn't realise she was still looking at me. Okay. I think I was just focusing so much on 'okay, what should I say', like 'how to reply to this', but I didn't have anything to say, so I didn't realise she was still waiting.

**Jamie 4:1**

The extract above suggests that making eye contact may signal one’s expectation of the other to contribute verbally. In Jamie’s case this is an example of the misalignment of the discourse and thought dimensions (as delineated in Section 4.2.1). Jamie is primarily concerned with self-regulation; she only thinks about the content of her future utterances.

Listeners’ report of using *hand gestures* is another element in conversation that may carry multiple functions. Analysis of the interview data shows that it may facilitate comprehension. In the following example, Maria comments on the function of similar hand gestures:

> We've got similar gestures, similar facial expression, and you can probably tell or you can probably see just from that without even like listening to what we say that we have kinda strong feelings towards it.

**Maria 4:1**

This extract shows that Maria is very aware of the use of hand gestures in interactions. In conjunction with facial expressions, hand gestures may be indicators of mutual feelings and agreement between the interlocutors.

The functions of *nodding*, another type of body language commonly used by listeners, might be to encourage the other person to continue, or to indicate agreement. In the following example, Caitlin discusses the function of nodding in relation to the agreement established in the interaction:

> I guess we had the same opinion about the situation. That's why I was nodding that much.

**Caitlin 4:1**

Other than body language, my findings suggests that listeners’ awareness of fundamental units of the discourse, which constitute overall patterns, is also crucial to the co-regulation process. These include elements such as collaborative completion, hesitation, overlaps or interruptions, and silence.
Collaborative *completion* is quite a prevalent feature in the data. It generally involves both participants constructing the same utterance in a collaborative manner, i.e. one finishes the other’s sentence. It is termed ‘co-construction’ by Foster and Ohta (2005). In this thesis, the notion of ‘co-construction’ refers to the joint creation of shared understanding, emphasising mutual sharedness in the thought processes (see Section 4.1.3). Collaborative completion, on the other hand, refers to the joint construction of verbal contributions only. The awareness of this discourse feature may signal participation, listenership, expectation, agreement, or even misunderstanding.

Interestingly, Jane comments on her tendency to produce incomplete sentences as a habit even in her first language; Iris, in contrast, remarks that it shows one’s weakness in L2. Moreover, there are several instances in the Jamie-Iris interaction where Jamie deliberately refrains from completing Iris’s utterances (see Chapter 5 for exemplifications). In the following comment, Norah elaborates on her awareness of collaborative completion as she and her partner achieve mutual understanding:

> I think I was pleased she understood me, and our thought in this moment, it was at that point in the same floor, and that she was with me.

**Norah 4:1**

Similarly, Tanner comments on his understanding of completing his partner’s utterance in the extract below. His willingness to form mental elaborations of the situation that his partner has been describing contributes to the completion:

> Probably I would've been the same, you know, I would've been happy to have that kind of flatmate that if I leave things a little bit messy then she comes cleans up.

**Tanner 4:1**

*Hesitation* is defined in this study as segments of an utterance with unnatural pauses. This discourse feature cannot simply be reduced to the participants’ lack of linguistic competence. Participants may hesitate when they are in the process of formulating a response, or when they have feelings of confusion. In the following excerpt, Fiona comments on her hesitations:

> I think you can also see here from, like I speak very hesitantly, and that's because I'm trying to imagine, cos I've, I've never been to the situation, so that's why I'm, I speak a lot slower than if I would know what I'm talking about.

**Fiona 4:1**
Fiona is aware of the hesitations in her utterances. She comments on her thought processes behind them. It is worth noting that rather than attributing hesitations to her having linguistic difficulties, Fiona’s comment suggests that this is the result of her active elaboration of the other’s account and unfamiliarity with the topic. Apart from hesitation, another type of discourse feature evident in the interview data is overlap.

Overlap generally refers to instances where the listener starts to talk before the ongoing utterance ends – simultaneous speech. My findings indicate that it may be related to the social category, such as cultural differences and politeness (see Section 4.2.2). In this thesis, the term ‘overlap’ includes interruptions in the conversation. A distinction between ‘overlap’ and ‘interruption’ has been made in Section 3.6.2. In the context of this study, overlaps may entail a certain level of interest or agreement. In the following interview extract, Rachael comments on her awareness of overlaps:

I tried to show my agreement… to support him, his argument, because it’s just the same as what I was thinking just now.

Rachael 4:1

The extract shows that from the co-regulation perspective, Rachael monitors the agreement and overlaps with her partner in order to signal the agreement established between the two. Moving on to the last element of discourse patterns in my findings, there are often instances of significant pauses in the interaction. These instances are termed silence. The analysis shows that these may due to a variety of reasons including lack of content to contribute, the need for initiation, language use and so on. In the following extract, Jamie elaborates on the long pause in the interaction:

I think I realised that she, she seemed to have solutions to everything, and then I just wanted to think of a problem that we could come to a solution.

Jamie 4:2

Silence prevails in the interaction between Jamie and Iris. Moreover, it is one of the predominant features in Jamie’s interview (see also Table 4:19). Here Jamie evaluates Iris’s preceding contributions and orchestrates her own cognitive resources to formulate a new problem. In other words, she is still actively engaged in the interaction despite the apparent silence. This view is echoed by Yuzuki as she illustrates in the following example:

When you got silence in a conversation, I think it’s about time to go on to next topic, or it’s my time to say something.

Yuzuki 4:1
Yuzuki associates silence in the interaction to the initiation sequence, which, according to her, is a shared responsibility between the two. Although initiation and shared responsibility are parts of the global level of the discourse and the social category as defined in Section 4.1.2 and Section 4.1.4, the analysis of this extract already suggests the interrelatedness between categories (see Section 4.2.2 for details).

Having discussed listeners’ awareness of discourse features in the interaction, we now turn our attention to what was conventionally viewed as listeners’ responses (see Section 2.4.1). Responses generally refer to the ways in which the listener provides his or her partner with feedback or feed-forward. My findings show that different listeners may have different expectations with regard to how explicit certain responses should be. Because the participants of this study come from diverse cultural backgrounds, this may lead to their distinct expectations towards responses. While acknowledging that other discourse features such as body language can also be considered as responses, this study looked at four specific types of verbal responses derived from the data: asking questions, repetition or paraphrase, minimal back-channels and clarification requests. As an integral part of the listening process, analysis of these types of responses can offer insights into the implicit process of listening (see my discussion in Section 2.4.1).

The first type of listeners’ response is questioning. Although categorised under LD, it should be noted that its conceptual implications extend beyond this category. In other words, it may be used as a strategy to encourage the other to talk, to maintain the flow of the conversation, to check understanding, and to show interest, which are elements to be looked at under the global discourse category (see Section 4.1.2), the thought category (see Section 4.1.3) and the affective category (see Section 4.1.5).

My findings indicate that listeners may ask questions because of misunderstanding or communication breakdown. They may also choose not to ask questions despite the temporary feelings of confusion. In the following extract, Rachael comments that asking questions helps to maintain the flow of the conversation:

Sometimes I will challenge him, I think, to give different opinions or just ask questions about what's his opinion. I was just thinking how to move the conversation, how to keep it longer.

Rachael 4:2
This example suggests that rather than being a result of misunderstanding or a feeling of confusion, listeners may use the strategy of asking questions to ensure the conversation progresses naturally. This function of questioning is discussed further under the global discourse category.

Asking questions may also intersect with the affective category (see Section 4.2.2). Yuzuki, as the comment below illustrates, is aware of the fact that asking questions signals a degree of interest from the other’s perspective, which subsequently contributes to the development of the discourse as a whole. She monitors and evaluates her partner’s level of interest in action through questioning:

By her asking questions, that was a kind of sign to me she got interested in the topic. Yeah this is very useful to develop my topic, to complement my ideas.  

Yuzuki 4:2

Another type of response that features heavily in the interview data is a minimal backchannel such as ‘yeah’, ‘uhm’, ‘uhuh’ and so on. The interview data shows that it may serve the following functions: to maintain the flow of the conversation, to signal understanding or acceptance. In the extract below, Yuzuki goes on to discuss the use of multiple ‘yes’ to signal understanding:

I say ‘yes yes yes’ when I can get her point. Finally I understand she wants to do, wanted to say, or kind of I got the same feeling as she has.  

Yuzuki 4:3

Clarification refers to the type of verbal response that aims to clarify the meaning of the preceding utterance. The findings show that it may be self-initiated when one is in the process of formulating an utterance, or other-initiated when the listener give the other person the cue to elaborate on preceding utterances. The latter is commonly referred to in L2 literature as clarification requests (see the Literature Review chapter). Both self-initiated and other-initiated clarifications are considered relevant in the present study. In terms of its functions, my findings indicate that listeners often link clarifications to the misalignment of understanding or to the explicit checking of agreement. In the example below, Yuzuki comments on self-initiated clarifications. For her, the strategy to clarify is derived from her continuous monitoring of her partner’s understanding:

I thought I couldn’t, she didn’t get what I would like to say, so I thought I needed to explain different, in different words, different sentences.  

Yuzuki 4:4
This extract shows that although Yuzuki is the main speaker, she is also ‘listening’ to her partner’s responses. The evaluation of the other’s misunderstanding triggers her decision to modify her ways of phrasing the ideas – this is an example of self-initiated clarifications. Furthermore, she has a sense of responsibility to make herself clear, which demonstrates the reciprocal nature of listening. Issues regarding the listener’s reciprocity will be elaborated further in Section 6.4.

Finally, *Repetition* refers to the listener’s strategy to repeat all or part of what one or the others have said in the present or preceding utterance. The latter accompanied by a rising intonation is often referred to as a confirmation check in the L2 literature. The interview data show that repetitions may be used to show understanding, agreement or participation. In the following extract, Mara comments on her repetition of her partner’s utterance. For her, repetition is a strategy to show understanding:

I was to basically reiterate what he said and to show him yes I understand. **Mara 4:1**

This section has presented the elements in the local discourse category. The discussion followed L2 listeners’ understanding of three broad areas: discourse patterns, responses and the use of body language. In particular, my analysis focused on the ways in which these areas were related to the dialogical view of discourse and thought. This section also provided an initial conceptualisation of the interconnectedness between categories, which will be outlined further in Section 4.2. The following section explicates the elements in the global discourse category – the other subcategory of the discourse dimension.

### 4.1.2 The global discourse category

In comparison to the LD, the *Global Discourse* category (GD) is primarily concerned with the regulation of discourse and thought at a macro level. For example, when the listener monitors agreement, he or she is not merely limited to the local language in use or individual responses at a micro level, but rather concerned with the more holistic trajectory of the understanding of the discourse. Table 4.2 illustrates the eleven elements in GD.
Table 4.2 presents the distribution of the codes within GD. Similar to the operationalisation of the elements in LD, the codes in the table above resulted from my fine-grained analysis of the interview data (see Section 3.6.1 for my analytical framework). Some of the components were theoretically informed, whereas others were derived from the empirical data. The table shows that participants of this study are very aware of the language use (19%) despite the fact that they are upper-intermediate to advanced learners of English. This suggests that even for relatively high-level L2 listeners, the awareness of language use seems to remain important. In addition, participants of this study tend to comment on the initiation of the conversation or new topics (17%) along with the monitoring and control of agreement (17%) more often. In contrast, sequencing of the topics (3%) and communication breakdown (4%) are not the primary concerns for the majority of my participants. In the discussion that follows, the global discourse codes are defined with illustrations from the participants’ retrospective comments.

**Adjustment** refers to the listener adjusting the discourse patterns in the conversation. For example, he or she decides to listen more or accept his or her partner being the dominant speaker. My findings indicate that discourse adjustments are often based on the listener’s continuous monitoring and constant comparison of emergent goals in the listening process, including imbalanced/balanced contributions, imbalanced/balanced participation, and so on. In the following example, Rachael comments on her evolving understanding of the importance of listening more in the interaction:

> For me I learn to listen to him very carefully and not interrupting him at the very middle to express my opinions at first, so yeah.

**Rachael 4:3**

Following her monitoring of the imbalanced contribution patterns in the interaction, Rachael decides to deliberately refrain from interrupting her conversation partner. She directs her attention to the listening process so as to ensure the other can finish his ideas.
Agreement refers to the listener’s monitoring of agreement or disagreement during the interaction. My findings suggest that the listener may seek explicit confirmation of agreement, negotiate agreement explicitly, signal phatic agreement and so on. In addition to this, the listener may also display or withhold disagreement explicitly. The following example illustrates the use of phatic agreement:

She understood my point of view. She understood what I was saying, and I understood what she was saying, but we're not, we're not agreeing, and probably we’re not ready to accept each other's point of view.

Megan 4:1

This comment illustrates that although it may seem that Megan and her partner agree with each other on the LD level (with positive backchannels), no genuine agreement has been reached. Hence, while recognising that they both understand each other’s utterances, Megan concludes that it may be the fact that they have difficulty accepting each other’s opinions that leads to the phatic agreement.

Coherence looks at the coherence or the sense-making of utterances. My findings show that a variety of strategies may be used to maintain the coherence in the discourse. In the following example, Norah comments on her strategy to refer to the anaphoric context in the interaction as a means of maintaining coherence:

It is important if you interact with other people. Obviously it all depends on your personality but I’m just always happy to bring up the things that somebody else mentioned to relate to them and say that, you know, we came up with this idea together for example.

Norah 4:2

In this study, communication breakdown generally refers to instances where misunderstanding affects the flow of the communication. A discussion about this theoretical construct was given in Section 2.4.5. In my study, eight participants commented on the relationship between communication breakdown and language use. Interestingly, the strategies that listeners utilise differ: some resort to explicit negotiation for meaning, whereas others negotiate meanings in an implicit way. In the following example, Jamie comments on her thought processes when she negotiates meaning with Iris (her partner) in an explicit manner. She uses the strategy of confirmation checks to achieve this:

Just that word, she said ‘can’, and I thought she said ‘can’t’, so I wasn’t too sure. I guess I was expecting her to say ‘we can’t’.

Jamie 4:3
In the next extract, however, rather than pointing out the misunderstanding explicitly, the word ‘chart’ in this case, Norah elaborates on how her partner’s understanding contradicts her expectations when she realises the discrepancy. Her strategy to negotiate meaning is to accommodate her partner’s thoughts in an implicit manner:

I didn't expect her commenting because I thought, I was quite sure, well but I didn't explain that, but in my thought it was seen when you form a chart, you split the jobs, so that's why you would make a chart, otherwise why would you, well there could be different charts.

Norah 4:3

*Contribution* is the monitoring of verbal contributions in the interaction. The awareness of the conversation as a whole is essential for the monitoring of this element. Moving beyond individual utterances, the findings of my study show that a pattern of imbalanced contributions throughout the interaction may have an impact on the listening process. The following extract illustrates how Kailee monitors the contribution imbalance between herself and her partner:

Along the way I was aware that I was talking perhaps more than her, and that didn't feel right.

Kailee 4:1

Due to the nature of the study, it is important to recognise the effect that the task may have on the utterances produced. This point has been discussed in Chapter 3. Although the task design tried to create a genuine environment for natural conversations, it was undeniable that the participants’ interactions might be influenced by the task itself. Therefore, in my analysis of the interview data, I have looked at the listener’s awareness of the task *demand*. This element examines the instances where the listener monitors the task requirements during the ongoing interaction. The findings suggest that L2 listeners use a range of strategies to cope with the task demand: asking questions, co-constructing shared understandings, being polite, reflecting on prior knowledge, and so on. In the following extract, Caitlin comments on her strategy to ask questions in order to initiate a new topic:

I think we were done with the questions, at the end you said 'however, if there are other flat-sharing issues', so I wanted to ask her to see if she had dealt with more issues than these where she had to communicate with her flatmates, so that's why I just asked her the question.

Caitlin 4:2
Another aspect in GD is the flow of the interaction. This element generally refers to the monitoring or maintenance of the flow of the communication. Different strategies may be used by the listener to monitor or maintain the flow. For example, the listener might ask questions, encourage the other to talk, listen more or contribute more information in order to maintain the flow of the interaction. In the following example, Rachael talks about her strategy to contribute more information in order to maintain the flow of the interaction:

At first I read the question I wanted him to respond to me, but obviously he's not, so I, I kept, I say another sentence to keep the conversation.  

Rachael 4:4

Another concept that demonstrates the listener’s global discourse awareness is the participants’ perception of the initiation of the interaction or the new topic. The findings indicate that at the beginning of the interaction, silence often leads the participants to initiate. With regard to topic shift, apart from silence, participants of this study also comment on the readiness to move on to the next topic. The readiness suggests the alignment or misalignment of the expectations related to turn taking and the natural flow of the interaction.

Interestingly, Maria and Norah both commented extensively on their awareness of initiation (see Table 4:23 and Table 4:20), but neither of them signals this explicitly in the interaction, resulting in the misalignment of understanding in the discourse. The misalignment in communication is discussed extensively in the next chapter. In the following example, Rachael comments on her awareness of the link between silence and initiation:

There is, that period of time seems very awkward, because he didn't speak at first, so maybe I think I will initiate the question.  

Rachael 4:5

The extract below demonstrates that Tanner is aware of the shared responsibility in terms of turn taking and initiation in the ongoing interaction. He recognises the importance of having evenly distributed contributions between the participants:

I felt like if she continues asking questions, it's going to be her asking and me talking, and that might not be a very good thing, because she has also to get idea across, ... I think it was quite critical, otherwise maybe she would've, it would have been a lopsided conversation.  

Tanner 4:2
Language use refers to the listener’s awareness of the language-related aspects of the discourse, which may involve the use of pronouns or adverbs, retrieval skills, diction, pronunciation, syntax, fluency and so on. My findings reveal that listeners utilise a broad range of linguistic knowledge and strategies during the listening process. In the following example, Megan evaluates her partner’s language level and concludes that she is having difficulties retrieving certain vocabulary, which leads to her prediction of her partner’s upcoming utterance:

She was trying to find a word, that was what I thought of, because she has, she already mentioned, the first time she said she’s going to write to the, and then when she moved her hand.

Megan 4:2

Sequencing is primarily concerned with the order of the topics to be discussed. The participant may monitor or assume the other’s approach to the task tacitly or negotiate the approach explicitly. Similar to other components in GD, the awareness of sequencing extends beyond the immediate context of individual utterances. In the example below, Caitlin elaborates on how she monitors her partner’s approach to the task:

I wasn’t sure if she was looking at maybe the last one or is she, if she wanted to do them in a different order, so I guess I just… I guess she was still thinking so I thought maybe if I start saying what I think she’ll just continue.

Caitlin 4:3

From this extract, we can conclude that the negotiation of task sequencing between Caitlin and Lena is achieved through implicit co-ordination. The negotiation process here is implicit. Although Caitlin is uncertain about her partner’s preference regarding the sequencing of the issues to be discussed, she assumes her role in leading the conversation by initiating the interaction.

Timing refers to the instances when the listener monitors and evaluates the current or overall pace of the interaction. The timing element may have an influence on the discourse as well as one’s thought process. In the following example, Savannah explains why she monitors timing and decides to contribute the extra information in the interaction:

I felt like we were, like if we now skip to the next question, I felt like we were going too fast, and by the end of the 8-10 minutes, we you know will run out of things to say, because we’ve been like through all the topics already.

Savannah 4:1
Savannah is very aware of the timing of the interaction. She monitors the timing, and takes control by adding additional information to the interaction. This extract shows that Savannah has an understanding of planning the overall pace of the task. Her evaluation of the current pace leads to her regulating the discourse at a macro level.

The preceding two sections have outlined the elements in the local discourse and global discourse categories. Together, they form the discourse dimension. My study shows that L2 listeners’ awareness of the discourse dimension is concerned with their awareness of regulating the discourse both at a micro level and at a macro level. The preceding two sections have also indicated that L2 listeners’ conscious understanding of the discourse dimension is related to their understanding of other dimensions. The interconnectedness between dimensions will be explored in Section 4.2.

The following section explicates the elements in the thought category. As was discussed earlier, the components of the thought category are essentially the components of the thought dimension.

### 4.1.3 The thought category

In addition to the examination of L2 listeners’ awareness of the co-regulation at the discourse dimension, my findings have also identified the management of thought as another important category in the exploration of cognitive monitoring and control in the listening process. The Thought category (THO) refers to the listener’s understanding of how the thought processes are organised and orchestrated in certain contexts so that they are relational and reciprocal to those of the other.

**Table 4:3 The thought category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>confusion</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-construction</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3 outlines the distribution of the components in THO. From this table, we can see that the awareness of expectation and reflection on prior knowledge play a major part in the co-regulation process. Not only does the listener have to attend to the ongoing message for its meaning potentials, but he or she also reflects on prior knowledge (23%) and forms certain expectations (25%). In the following part of this section, details regarding each element in THO are discussed with its definition followed by exemplifications.
**Accommodation** is when the listener accommodates the other’s thought. The listener changes his or her original mental elaborations or opinions and accepts the other’s experience. My findings show that this may be due to the listener’s intention to avoid confrontations. In the following example, Tara changes her opinion about her partner Kailee’s account of the flat-sharing issue:

> So she convinces me that there can be something. That it's not her personality. It's something objective and yeah.

**Tara 4:1**

This extract is preceded by Tara’s comment on her disbelief about Kailee’s account. Initially, Tara is doubtful of Kailee’s story because it contradicts with her pre-conceptions. In the end, she accepts Kailee’s account and adjust her understanding accordingly.

**Attention** refers to the listener’s focus on the various aspects of the interaction. This is represented by the participants’ accounts of where their attentiveness lies and the monitoring of attentiveness - selected attention or directed attention. The findings indicate that the regulation of attention may involve one’s attention to the incoming message, to the responses, or both. Moreover, attention could include the listener’s attention to the discourse dimension, such as the global planning of the discourse, to the task demand, or to the language use as was delineated in Section 4.1.1 and Section 4.1.2. Lost attention is also examined. The following comment illustrates how Rachael directs her attention during the listening process:

> I just try to listen to him very carefully, try to figure out what are they saying, and prepare what I will say next.

**Rachael 4:6**

Rachael focuses her attentional resources on the meaning of Tanner’s utterances. Furthermore, she is aware of the responsibility to respond as part of the listening process.

**Co-construction** is defined in this thesis as the joint creation of shared understanding. It generally involves reflection on one’s prior knowledge as well as the awareness of the ongoing or preceding utterances so that shared understanding can be established. My findings show that co-construction enables the participants to form interpersonal relationships, to maintain the flow of the interaction or simply to follow the other’s thoughts.
In the following example, Savannah reflects on her prior knowledge and her partner’s preceding utterances before she and her partner achieve a shared understanding:

She must hear it too because if I hear it then the chances are that she, she can hear her next door neighbour as well or relatively high.

Savannah 4:2

This extract suggests that Savannah and Yuzuki (her partner) work collaboratively in terms of the creation of shared understanding. As the listener, Savannah’s reflection on her prior knowledge about the noise issue contributes to this process.

Confusion refers to the listener’s feeling of confusion. The findings indicate that the listener can feel confused about a number of things, such as the other’s account, the language usage, the other’s responses (including backchannels) and so on. In the following example, Savannah comments on her feeling of confusion due to linguistic misunderstandings. She adjusts her understanding according to her partner’s linguistic choices in order to achieve shared understanding:

‘You guys’ mum’, yeah that’s what she said, and I was like ‘No, not you guys’ mum, but you guys are the mums’, so yeah I go up, and then I realise ‘Yeah we guys are the mums’, and then, like that, I was about to disagree like ‘No, not with his mum, oh she means we are the mums’, yes and then.

Savannah 4:3

The listener’s strategy to overcome temporary feelings of confusion requires a range of mental activities, which involves more than individual regulation. In the extract above, ‘you guys’ mum’ is Yuzuki’s metaphoric reformulation of the Savannah’s earlier account about her being the only flatmate who cleans the flat. Savannah’s comment shows that she is aware of her evolving understanding of the language that Yuzuki has used. Additionally, for Savannah the development of the understanding of the utterance is relational to Yuzuki’s discourse, which demonstrates the dialogical nature of the co-regulation process (see Section 6.4.1).

Mental elaboration is the listener’s awareness of forming a mental image based on the situation that the other is describing. From participants’ interview data, it can be concluded that mental elaboration allows the listener to be able to relate to the other and to connect his or her thought to the other’s. In the following example, Abby imagines herself in the situation that her partner is describing:
I’m trying to imagine if that happens in real situation what will I do… I think I could understand what she’s talking about. Maybe I would say that she’s the kind of people who express herself a lot.

Abby 4:1

Apart from suggesting that Abby forms a mental image as she listens, this extract also shows that Abby develops an understanding of Norah’s personality from preceding utterances. Another example that demonstrates participants forming a mental image of the situation is presented below. Here Harry reflects on his prior knowledge so that he can better relate to his partner:

I, I just, I’m now in there because I consider myself to be like Spanish, but maybe because I’m constantly cleaning… And she she was talking about her flatmate yes because I felt like I’m that kind of flatmate.

Harry 4:1

Linking his prior knowledge to Mara’s account of her Spanish flatmate enables Harry to better understand the situation that Mara is describing. The definition of reflection on prior knowledge will be discussed later in this section.

Expectation refers to the listener’s expectation with regard to a range of aspects in the listening process. This includes the expectation of a response, sequencing, initiation, or encouragement (see Section 4.1.5). The listener’s expectation may be dependent on the cultural difference between the participants or the specific language use. Interestingly, the participants in this study tended to report what was unexpected in the listening process. My findings indicate that L2 listeners’ thoughts on misaligned expectations or the unexpected are particularly relevant to their understanding of metacognitive awareness and activity (see Section 5.4). In the following example, Mara comments on how her partner’s response surprises her. Her subsequent monitoring and control of the discourse dimension and the social-affective dimension, therefore, are contingent on the degree of the misalignment in expectations:

I was a bit shocked that he was very straightforward like, I don’t know, maybe it wasn’t as straightforward as I thought it was, but at that point in time, like listening to it now it was, it’s normal, but at that point in time I was like oh how should I react to that.

Mara 4:2

The content of Harry’s response does not meet Mara’s expectations. Later in the interview, Mara clarifies that it is Harry’s description of some of his flatmate’s behaviours that makes
Mara feel surprised. This further contributes to Mara’s perception of Harry’s personality and how she should talk and listen in the interaction. In the following example, Gary comments on his expectation for his partner to respond. Gary monitors Nicole’s understanding through her response, which is missing in this case:

Yeah, so maybe, yeah, I was expecting some kind of response to that, but I never got the response, and hence the silence. Yeah, I think so [having a response is important], because then you know, you know that the other person is understanding what you are saying.

**Gary 4:1**

Reflection on *prior knowledge* is one of the key components in THO. My findings suggest that the listener’s reflection on prior knowledge serves a variety of functions: to facilitate shared understanding, to create a comfortable feeling, to maintain the flow of the interaction, to monitor the agreement, to ask questions, to help with the collaborative completion, etc. From these functions we can see that reflection on prior knowledge is often associated with the discourse dimension and the social-affective dimension (see Table 4:6, Table 4:7 and Table 4:13). The following example illustrates how prior knowledge and the co-construction of shared understanding are interconnected:

I think it’s quite important because it can help people to understand where you are coming from. Maybe it will allow them to empathise with your expression, to understand why you’re saying what you’re saying. Because if I said, for example, she said 'I'm from Arabic culture as well, so I don't have a problem sharing yes', and I explain to her that I don't have a problem sharing as well.

**Harry 4:2**

For Harry, having the relevant prior knowledge and experience helps him to be able to relate to his partner. As the listener, Harry constructs an understanding of Mara based on the prior knowledge that is shared between the two. Furthermore, reflection on prior knowledge helps the listener to monitor the agreement. In the following extract, Caitlin compares her personal experience with her partner’s and attempts to understand the source of the disagreement in the interaction:

There is another 'really' because I wasn't, in my experience I find it always more difficult to tell your friends when they do something you don't like, and obviously she's in a different situation: she thinks her friends, well she can tell them everything and they won't get upset, because she's her friend and I think, for me, it would be the opposite.

**Caitlin 4:4**
Caitlin and Lena have different views on whether to be straight-forward when their friend’s behaviours are causing difficulties in the flat. Caitlin reflects on her personal experience in the past and recognises the disagreement in their opinions about this issue.

**Waiting** is the deliberate control, in which the listener waits for the other to finish the last turn, or to self-repair. The findings indicate that waiting shows the inhibiting control function of metacognition and discourse in the listening process. In the following example, Maria waits deliberately for her conversation partner to initiate the new topic:

I was like, I was like, I'm not going, I'm going to, yeah I thought I'm going to shut up now and like I want her to start talking about the next point.

Project 4:2

Maria monitors and evaluates the contribution imbalance in the interaction. She uses the strategy to wait so that Fiona can initiate the conversation. Maria’s deliberate control of her own turn taking and expectation of the other to start the new turn show that waiting can be used as a strategy to regulate the discourse as well as the others.

The preceding section has delineated the elements in the thought category. This provides insights into L2 learners’ awareness of the ways in which these eight elements are managed so that shared understanding can be achieved in the listening process. Some of these components are central to the conventional view of metacognition (see my review in the Literature Review chapter). The listener’s awareness of the planning, predicting, shifting attention, reflecting on prior knowledge, and so forth is the key to his or her development of an understanding in the interaction. The preceding section also discussed the possibility of misunderstanding, and how L2 listeners utilise a range of strategies in order to achieve shared understanding through the co-construction and negotiation process. The next section will present the elements in the social category – a sub-category of the social-affective dimension. Some of these elements have been mentioned in the preceding three sections.

### 4.1.4 The social category

Beyond the discourse and thought dimensions of co-regulation in the listening process, the findings of this study show that L2 listeners’ monitoring and control process is socially constructed. The Social category (SOC) explores the listener’s awareness of the wider interpersonal sphere, including politeness, personality differences, shared responsibility, the formation of relationships, cultural differences or biases and so on. Table 4:4 provides an overview of the frequencies of the eight codes under the social category.
Table 4.4 The social category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>culture</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>personality</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominance</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>politeness</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formality</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table summarises the distribution of the various aspects in SOC. From this table, we can see that politeness (18%), personality difference (16%) and shared responsibility (16%) occur a relatively more frequently. In contrast, the participants of this study are less likely to comment on their perceptions of the formality of the situation and individual’s role in the interaction. In the next section, I will explicate the different areas of the social category.

The code culture refers to the listener’s awareness of the culture-specific aspects of the interaction. This may be about L2 listeners’ understanding of the cultural difference in the dyad or about certain cultural bias towards the conversational partner, which subsequently has had an impact on the discourse. The listener may feel nervous when communicating with people from a certain culture, use a particular type of body language, deliberately ask more questions or overlap, etc. In the following example, Rachael comments on her strategy to ask questions as a sociocultural adaptation in conversation:

> I tend to adapt more into the local culture, local academic culture, so we will develop, I will develop the critical thinking, kind of skill like that sometimes. I learned how to challenge people and learn from it.

Rachael 4:7

Rachael is aware of the cultural difference between the local cultural environment and that of her home country. She adapts herself socioculturally in terms of the strategy of asking questions. It is also worth noting that she uses the word ‘challenge’ when referring to the questioning strategy. Other functions of the listener’s asking questions intentionally, such as to the other engaged in the conversation, have been discussed in the earlier section of this chapter.

Dominance in conversation is another area which might relate to the social co-regulation of cognition in the listening process. The listener may be aware of the other being dominant, or the fact that conversation is a joint venture, in which neither participant should be the dominant speaker. In the following extract, Tara discusses her acceptance of the partner being dominant:
I realised 'okay she wants, she doesn't let it go, she's going to talk about her own experience and this German girl', so I just have to accept it.

Tara 4:2

It is interesting to see that Tara, though quite aware of her partner Kailee’s dominance in terms of verbal contributions, chooses to accept this discourse pattern. Her decision to accept Kailee being dominant might have something to do with her personality as a listener (see the next chapter). In the end, she adjusts her strategy in order to ensure the flow of the interaction.

**Formality** refers to the listener’s perception of context formality in conversation. In the following extract, Abby comments on her expectation of the formality:

> She's being so formal. It's not like a leisure discussion which I more expect her to be actually... because she started reading those things, because I thought we should, it's like, I would prefer to take it more leisurely rather than more formally by reading those sentences.

Abby 4:2

Abby is aware of the discrepancy in terms of her partner and her own perceptions of context formality. On the one hand, Abby expects the conversation to be informal. On the other hand, the way that her partner approaches the task suggests that this expectation is not shared. This misalignment of expectations is embedded in her listening process. This issue is discussed further in the next chapter.

**Personality** difference looks at how the listener perceive his or her own as well as the other’s personalities, be it talkative, patient, passive, argumentative, and how this might have shaped the ongoing discourse. In the following comment, Tara elaborates on the personality difference between her partner and her:

> Well you can get actually some kind of picture of someone after a couple of seconds by talking to someone. So my first impression would be, okay, she's a big talker so. Already then I knew, okay we don't have much in common.

Tara 4:3

Tara compares her partner’s personality with her own by observing the way that her partner interacts. After reaching the conclusion that her partner is much more talkative than her, she assumes the role of being the ‘listener’ in the conversation. Moreover, a close examination of
the interaction suggests that Tara does not engage in any explicit negotiation of her relatively passive role either.

*Politeness* involves the participant avoiding overlaps, dominations or confrontations. This might be due to the nature of the study - the relationship between the participants or the task itself. The following comment demonstrates Harry’s awareness of being polite in the interaction:

> I don't want to take over the whole conversation. That wouldn't be polite... I think it's also a matter of politeness.
> 
> **Harry 4:3**

Harry is aware of the interpersonal norms in the interaction. For him, being dominant may indicate impoliteness. His awareness of being polite is evident throughout the whole interaction. This may also have an impact on the ways in which he talks and listens.

*Relationship* with the other person is another area within the social category. The listener monitors and controls the relationship formation during the interaction. The listener may use a range of strategies as he or she builds relationship with the other. These strategies may include co-constructing a degree of shared understanding, maintaining eye contact, offering similar views, listening more and so on. In the following example, Jane comments on the difference between her relationship with her interaction partner and with her friends:

> With her I still try to control myself not to speak, speak, speak, just try to be, to listen, and to be collaborative. But if she were my friend, I would be more relaxed, obviously. And it could be worse or it could be better. It depends on the situation.
> 
> **Jane 4:1**

Jane is aware of her relationship with Megan (her partner). According to this comment, her perception of the relationship has a direct impact on the way that she interacts with the other. The new relationship with Megan formed during the interaction leads to her refraining from talking too much and focusing on listening more.

*Role* refers to the participant’s perceived role in the interaction. Roles can be assumed implicitly or negotiated explicitly. Rather than being static, the role of being the listener is constantly changing throughout the trajectory of the interaction (see the next chapter for further details). In the following comment, Kailee elaborates on how she assumes the role of the listener in an implicit manner:
I mean just by the fact that she was asking me things I couldn't really understand exactly what her ideas were, so I thought it would be best to just take a pause and listen to her.

Kailee 4:2

Prior to this extract, Kailee is the dominant speaker in the interaction. Tara (her partner) mainly provides minimal responses while she listens. Here Kailee assumes the role of the listener, which is the result of her monitoring the pattern of the interaction. This point has been discussed in the preceding sections of this chapter. Here Kailee’s transition from the dominant speaker to the listener shows her evolving understanding of the role change in the interaction.

Responsibility, or shared responsibility involves primarily the listener’s obligation to balance verbal contributions or the initiations of a new topic. In the following extract, Megan identifies the contribution imbalance, and attempts to address it by creating a more balanced pattern:

Megan 4:3

It's not just about me doing it alone, I should also allow her to, give her the opportunity to talk and bring up ideas.

Megan is aware of the dialogical nature of the listening process. Her understanding of monitoring and controlling the responsibility reciprocally leads her to the decision to encourage her partner to contribute.

This section has delineated the elements in the social category of L2 listeners’ reciprocal monitoring and control process. The next section will outline the other category in the social-affective dimension – the affective category.

4.1.5 The affective category

As an indispensable part of the metacognitive experiences, affective variables, such as feelings of encouragement, comfort, difficulties and so on, were coded in the analysis of the interview data. In this thesis these affective variables are categorised as the Affective category (AFF). Table 4:5 gives an overview of the seven elements in this category.
Table 4:5 The affective category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>interest</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>worry</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulty</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>nervousness</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouragement</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>patience</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above shows the distribution of the codes in the AFF. It suggests that the monitoring of interest (31%) and feeling of comfort (23%) have relatively higher occurrences, while feelings of worry have relatively low occurrences. In the co-regulation process, the participants of this study tend to be more concerned with the monitoring and control of each other’s level of interest and creating a comfortable environment as well as feeling comfortable themselves. In contrast, negative affective feelings, such as worry, do not seem to have much impact on the listening process. Next, the seven elements in the affective category are explicated.

**Comfort**, in this study, refers to the participants’ feelings of comfort with the interlocutor, the interaction or the atmosphere in general. The listener’s awareness of level of comfort may indicate whether he or she is affectively engaged in the interaction. This is often linked to other elements I have discussed earlier. In the following example, Jane notices the body language, refer to LD elements, and attributes it to the other person feeling uncomfortable:

> We're still not so comfortable. I could not describe completely what was uncomfortable: something obviously made someone do something like this (scratching). It means she is slightly nervous or slightly uncomfortable.

*Jane 4:2*

Jane is aware of her partner Megan’s body language and tries to interpret it as her feeling uncomfortable. Their subsequent interaction shows that Jane and Megan negotiate the approach to the task explicitly by agreeing that they should only discuss flat-sharing issues that they have experienced personally.

**Difficulty** or feelings of difficulty may be due to cultural differences, unfamiliar mental elaborations, lack of prior knowledge and so on. Similar to the monitoring and control of comfort, feelings of difficulty also demonstrate the interconnectedness between the elements across dimensions. In the following extract, Tara comments on her feelings of difficulty due to lack of prior knowledge:
I was struggling with that [thinking of flat-sharing issues to discuss] because I'm not in the same [situation]. I'm not in the same situation now. So I was going back in time thinking about my previous experience and thinking about task as well.

Tara 4:4

This extract shows that Tara is aware of the difference between her and her partner Kailee in terms of recent flat-sharing experience. This causes her feelings of difficulty which, on the discourse level, lead to her making limited verbal contributions in the subsequent interaction.

Encouragement refers to feelings of being encouraged. The listener, in particular, offers encouragement through responding or asking questions to keep the conversation going, and/or signaling agreement. Savannah comments on the functions of response tokens in the example below:

I think usually they are just encouragement, and yeah, encouragement to keep going, or signal that you are still paying attention, by nodding and saying 'yeah yeah yeah, keep going, I'm listening, keep talking to me'.

Savannah 4:4

From the listener’s perspective, verbal and non-verbal responses serve the purpose of co-regulating the discourse by providing the interlocutor with feelings of being encouraged; these feelings in turn contribute to the flow of the interaction.

Maintaining a certain level of interest is also important. The listener can be interested in the other’s opinions or the listening process in general. In the following example, Jane illustrates her high level of interest in her partner’s opinion:

In the situation that you are just discussing something, it's very very interesting to hear another position.

Jane 4:3

Nervousness or feelings of nervousness is another affective variable that may contribute to the co-regulation of thought and discourse. Despite its relatively fewer occurrences (6%), it is still worthy of investigation, especially given the cultural and linguistic diversity of the participants. In the following example, Yuzuki comments on her nervousness when talking to her partner and how this nervousness relates to her partner’s cultural background:

I was feeling nervous, because at first I was feeling nervous to talk to her, not because of her personality, but because of, I think this is partial [partially due to]
cultural difference. I feel a bit tensed when I talk to someone who is unfamiliar to me, the first encounter.

Yuzuki 4:5

Yuzuki is very aware of the cultural difference between the interlocutor and herself, especially if they are from a culture which is unfamiliar to her. This nervousness certainly has an influence on her discourse as can be seen from her hesitations, repetitions and silences throughout the interaction. Examples related to these discourse patterns in Yuzuki’s discourse will be explored further in the next chapter.

In the present study, patience refers to one’s emotional state of feeling patient in the listening process. As the listener monitors the thought and the discourse, he or she also makes the conscious decision whether to ‘sit back’ and to listen more. Megan comments below on her strategy to be more patient in the interaction:

I kind of thought 'okay probably I should be more patient and I should listen and allow her finish off what she's saying' yeah.

Megan 4:4

After monitoring the patterns of the interaction for a while, Megan decides to shift to the strategy to deliberately listen more, giving Jane (her partner) enough time to finish articulating her utterances. Closely linked to the emotional state of being patient, Megan’s conscious decision to refrain herself from dominating the conversation shows her awareness of the control function that regulates thought and discourse.

Worry, or feelings of anxiety is similar to feeling nervous. Although it only occurs in the Tara-Kailee dyad (3%), it had a significant impact on the participants’ thought processes and discourse patterns. In this example, Tara discusses feelings of worry and anxiety in her interaction with her partner Kailee.

There is this anxiety problem as well, it’s better to say nothing than to say something wrong, yeah… I wish she was, now I wish she was just ‘okay, sorry what were you, were you trying to say something?’ Maybe I needed some kind of encouragement.

Tara 4:5

The extract above suggests that when communicating with Kailee, Tara adopts the strategy of keeping silent due to her feelings of worry and anxiety. Tara is anxious about making mistakes in the language. Moreover, as the listener, Tara expects Kailee to give her more encouragement so that she can feel more at ease to make verbal contributions.
The preceding two sections have focused on how perceptions of attentiveness to social and affective contextual information are embedded in the co-regulation of discourse and thought. The social category and the affective category form the social-affective dimension which recognises the situatedness of L2 listeners’ co-regulation in communication. My analysis shows that L2 learners’ understanding of the social-affective dimension is inextricably linked to their awareness of the discourse and thought dimensions in the listening process.

Section 4.1 outlined the elements, categories and dimensions of L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity (definitions, functions and explications). The three-level analysis indicates the complexities of the elements in each dimension. The following section (Section 4.2) will explore the interconnectedness of the elements between dimensions.
4.2 The interconnectedness between dimensions

The preceding sections of this chapter have presented the definitions, functions and exemplifications of the components in the three dimensions of L2 learners’ awareness and activity in the listening process: the discourse dimension, the thought dimension and the social-affective dimension. The delineation of these components already indicated that there was interrelatedness between dimensions. This section draws our attention to the interconnections between dimensions by examining the frequencies of the code co-occurrences. In addition, extracts from participants’ interview data offer further insights into my analysis of the co-occurrence tables. These extracts contextualise the numerical data and strengthen my interpretations of the interconnections between dimensions.

In order to operationalise the exploration of the links between the three dimensions, this section explores the interconnectedness between five categories: the local discourse category (LD), the global discourse category (GD), the thought category (THO), the social category (SOC) and the affective category (AFF). The components of each category were discussed in Section 4.1. The co-occurrence tables in this section present the cross tabulation of the elements between categories from different dimensions. Cells in the tables are colour coded: red represents the relatively high co-occurrences, and green represents the relatively low co-occurrences. The number in each cell denotes that time(s) in which the corresponding codes (elements) co-occur in participants’ retrospective semi-structured interview data. The co-occurrences between each element in one category and all elements in the other category are aggregated as totals so as to depict the overall trends in the data.

By presenting the data in this way, the interrelatedness across the dimensions can be explicated. However, as was discussed in the Methodology chapter, while the co-occurrence matrices helps to present the interconnectedness of categories (dimensions) in a more systematic manner, certain subtleties in the constructs might be lost in the table. Therefore, cross tabulation of the components were complemented by participants’ retrospective comments. The analysis of the co-occurrence tables in conjunction with examples of L2 learners’ verbal accounts provides a more in-depth understanding of the ways in which two or more elements in different dimensions are interconnected.

The findings confirm the claims already made in the preceding sections: as listeners are engaged in the listening process, they are concerned with the monitoring and control of more than one dimensions. For example, the listeners’ awareness of aspects in LD may co-occur with their awareness of aspects in THO (see Table 4.6). In the following section, the
interconnections between the discourse dimension and the thought dimension are delineated.

### 4.2.1 The discourse dimension and the thought dimension

In this section, the co-occurrences of the elements in the local discourse category (LD) and the global discourse category (GD) and the elements in the thought category (THO) are examined respectively. Table 4:6 outlines the interconnections between LD and THO, and Table 4:7 outlines the interconnections between GD and THO. The first column lists all the elements in LD which occur with the elements in THO; the first row lists all the elements in THO which occur with the elements in LD. The sub-totals and grand totals of these co-occurrences are also displayed in the table.

**Table 4:6 Co-occurrences of LD and THO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>accommodation</th>
<th>attention</th>
<th>co-construction</th>
<th>confusion</th>
<th>elaboration</th>
<th>expectation</th>
<th>prior knowledge</th>
<th>waiting</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backchannel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye contact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand gestures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hesitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silence</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:6 shows that the listeners’ awareness of LD and of THO co-occurs a total of 64 times in the interview data. The monitoring and control of questioning and collaborative completions in LD are more likely to co-occur with THO, occurring 14 and 15 times respectively. More specifically, the listeners’ awareness of questioning and of completion are often related to reflection on prior knowledge and elaboration respectively.

In the following extract, Iris and Abby comment on their decision to ask questions and how it is linked to reflecting on prior knowledge about sharing flats with people from difference cultural backgrounds:
In my opinion, sharing a flat with people from different nationalities is always more difficult. I mean you have to put in more of you to understand the other person, and that's why I asked her that question.

Iris 4:1

The reason I throw a question to her is actually because I don't have any experience in this case, so it would be better to ask somebody else who might have some experience in this situation. That's why I throw the question to her.

Abby 4:3

The two extracts above demonstrate the interdependence between questioning (LD) and reflection on prior knowledge (THO). Iris reflects on her personal experience of flat sharing, which leads to her strategy to ask questions in order to elicit her partner Jamie’s opinions. Abby also reflects on her personal experience; however, it is rather her lack of such experience that leads to her strategy to ask her partner the question.

The following two extracts exemplify the interrelatedness of the collaborative completion element in LD and the elaboration element in THO:

Well I kinda knew what she was going to say, so that's why I said that… I guess well I could just imagine the situation ‘okay open the fridge’, and she even made the movement with her arm.

Fiona 4:2

I imagined the problem in my head: if eight people share the fridge together, and one day if I find my favourite chocolate mousse gone, it would be difficult to find who was the one to blame for. I just imagined her context, and I thought it must be difficult to find.

Yuzuki 4:6

In the first extract, Fiona discusses how she is able to form mental elaborations of Maria’s (her partner) description which helps her to predict Maria subsequent remaining utterance. Her mental elaboration in the thought dimension and collaborative completion in the discourse dimension are closely related. In the second extract, Yuzuki also comments on her mental elaboration of her partner’s account, which results to her completing her partner’s remaining utterance.

General observation of Table 4:6 shows that the listeners’ awareness of expectations, reflection on prior knowledge and confusion in THO are more likely to co-occur with LD, occurring 15, 14 and 12 times respectively. Expectations, for example, co-occur with all the codes under LD except clarification, hesitation and repetition. Of all the LD codes, clarification seems to co-occur more often with confusion, which confirms that when participants experience feelings of confusion they are likely to seek clarification. Having
explicated the interconnections between LD and THO, this section now examines the other half of the interconnectedness – GD and THO. Table 4.7 offers an overview of the co-occurrences between elements in GD, listed in the first row, and elements in THO listed in the first column.

Table 4.7 Co-occurrences of GD and THO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>adjustment</th>
<th>agreement</th>
<th>coherence</th>
<th>communication breakdown</th>
<th>contribution</th>
<th>demand</th>
<th>flow</th>
<th>initiation</th>
<th>language use</th>
<th>sequencing</th>
<th>timing</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confusion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7 provides the co-occurrence matrix which outlines the interconnectedness of the global discourse category (GD) and the thought category (THO). Overall, the elements in these two categories co-occur a total of 94 times in the data. The initiation of the conversation or new topics, the monitoring of agreement and language use in GD are more likely to co-occur with THO category than the other elements in GD, occurring 26, 15 and 15 times respectively. More specifically, the initiation element is often linked to the expectation element (N=13). The monitoring of agreement tends to co-occur with reflection on prior knowledge (N=6). The language use element is often associated with the confusion element (N=6). In the following three extracts, Rachael, Norah and Maria comment on the relationship between the initiation of the new topic and their expectations of doing so:

Before he started the second question, I was just thinking about maybe we could talk more about the first question, but he chose to move to the next question… so I just followed his opinions and focused on the next question.

Rachael 4:8

It was kind of my initial plan to share everything equally, but I understood she didn’t prefer to read out the question, so I quickly decided to read the question.

Norah 4:4

As you can see here, according to the initiation schedule, she should be initiating, but she wasn't saying something for a while… So I just go ahead (and start the next topic).

Maria 4:3
The first extract shows that Rachael is aware of the topic shift. She is also aware of the discrepancy between her expectation of extending the discussion on the preceding topic and Tanner’s (her partner) willingness to move on to the next topic. Rachael’s expectation is shaped by her actively engaging with her partner and the task. Her strategy in response to Tanner’s initiation of the new topic is to accommodate his proposal and to focus her attention accordingly. Similarly, in Norah’s comment, she elaborates on her awareness of her partner’s reluctance to read the question out aloud, which is not what she has expected; therefore, she adopts the strategy to read out the question herself. Maria echoes Norah’s understanding, as she is also aware of her partner’s unexpected silence during the interaction. Maria’s strategy to take control of the turn to initiate the new topic demonstrates the interrelatedness between the listeners’ expectation in the thought dimension and the initiation process in the discourse dimension.

In the following extract, the relationship between the agreement element in LD and the reflection on prior knowledge element in THO is illustrated:

I thought that’s a good idea also, because I did it in the previous flat, and I think generally it works really well, so I kinda agreed with her that it’s a good solution. It doesn’t always work, but I think generally it’s a good solution.

Fiona 4:3

This extract highlights the possible interrelatedness of reflection on prior knowledge and monitoring of agreement. The fact that Fiona agrees with Maria’s solution about the flat-sharing issue is underpinned by her recall of the way that similar kinds of issues were resolved in her previous flat.

The preceding section has explicated the interconnectedness of the discourse dimension and the thought dimension. Not only did my analysis examine the co-occurrences between all elements in each of the two dimensions, several key links were identified and explored further. The following section outlines the interconnections between the discourse dimension and the social-affective dimension.

4.2.2 The discourse dimension and the social-affective dimension
This section aims to explore the interconnectedness of the discourse dimension and the social-affective dimension. More specifically, the co-occurrences between the elements in the local discourse category (LD) and the social category (SOC) as is shown in Table 4:8, the global discourse (GD) and SOC as is shown in Table 4:9, LD and the affective category (AFF)
as is shown in Table 4:10, and GD and AFF as is shown in Table 4:11, will be examined respectively.

In Table 4:8, elements in LD and SOC are cross tabulated. The first row lists the relevant elements (codes) from LD and the first column lists the relevant elements (codes) in SOC. The last row and the last column in the table provide a summary of the total number of co-occurrences between these two categories.

Table 4:8 Co-occurrences of LD and SOC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>eye contact</th>
<th>hand gestures</th>
<th>nodding</th>
<th>completion</th>
<th>overlap</th>
<th>silence</th>
<th>questioning</th>
<th>backchannel</th>
<th>repetition</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politeness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:8 shows that LD and SOC co-occur a total of 27 times in the sample data. The monitoring and control of overlap in LD are more likely to co-occur with SOC. More specifically, they are often associated with politeness, occurring 5 times. The ‘culture’ element and the ‘politeness’ element in SOC are more likely to co-occur with LD, occurring 8 and 9 times respectively. In the following part of this section, concrete examples are provided to illustrate the interconnectedness between elements in LD and SOC.

The two extracts show Savannah’s and Yuzuki’s divergent understanding towards overlapping and being polite in the interaction:

I felt like I was being polite, and not interrupting her all the time, but then again I know that I have a feeling of, when something pops into my head I just need to get it out right now, no matter if the other person is saying something.

Savannah 4:5

Some of my friends here told me ‘you don’t talk much.’ That was a great surprise for me. I’m a very chatty girl in Japan, so I think that was a cultural difference. I have or I need to interrupt them to join the conversation, otherwise they feel a bit weird or strange. In my understanding, it’s more polite to interrupt them.

Yuzuki 4:7
In the first extract, Savannah comments on the dilemma she faces when choosing between being polite and overlapping with her partner Yuzuki’s ongoing utterance. On the one hand, she is aware of the importance of the ‘politeness’ element in SOC and its impact on the way that she makes verbal contributions as the listener. On the other hand, she is aware of her own tendency to articulate her thoughts immediately in spite of the fact that the other might be in the process of formulating an utterance. In the second extract, Yuzuki discusses her understanding of the conversational norms in the UK and compares them to the norms in Japan. She has developed the socioculturally adaptable strategy to participate in the conversation, which involves interrupting or overlapping others’ utterances in order to seem more polite.

As was mentioned earlier, Table 4:8 also shows that the awareness of the ‘culture’ element in SOC is likely to co-occur with the ‘questioning’ element or the ‘hand gestures’ element in LD. In the extracts that follow, Caitlin and Harry comment on the relationship between their cultural backgrounds and the use of hand gestures and the notion of physical space:

Caitlin 4:5

I’m from the South of France, so we do a lot of hand gestures. I tone it down when I speak English, but I think that sometimes it comes out.

When I think of Latin American culture, I relate to that culture with a more physical attitude towards things, because we are a culture where physical approach is important. We don’t have the notion of physical or private space.

Harry 4:4

Both Caitlin and Harry come from a culture in which the use of hand gestures and intimate physical distance between interlocutors are common. Coming from the South of France, Caitlin is aware of the impact of the overuse of hand gestures when speaking English. Coming from Latin America, Harry is aware of the distinct discourse feature of having a close personal space when communicating with others in his culture. In Table 4:9, I explore the interconnections between the elements in the global discourse category (GD) and the social category (SOC). The first row lists all the relevant elements in GD and the first column lists all the relevant elements in SOC.
Table 4: 9 shows, there are 37 instances in total where GD and SOC co-occur. What is interesting in this table is that the ‘initiation’ element in GD is more likely to co-occur with SOC, occurring 15 times. Moreover, it tends to co-occur with the ‘responsibility’ element in SOC (N=6). The other element in GD that is more likely to co-occur with SOC is the ‘adjustment’ element. The ‘personality’ element and the ‘responsibility’ element in SOC both co-occur with elements in GD 9 times according to the table. In the following part of this section, I use three extracts from the interview data to illustrate the interconnections between the ‘initiation’ element in GD and the ‘responsibility’ element in SOC:

I noticed my mate didn't show any signs of reading it out, so I thought of taking the initiative in my hands, and then I kind of thought we could share it. We could do one each and see if it was going to work.

Norah 4:5

It's a conversation between two people, so both of us have to take charge, otherwise it's not much of a conversation, just a one-way conversation: someone's just asking the questions, and there's not much interaction between the two people I guess.

Caitlin 4:6

I think it was my turn to start… cos she didn't initiate the next topic, yeah I was thinking about it… I don't know, it just seems more fair, like we don't know each other, so you know, I wouldn't like to come across as too pushy a person obviously, but yeah I just wanted it to be even.

Maria 4:4

In the first extract, Norah monitors the initiation of the interaction. She takes the initiative to start the conversation having noticed that her partner is still waiting. In addition, Norah is very aware of the fact that the responsibility to contribute in the interaction should be shared. In the second extract, Caitlin also recognises the reciprocal nature of the responsibility to initiate and make verbal contributions in the listening process. In the third extract, Maria links the shared responsibility to initiate a new topic to the relationship.
formation between the two interlocutors. Not only does Maria monitor her own initiation of new topics and turns, but she monitors the ways in which her partner initiates new topics and turns. The three extracts above suggest that the co-construction and negotiation of shared responsibility in conversation are central to the monitoring and control at the discourse level. Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 explore this understanding of the interconnectedness between the discourse dimension and the social-affective dimension further.

The next two tables outline the elements in the local discourse category (LD) and the global discourse category (GD) and how the elements in these two categories co-occur with the elements in the affective category (AFF). In Table 4:10, the first row lists the relevant elements in LD and the first column lists the relevant elements in AFF.

**Table 4:10 Co-occurrences of LD and AFF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>comfort</th>
<th>difficulty</th>
<th>encouragement</th>
<th>interest</th>
<th>nervousness</th>
<th>patience</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>eye contact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand gestures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nodding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlap</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backchannel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table above presents the code co-occurrences between LD and AFF. There are a total of 33 co-occurrences between the elements in these two categories. The monitoring and control of the ‘encouragement’ element and the ‘level of interest’ element in AFF are more likely to co-occur with LD, which occurs 11 and 9 times respectively. In particular, these two elements are often linked to the ‘backchannel’ element (N=4) and the ‘questioning’ element (N=4) in LD. This may indicate that the main functions of the listeners’ backchannels and asking questions are to show interest and to encourage the interlocutor to continue, highlighting the listeners as the co-regulators of the interaction – a notion to be discussed in the next two Chapters. In the following two extracts, Norah and Gary comment on their understanding of verbal and nonverbal backchannels and their relation to feelings of encouragement:
I think little encouragements like, I think I did a couple of them, if you say ‘yes’ or what is called body language … to show interest in the other person’s thoughts and ideas.

Norah 4:6

Everyone likes positive re-enforcement. It makes you think that your approach to solving the problem is valid, and it’s a good approach. I think that kind of responses is usually good.

Gary 4:2

According to Norah, backchannels such as ‘yes’ are encouragements and show that the listeners are interested in the ongoing conversation. Gary shares Norah’s view on the positive affective impact that backchannels have during the validation of the preceding utterances. In the next extract, Mara comments on how her strategy to ask questions is related to her genuine interest in her partner’s solution to the flat-sharing issue:

(I decided to ask a question) because I actually wanted to know what they did about that situation… I actually wanted to know what he did, to see if I would’ve agreed with it or not.

Mara 4:3

For Mara, questioning may indicate that the listeners are interested in the interlocutor’s ideas. The strategy to ask questions is her way of showing the high level of interest that she has developed as a result of the ongoing monitoring and evaluation of her partner’s account.

In the last part of this section, I examine the interconnections between the global discourse category (GD) and the affective category (AFF). The first row lists the relevant elements in GD and the first row lists the relevant elements in AFF. The interconnections between the elements in these two categories are presented in Table 4:11 in which the numbers indicate that instances where they co-occur.

Table 4:11 Co-occurrences of GD and AFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>adjustment</th>
<th>agreement</th>
<th>contribution</th>
<th>demand</th>
<th>flow</th>
<th>initiation</th>
<th>language use</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouragement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:11 illustrates the relative lack of interdependence between the elements (codes) in the GD and AFF as the table shows that very few codes from either category co-occur. There are only 19 instances in total where these two categories intersect. Of the 19 co-occurrences, the ‘agreement’ element in GD is more likely to be associated with the ‘encouragement’ element in AFF (N=3).

In the following extract, Savannah elaborates on the interrelatedness of these two areas:

I think in conversation people interrupt each other all the time… (It shows) agreement often… it’s agreement or encouraging the other person to keep talking. 

Savannah 4:6

This extract above is taken from Savannah’s interview. She comments on the instance of overlap (interruption) in the interaction. From this comment, we can see that Savannah’s understanding of overlaps in conversation is positive. For her, overlaps may serve the function of indicating mutual agreement or encouragement. Issues related to overlaps and agreement (disagreement) will be discussed in detail in Chapter 5.

The preceding section has explicated the interconnectedness between the discourse dimension and the social-affective dimension. The section examined the co-occurrences between all elements in each of the two dimensions by means of cross tabulation with an emphasis on key connections between dimensions. These key links were then exemplified by L2 learners’ comments. The following section presents the findings from my analysis of the last two possible interconnections: the thought dimension and the social-affective dimension.

4.2.3 The thought dimension and the social-affective dimension

The present section depicts the interconnectedness of the thought dimension and the social-affective dimension. For presentation purposes, I outline the findings from the thought category (THO) and the social category (SOC) co-occurrence table and the THO and the affective category (AFF) co-occurrence table respectively. Table 4:12 presents the interconnections between THO and SOC. The first row lists the relevant elements in THO and the first column lists the relevant elements in SOC.
The table above reveals the co-occurrences between the elements in THO and the elements in SOC. There is a total of 30 instances where the elements in these two categories intersect. Interestingly, of these 30 instances, 10 are the co-occurrences of expectation with SOC. In other words, these L2 listeners' awareness of expectations is related to the different aspects of SOC. The findings of this study show that the interconnectedness between the expectation element in THO and the many elements in SOC underpins the listening process in such a way that the co-construction and negotiation of meaning may also be influenced. This important understanding of the listeners' expectation and its misalignment is further explicated in Chapter 5 and Chapter 6. The present section uses one specific example from Mara’s interview to illustrate the co-occurrence of the expectation element in THO and the ‘relationship’ element in SOC:

I was in shock that he was willing to share information with me about his flatmate who is a mess and eats dirtily… I was like ‘should I feel comfortable talking to this person or not.’ If it was my friend I don’t mind if you want to tell me a problem that you’re having with your flatmate, but not to a stranger… What he was saying made me so uncomfortable.

Mara 4:4

In the extract above, Mara comments on the unexpected of Harry (her partner) sharing details about his dirty flatmate. This unexpectedness, accompanied by temporary unease, is the result of her monitoring and evaluating her relationship with her partner. The unexpected is thus attributable to Mara’s unfamiliarity with her partner.
Table 4:13 gives an overview of the interconnections between the elements in the thought category (THO) and the affective category (AFF). The elements in THO are listed in the first row and the elements in AFF are listed in the first column.

**Table 4:13 Co-occurrences of THO and AFF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>accommodation</th>
<th>co-construction</th>
<th>confusion</th>
<th>elaboration</th>
<th>expectation</th>
<th>prior knowledge</th>
<th>waiting</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>difficulty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouragement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nervousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 4:13, we can see how the elements in THO and AFF are interrelated. There are a total of 25 instances of co-occurrences. More specifically, the ‘interest’ element in AFF is more likely to be associated with the *expectation* element (N=3) and the ‘reflection on prior knowledge’ element (N=3) in THO. In the following two extracts, Abby and Jane discuss the interconnectedness between listeners’ expectations and the monitoring of the level of interest:

When you talk to somebody you expect people to have eye contact with you. But if, people don’t make eye contact, sometimes you think maybe they’re not interested in what you’re saying.

*Abby 4:4*

For me it was a very interesting moment, because it would not be my first thought. That’s why I was thinking ‘aw I’d better listen. It’s very interesting.’ … Her thought obviously was interesting and unexpected for me, so I tried to provoke her to move forward.

*Jane 4:4*

In these two extracts, Abby and Jane comment on two specific types of listeners’ expectations. Abby’s awareness of expectations in the first extract is more concrete, which refers specifically to maintaining eye contact in communication. She expects her partner to make eye contact so that she can monitor the other’s level of interest. Through observing her partner’s eye contact, she monitors her level of interest. For Abby, lack of eye contact may suggest a certain level of disinterest. In comparison to the first extract, Jane’s understanding
of the relations between listeners’ expectations and the monitoring of interest is more abstract. For her, the unexpected in the interlocutor’s opinions enhances her interest in shifting her attention to the listening process and eliciting more information from the other. The analysis of these two extracts highlights the interconnectedness between THO and AFF.

In the next two extracts, Caitlin and Fiona comment on their reflection on prior knowledge and its relation to the monitoring of interest in the listening process:

I've never seen someone putting, like hiding you know the goods in some box... so I'm slightly surprised... I was sort of interested to know a bit more about that as well.

Caitlin 4:7

I think what was interesting for me at that point was that she said that she realised herself that she should do it (cleaning the flat regularly). This is sort of her own ambition, 'yeah okay, it's unfair if I don't do it', because again I was linking that back to my own situation.

Fiona 4:4

Caitlin reflects on her prior knowledge about the similar situation that her partner describes. However, as she does not have the prior knowledge, she feels surprised. She is thus interested in listening to her partner. In the second extract, Fiona also listens to her partner and reflects on her prior knowledge. The difference between these two extracts is that Fiona has the prior knowledge to help her better understand her partner’s position in the flat-sharing situation. Both extracts show that the monitoring of interest during the listening process and how it can be linked to aspects in the thought dimension.

The preceding three sections have explored the complex interconnectedness between the elements in each of the three dimensions: the discourse dimension, the thought dimension and the social-affective dimension. The next section will present findings with regard to L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity across the three dimensions among each of the ten dyads.
4.3 The interconnectedness across dimensions and between dyads

In order to present a detailed summary the interview data in which key elements of L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity were situated, the code distributions for individual participants were counted and grouped by category. Apart from serving the purpose of data transparency, these summary tables also may give the reader a sense of the flavour of the data as a whole, indicating trends and patterns.

As this section unfolds, I compare and contrast the code distributions and occurrences for the participants by dyad. Within each table, the first column shows the weighting of the five categories, outlining the respective relative significance. Under the percentages, a summary of code occurrences for each participant is provided. The comparison and contrast of total code counts reveal the variance of the participants. The second and the third columns give detailed information about how different aspects of the five categories are distributed. The code occurrences are ranked from the highest to the lowest in order to show their relative frequency compared to other codes in the same category. In addition, the ranking helps me to identify frequently-occurred elements for each participant so that I can compare them with his or her partner. The bottom row summarises the code occurrences for each participant across all five categories. Overall, not only do the tables below offer concrete information about the individual participants in this study, they also function as a mapping of the entire interview data set, explicating its variability, patterns and trends.
Table 4: The Savannah-Yuzuki dyad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Savannah Codes</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Yuzuki Codes</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD (26%)</td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Savannah = 15; Yuzuki = 10)</td>
<td>overlap</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nodding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>backchannel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>backchannel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>completion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>eye contact</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eye contact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>hand gestures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hesitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>overlap</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD (27%)</td>
<td>flow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Savannah = 16; Yuzuki = 10)</td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjustment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>adjustment</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>communication breakdown</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coherence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>flow</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>timing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>timing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THO (16%)</td>
<td>co-construction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>co-construction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Savannah = 13; Yuzuki = 3)</td>
<td>confusion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC (22%)</td>
<td>politeness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Savannah = 7; Yuzuki = 15)</td>
<td>personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>politeness</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>personality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>role</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dominance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>role</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF (9%)</td>
<td>encouragement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>interest</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Savannah = 4; Yuzuki = 5)</td>
<td>interest</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>nervousness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>difficulty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:14 presents a comparison of the code distributions for the Savannah-Yuzuki dyad. The definitions and exemplifications for each code have been provided in Section 4.1. Savannah is a 26-year-old female German speaker studying for the degree of MSc in Linguistics. She has lived in English speaking countries (US and UK) for 30 months. Yuzuki is a 27-year-old female Japanese speaker studying for the degree of MSc in TESOL. She has lived in the UK for 6 months at the time of the study.

Table 4:14 reveals Savannah’s and Yuzuki’s complex monitoring and control of aspects in listening. As a pair, the three most frequently occurring categories are GD (27%), LD (26%) and SOC (22%). Savannah has higher code occurrences (N=55) compared to Yuzuki (N=43).

A close examination of this table indicates that Savannah is primarily concerned with LD (questioning and overlap), GD (flow and language use) and THO (co-construction, confusion and reflection on prior knowledge). Yuzuki, on the other hand, is concerned with SOC. Her interview data features more on the culture element with 6 occurrences and the politeness element with 4 occurrences respectively.

Table 4:14 also shows that both Savannah and Yuzuki use a variety of strategies across the five categories. However, there is a difference in the way that they orchestrate these strategies. This difference can be illustrated by the distinct elements found in the table. Another key distinction between the participants is that Savannah displays more codes with occurrences being more than two, whereas for Yuzuki, the codes are evenly distributed across the categories except for the SOC. This might suggest that Savannah and Yuzuki have different perceptions with regard to the use of certain strategies. Chapter 5 will provide concrete examples as to how this distinction could have an impact on their discourse.
Table 4:15 The Tara-Kailee dyad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Tara</th>
<th>Kailee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD (20%)</td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tara = 8;</td>
<td>completion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailee = 11)</td>
<td>eye contact</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hesitation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nodding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD (27%)</td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tara = 15;</td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailee = 11)</td>
<td>adjustment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THO (21%)</td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tara = 10;</td>
<td>confusion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailee = 10)</td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attention</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>co-construction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC (18%)</td>
<td>personality</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tara = 8;</td>
<td>dominance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailee = 9)</td>
<td>role</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF (14%)</td>
<td>interest</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tara = 7;</td>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kailee = 6)</td>
<td>difficulty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>encouragement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>worry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 4:15, I compare the code distributions for the Tara-Kailee pair. Tara is a 37-year-old female Serbian speaker studying for the degree of MSc in Language Education. She had lived in the UK for 6 months. Kailee is a 22-year-old female Romanian speaker studying for the degree of MSc in Psychology. She has also lived in the UK for 6 months. Initial reading of the table suggests that both Tara and Kailee have an in-depth understanding of the complexities of the co-regulation process. Table 4:15 indicates that the dyad is primarily
concerned with the GD (27%). The distributions of the code occurrences in LD (20%), THO (21%) and SOC (18%) can be considered quite even.

Both Tara and Kailee are quite aware of the task demand, occurring 4 and 3 times respectively. Moreover, Tara is concerned with the language use in the interaction (N=5) as well as the management of expectations (N=3) and level of interest (N=3). Kailee, on the other hand, is mainly concerned with the different functions of questioning (N=5), accommodating Tara’s thought (N=3) and encouraging Tara to keep talking (N=3). This table, therefore, reveals that whilst there are some similarities between Tara and Kailee in terms of, for example, the use of questioning and the awareness of the task demand in the listening process, there are also differences. In particular, Tara prioritises the way that she makes linguistic adjustments and monitors the task demand in the interaction. Kailee, on the other hand, seems to be more aware of the accommodation of her partner’s thought processes and offering encouragements.

Table 4:16 The Rachael-Tanner dyad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Rachael Codes</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Tanner Codes</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD (33%)</td>
<td>overlap</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>completion</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>overlap</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eye contact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD (28%)</td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjustment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication breakdown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>timing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THO (22%)</td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>co-construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC (10%)</td>
<td>politeness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>personality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dominance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF (6%)</td>
<td>encouragement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>patience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: 16 presents an overview of how the elements across dimensions are distributed in the Rachael-Tanner dyad. Rachael is a 22-year-old female Mandarin speaker studying for the degree of MSc in Language Education. She has lived in the UK for 6 months. Her partner Tanner is a 24-year-old male Swahili speaker studying for the degree of MSc in International Development. He has lived in the UK for 8 months. The table highlights the importance of LD (33%) and GD (28%) in Rachael’s and Tanner’s interviews. It is interesting to note that the two participants have almost the same code occurrences (34 for Rachael and 33 for Tanner).

In their interview, both Rachael and Tanner comment extensively on the regulation of THO in relation to LD. More specifically, Rachael is primarily concerned with thought processes in overlaps (N=4) and silence (N=3). Tanner, apart from discussing his understanding of overlaps (N=3), seems to be also aware of questioning as a strategy of responding to his interlocutor (N=4) and the process of collaborative completion (N=3) in the interaction. Under GD, Rachael prioritises the initiation element (N=3) and the language use element (N=3). Under THO, both Rachael and Tanner foreground their management of expectations in the listening process (N=3 for Rachael and N=4 for Tanner).
Table 4: The Nicole-Gary dyad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Nicole Codes</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Gary Codes</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD (30%) (Nicole = 6; Gary = 10)</td>
<td>completion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>backchannel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>overlap</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>completion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eye contact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hand gestures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hesitation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD (35%) (Nicole = 8; Gary = 11)</td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>communication breakdown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>communication breakdown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THO (17%) (Nicole = 2; Gary = 7)</td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>confusion</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC (9%) (Nicole = 4; Gary = 1)</td>
<td>politeness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>personality</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF (9%) (Nicole = 3; Gary = 2)</td>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>encouragement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>encouragement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>patience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The Nicole-Gary dyad outlines how the elements in each category are distributed in the Nicole-Gary dyad. Nicole is a 31-year-old female Mandarin speaker studying for the degree of PhD in Biology. She has lived in the UK for 30 months. Gary is a 24-year-old male Hindi speaker studying for the degree of PhD in Genetics. He has lived in the UK for 84 months.

According to this table, one of the more noticeable features is that the dyad is more concerned with the discourse dimension in the listening process (GD and LD), occurring 30% and 35% respectively. In addition, the participants vary in terms of the total code occurrences with Nicole being 23 times and Gary being 31 times. This could indicate a distinction in the monitoring and control process, particularly in THO. A close examination of the table also reveals that Gary places greater emphasis on the regulation of the agreement element (N=6) and the backchannel element (N=3) in the interaction, whereas Nicole highlights the politeness element (N=3) in SOC. These findings show that whist participants...
may both focus on the discourse dimension in the listening process, it is their attention to the thought dimension and the social dimension that distinguishes the two.

Table 4:18 The Megan-Jane dyad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Megan</th>
<th>Jane</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD (16%)</td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hand gestures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD (26%)</td>
<td>adjustment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sequencing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THO (28%)</td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>co-construction</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attention</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC (13%)</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>role</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF (16%)</td>
<td>patience</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:18 presents an overview of the code distribution for Megan and Jane. Megan is a 25-year-old female Hausa speaker studying for the degree of PhD in Education. She has lived in the UK for 17 months. Jane is a 31-year-old female Russian speaker studying for the degree of MSc in Film Directing. She has lived in the UK for 6 months. The table shows that the difference between the total code occurrences for Megan (N=28) and Jane (N=40) is greater than Nicole-Gary. Generally speaking, the pair tends to focus on GD (26%) and THO (28%).

Megan is primarily concerned with the elaboration of Jane’s account (N=3) and the shared responsibility between them (N=3) during the listening process. In comparison, Jane
prioritises the *language use* in the interaction (N=3), the *co-construction* of shared understanding (N=3) as well as the formation of *relationship* (N=3). In addition, Jane is much more aware of AFF – the monitoring of level of *interest* (N=4) and feelings of *difficulty* (N=3). In contrast, there is only one instance in which Megan comments on AFF: Megan is only aware of the control of *patience* whilst listening to Jane (see the extract from her interview on Page 111).

To this end, it is worth noting that having a greater number in code occurrences does not equate better listening skills or indeed the fact that the listener is more skilful in terms of the monitoring and control process. This is because the occurrences presented in this chapter are dependent on a number of factors. It may be due to the dynamics of the pair during the problem-solving interaction, i.e. the way that the listener’s partner interacts with him or her could potentially lead to higher or lower code occurrences. Similar to the Megan and Jane dyad, the difference between total numbers of code occurrences in the dyad presented below is also quite noticeable.

Table 4.19 The Iris-Jamie dyad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Iris Codes</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Jamie Codes</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD (26%) (Iris = 6; Jamie = 8)</td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>completion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eye contact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD (48%) (Iris = 9; Jamie = 17)</td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>adjustment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>communication breakdown</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>timing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THO (22%) (Iris = 3; Jamie = 9)</td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>confusion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC (2%)</td>
<td>formality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF (2%)</td>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:1 outlines the code distribution for the Iris-Jamie dyad. Iris is a 25-year-old female Spanish speaker studying for the degree of MSc in Business Management. She has lived in the UK for 4 months. Jamie is a 25-year-old female French speaker studying for the degree of PhD in Evolutionary Biology. She has lived in the UK for 6 months. An overview of the code totals and code distributions of this table suggests that Jamie (N=34) may be much more aware of the key elements than Iris (N=20) in the listening process. The pair seems to be mainly concerned with GD (48%), and there is almost no mention of the social-affective dimension.

More specifically, both Iris and Jamie comment on the *language use* in the interaction quite prominently (N=7 for Iris and N=6 for Jamie). Jamie also attempts to *adjust* her comprehension strategies in order to communicate effectively with Iris (N=3). In terms of LD, Iris discusses her strategy of *questioning* (N=3) whilst Jamie elaborates her thought processes during silence in conversation (N=3). Furthermore, in THO, Iris prioritises the strategy to reflect on *prior knowledge* (N=3), whereas Jamie underlines the management of *expectations* (N=4). Interestingly, although Jamie has a higher code occurrences in total she does not seem to have commented on the social or the affective category in the interaction.
Table 4: The Norah-Abby dyad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Norah</th>
<th>Abby</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LD (13%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Norah = 6; Abby = 4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eye contact</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backchannel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>eye contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hand gestures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>silence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD (21%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Norah = 11; Abby = 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>initiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>language use</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>communication breakdown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>coherence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>language use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication breakdown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THO (32%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Norah = 11; Abby = 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waiting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>expectation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>elaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>co-construction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC (17%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Norah = 7; Abby = 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politeness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>formality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>personality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>dominance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF (16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Norah = 5; Abby = 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interest</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encouragement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patience</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:20 presents the findings with regard to the code distribution for the Norah-Abby dyad. Norah is a 27-year-old female Russian speaker studying for the degree of MSc in TESOL. She has lived in the UK for 68 months. Abby is a 35-year-old female Malay speaker studying for the degree of PhD in Landscape Architecture. She has lived in the UK for 6 months. The table shows that these two participants have similar numbers of codes individually (N=40 for Norah and N=35 for Abby). As a whole, the dyad is relatively more concerned with GD (21%) and THO (32%). In general, the percentages for all five categories are relatively more evenly distributed compared to some of the other pairs.
The Table further suggests that Norah is more concerned with the *initiation* element in GD - she *expects* her partner to initiate new topics (N=4), and she even *waits* for Abby to initiate if she has not done so (N=5). Abby comments on the management of *expectations* during the interaction (N=4). In addition, reflection on *prior knowledge* is crucial for Abby as she processes Norah’s utterances (N=5). In terms of AFF, Norah highlights the monitoring of level of *interest* (N=3) whereas Abby seems to focus more on the monitoring of level of *comfort* (N=5).

### Table 4:21 The Lena-Caitlin dyad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Lena</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Caitlin</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD (20%)</td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lena = 3; Caitlin = 11)</td>
<td>backchannel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>hand gestures</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>completion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eye contact</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nodding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>overlap</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>silence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD (38%)</td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lena = 10; Caitlin = 16)</td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>communication breakdown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>flow</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>sequencing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>timing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THO (32%)</td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>confusion</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lena = 6; Caitlin = 16)</td>
<td>attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>co-construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>attention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>waiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC (6%)</td>
<td>personality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lena = 2; Caitlin = 2)</td>
<td>responsibility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF (4%)</td>
<td>interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>comfort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lena = 1; Caitlin = 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>interest</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 22 (Lena) and 47 (Caitlin)

Table 4:21 compares the code distribution in Lena’s interview data against her partner Caitlin’s. Lena is a 22-year-old female Slovak speaker studying for the degree of BSc in
Geoscience. She has lived in the UK for 36 months. Caitlin is a 24-year-old female French speaker studying for the degree of MSc in Translation Studies. She has lived in the UK for 53 months. In this case, both Lena and Caitlin have lived in the UK for a relatively long period of time. However, they have quite different approaches to the monitoring and control of the discourse, the thought, and the social-affective dimensions. Lena’s interview has a total of 22 code occurrences, whereas Caitlin’s has 47. The difference between the totals is quite significant. In general, both participants are primarily concerned with GD (38%) and THO (32%) in the listening process.

More specifically, Caitlin demonstrates her extensive knowledge and understanding in LD as there are five more items in her LD than in Lena’s. Lena discusses the importance of making verbal *contributions* in GD – a way to regulate the conversation in a joint manner (N=3). Caitlin, however, places an emphasis on the monitoring of *agreement* (N=5) and *initiation* of new topics (N=4). Under THO, both Lena and Caitlin are fairly aware of the reflection on *prior knowledge* during the listening process (N=3). Caitlin also highlights awareness of managing feelings of *confusion* (N=5) and of *expectations* (N=3).
In the table above, I present details of the code distribution in Harry’s and Mara’s interview data. Harry is a 28-year-old male Spanish speaker studying for the degree of MSc in Philosophy. He has lived in the UK for 8 months. Mara is a 19-year-old female Arabic speaker studying for the degree of BSc in Law. She has lived in the UK for 24 months. The table shows that Harry and Mara have similar numbers of codes (N=36 for Harry and N=41 for Mara) in their respective interviews. As a pair, they tend to prioritise GD (29%) and THO (36%) compared to the other three categories. It is worth mentioning that Mara comments on a wider variety of the elements in LD, THO and AFF. Harry, in contrast, pays more attention to SOC.

For Harry the awareness of the hand gestures element is relative prominent in LD (N=3). Moreover, in terms of GD, both Harry and Mara prioritise the monitoring of agreement
during the listening process (N=3). Harry has a relatively stronger tendency to focus on the *initiation* process (N=3), whereas Mara stresses the *coherence* in the interaction (N=3). As for THO, both Harry and Mara consider reflection on *prior knowledge* to be important, although Harry seems to be more aware of this (N=6). Apart from reflecting on prior knowledge, Harry is also aware of the mental *elaboration* element as he listens to Mara’s account of and solutions to flat-sharing issues (N=5). In Mara’s interview, however, feelings of *confusion* (N=5) and management of *expectations* feature more heavily (N=4).

Table 4:23 The Fiona-Maria dyad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Fiona</th>
<th>Maria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Codes</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD (20%)</td>
<td>hand gestures</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hesitation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>questioning</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>clarification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>completion</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>repetition</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD (38%)</td>
<td>agreement</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demand</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>coherence</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>initiation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>language use</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>contribution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sequencing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THO (34%)</td>
<td>prior knowledge</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elaboration</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>expectation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accommodation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>co-construction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC (7%)</td>
<td>politeness</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>relationship</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF (1%)</td>
<td>interest</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:23 outlines details regarding the code distribution in Fiona’s and Maria’s interview data. Fiona is a 24-year-old female German speaker studying for the degree of MSc in Applied Linguistics. She has lived in the UK for 15 months. Maria is a 23-year-old female Polish speaker studying for the degree of BSc in Literature and Languages. She has lived in
the UK for 48 months. An overview of Table 4:23 suggests that Fiona (N=42) and Maria (N=40) have very similar numbers of code occurrences in total. However, it is the similarity in the distribution of the codes that is worthy of exploring. The similar distribution of the codes could indicate that they share a similar understanding of in the discourse, thought, social-affective dimensions. Collectively, there tends to be more regulation in GD (38%) and THO (34%). Interestingly, Maria did not comment on her awareness of the affective category in the interview at all.

In LD, Maria highlights the clarification element than Fiona. In GD, both Fiona and Maria pay more attention to the monitoring of the agreement element (N=5). In addition, Fiona is concerned with the task demand (N=3), whereas Maria is concerned with the initiation element (N=3). In terms of THO, both Fiona and Maria regard the reflection on prior knowledge to be important with 6 and 4 occurrences respectively. Furthermore, the table shows that the management of expectations is relatively more prominent: three and four occurrences for Fiona and Maria respectively. Apart from this, Fiona underlines the use of the mental elaboration strategy (N=4): she forms a mental image actively as she listens to Maria’s account. Neither Fiona nor Maria seems to consider AFF to be of a primary concern in the interviews.

This section presented my findings with regard to how the elements and categories outlined in the preceding sections were distributed within dyads. Drawing from the interview data, I compared and contrasted code occurrences by category as well as by participant. Thus I offered a detailed analysis of how L2 listeners in this study regulated their metacognitive monitoring and activity in relation to their partners.

The main purpose of delineating my findings from the interview data in such a manner was to foreground the variability of the ways in which L2 learners attune to each other in the listening process. This variability could be evident in their total code occurrences, which can be quite considerable. In the Lena-Caitlin dyad, my analysis of Lena’s interview identified 22 total code occurrences, whereas my analysis of Caitlin’s interview identified 47 total code occurrences. According to Table 4:21, the source of difference lies in LD and THO. However, only after scrutiny of Lena’s interview transcript was I able to conclude that this was due to Lena’s personality: the tendency to refrain from asking questions and to only follow the interlocutor’s thoughts in a passive manner in the interaction (see Chapter 5 for details).
The variability of the dynamics in the listening process could also be evident within categories. In the Tara-Kailee dyad, for example, the code occurrences in total for each participant are almost the same (see Table 4:15). However, it is the difference in the distribution of codes in GD, THO and AFF that distinguishes the two. Whilst Tara gives prominence to the language use element and the adjustment element, Kailee pays special attention to the task demand in GD. Similarly, on the one hand, Tara stresses the importance of showing interest while she listens; Kailee emphasises the sense of encouragement. These distinct differences in Tara’s and Kailee’s regulation processes lead to a unique interaction pattern (see Chapter 5 for details).

This section also argued that a greater number in code does not necessarily indicate that the listener has better listening skills or that he or she is more skilful in terms of the monitoring and control process. As L2 learners listen, they are often concerned with the regulation of a variety of elements, the orchestration of which can be highly contingent upon the way that they interact with the others. Although I examined my participants’ range of regulation strategies in relation to their partners’ in the interaction, it is important to acknowledge that this is only a snapshot of the whole process.

The ten tables in this section pointed up the patterns and trends that emerged from the entire interview data set. These patterns and trends highlighted a certain degree of variability in the participants, and how they regulated the use of strategies across dimensions in the listening process. From a discourse analytic perspective, Chapter 5 will explore these patterns and trends further by providing exemplifications of regulation in action.
4.4 Summary

In this chapter, I have presented the findings from my analysis of the interview data. These findings contribute to the building of a complex conceptual framework which highlights the interconnectedness within, between and across the discourse, thought and social-affective dimensions. For L2 listeners, this involves an understanding of a wide range of elements across these three dimensions. In order to operationalise the comparison and contrast of the data, this study sub-divided the three dimensions into five categories: the local discourse category, the global discourse category, the thought category, the social category and the affective category. My findings suggest that these categories are not only complex within themselves, but they are often linked to other categories, which holistically constitute L2 listeners’ awareness of the dialogical and reciprocal co-regulation process.

This chapter also discussed the findings with regard to the code distributions in each dyad. The analysis of code distribution within dyads allowed me to compare and contrast similarity and differences, providing a foundation for further examinations of the interaction data.

The findings delineated in this chapter offer insights into the complexity of a new conceptualisation - its elements, dimensions and connections. Having developed an initial understanding of this, Chapter 5 sets out to answer my second research question:

- To what extent can L2 listeners’ understanding of the monitoring and control process be exemplified through their discourse?

My re-conceptualisation of L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and listening process, metacognitive discourse awareness (MDA), will be delineated in full in Chapter 6.
CHAPTER 5  FINDINGS – PART II

The previous chapter has revealed that there are the three dimensions in L2 learners’ awareness of reciprocal monitoring and control in the listening process: the discourse dimension, the thought dimension and the social-affective dimension. The chapter also explored the components embedded within each dimension and the interconnectedness between and across dimensions. These findings have outlined some of the fundamental components in my investigation into L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity.

Chapter 5 aims to exemplify and capture the dialogical complexities of L2 listeners’ awareness of co-regulation. The findings to be discussed in this chapter are drawn from the participants’ interaction data, complemented by their follow-up interviews. These findings portray the ways in which L2 listeners’ orchestrate their cognitive resources through the means of discourse. As this chapter unfolds, I argue that the listener can be regarded as the co-regulator of the discourse in which he or she attunes to the other in order to create shared understanding. This chapter also examines the negotiation of sequencing and initiation, the management of the unexpected and disagreement. The findings suggest that L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness is discursive in nature. It requires learners to be aware of a reciprocal relationship in the listening process. The relational use of strategies such as predicting, monitoring, and evaluating enables the listener to orchestrate cognitive resources and regulate the discourse situated in the wider social and affective contexts.

I present my findings under six headings in this chapter. The first section examines the joint creation of shared understanding. The second section explores the notion of the listener as the co-regulator of the discourse. The third section presents explicit and implicit negotiation of sequencing and initiation. The fourth section looks into the listener’s management of the unexpected. The fifth section focuses on expressed and tacit disagreements and the strategies that L2 listeners utilise as they regulate the discourse, thought and social-affective dimensions of their thinking. The next chapter will bring these findings into a coherent analytical framework and outline a re-conceptualisation of L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in the listening process – Metacognitive Discourse Awareness.
5.1 Creating shared understanding

5.1.1 The co-construction of shared understanding

This section presents the findings with regard to L2 learners’ reciprocal monitoring and control processes which facilitate the creation of shared understanding in listening. The analysis focuses on participants’ understandings of overlaps and completions in the interaction and its link to the orchestration of prediction and reflection on prior knowledge. The findings suggest that L2 listeners’ awareness of the co-regulation process in the thought and discourse dimensions is contingent upon the wider sociocultural contexts: the listeners’ preconceptions about their partner as well as the social and discursive norms may have an impact on the strategies that they use. This section also explores the achievement of cognitive attunement, which involves both the listener and his or her partner jointly constructing a mental alignment through the means of discourse. Such an attunement requires the monitoring of oneself and the other which may subsequently contribute to the co-regulation of the discourse.

In the extract below, Nicole and Gary discuss the stolen butter issue. This is the beginning of their discussion. Gary is a Hindi speaker, and Nicole is a Mandarin speaker. At the discourse level, this extract demonstrates the listeners’ use of responses to form part of an overlapping completion in the interaction. The analysis of the extract in conjunction with the interview data indicates that active monitoring, predicting and reflecting as well as the listener’s use of interculturally adaptable strategies could contribute to the co-construction of shared understanding.

Gary: Yesterday you found the butter you left in the fridge was gone, but you remember clearly that you had only used half of it - possible solution?

Nicole: I have friends who used to have this problem that people [sharing]

Gary: [people stealing food yeah

Nicole: Yeah, bread, milk, things.

Gary: Uh put laxatives in the butter or milk so that you know who's stealing your butter, and they will [saying]

Nicole: <laugh> Yeah.

Gary: Possible solution is I think the best solution is just face like just have a meeting with your flatmate and [saying]

Nicole: [yeah sit down and see

Gary: Sit down and say, well this is the problem and this needs to stop, and if it continues, then yeah you take it up with someone else, and when you were sharing the flat with someone it might... I don't know.

Nicole-Gary 5:1
In this extract, there are two instances in which Gary and Nicole jointly create a shared understanding during the listening process. Firstly, Nicole reflects on her prior knowledge about the ‘stolen butter’ issue. Gary then completes the second half of Nicole’s utterance. Gary predicts Nicole’s unfinished preceding utterance by complementing it with ‘people stealing food yeah’ (Line 6). Nicole acknowledges Gary’s completion with ‘yeah’ and finishes the rest of her utterance. In the second instance, Nicole completes Gary’s utterance by saying ‘yeah sit down and see’ (Line 14). Compared to Nicole’s acknowledgement of Gary’s completion in the first instance, here Gary acknowledges Nicole’s verbal contribution in a more explicit way - he incorporates Nicole’s contribution into his following utterance.

It is worth noting that the collaborative completions discussed above are also overlaps. The analysis of these two instances therefore indicates that Nicole and Gary have two distinct ways of acknowledging the other’s complementary utterances: Nicole acknowledges Gary’s completion by simply saying ‘yeah’ before completing her original utterance; Gary, however, seems to prefer to acknowledge the other’s completion by incorporating it into his original utterance. Both instances of overlapping completion are syntactically and semantically compatible to the preceding utterances, which suggests that shared understanding is achieved to a certain degree.

Moving beyond the discourse level, the analysis of the interaction data links the findings to participants’ accounts in the interviews. With regard to the overlapping completions in this extract, Gary and Nicole both provide insights into the ways in which they co-ordinate the monitoring and control process. In the following comment from the interview, Gary illustrates his strategy to reflect on his prior knowledge, and compare it to Nicole’s utterance during the listening process:

I kind of knew where she was going with it. I was just reiterating what I thought as well because that same situation has happened to me before at university, so I was kind of agreeing with her in a way.

Gary 5:1

Not only does Gary monitor and predict Nicole’s ongoing and emergent speech, but he also reflects on his own prior knowledge. This active monitoring, predicting and reflecting on oneself as well as the other contribute to the formation of a shared understanding between the two. Moreover, Gary comments that his overlapping completion signals agreement and that his reformulation of Nicole’s idea is a way of confirming this agreement. The interconnectedness between the prior knowledge element in the thought dimension and the
agreement element in the discourse dimension is a recurring pattern among participants as was discussed in Chapter 4 (see Table 4:7). Nicole, however, is primarily concerned with the comparison between the cultural difference between her L2 culture and L1 culture. In the following comment, she comments on the overlapping completion in the extract:

Sometimes when I try to describe things, I use very poor or segmented sentences. If people help me by predicting what I'm going to say, it's going to be a lot of help for me, in English that is. But probably if I think of my own language, my mother language, that would kind of imply like, if you speak when other people are still speaking, yeah like you interrupt people when they are still speaking, that'll be sometimes considered as impolite.

Nicole 5:1

Nicole is very conscious about the limitations in her English. She contrasts overlaps in English (her L2) to Mandarin (her L1) in the comment above. For Nicole, the fact that her partner predicts the content, overlaps and completes her utterance in the interaction is helpful. If the overlap happens in her L1, however, Nicole would regard it as impolite. This shows that Nicole is aware of the intercultural pragmatics between the embedded social and discursive norms in English and her native language. She is able to adapt the ways in which she listens in the interaction accordingly. Her positive attitude towards Gary’s ‘help’, as was mentioned in the comment, contributes to the joint creation of shared understanding.

The analysis of Nicole-Gary 5:1 shows that listening is a dialogical process in which the listener predicts the other’s utterance while reflecting on his or her own prior knowledge and seeking agreement. The dialogical listening process may also require the listener to adapt his or her discourse strategies so that successful communication can be achieved. The awareness of this process manifests itself through discourse patterns such as overlaps and collaborative completions. Although Nicole and Gary may have seemingly different perceptions towards these local discourse features, they are able to co-construct a shared understanding in the listening process.

Similar to Nicole’s understanding that the listener predicts and completes the other’s utterance in overlaps and completions according to the prevailing social and discursive norms, the following extract demonstrates that Yuzuki’s strategy to overlap is dependent on her partner’s linguistic background and the wider sociocultural contexts within which the interaction is embedded. In the following extract, Yuzuki and Savannah also discuss the stolen butter issue.

Yuzuki: Yeah, how how about you?
Savannah: Not really, not really no. We have like a fridge,
Yuzuki: Mm
Savannah: and there are like 4 compartments in the fridge,
Yuzuki: Mm
Savannah: and everyone has their own like everyone has their own <gesture> like everyone has their own butter and, my food [was never
Yuzuki: [How how do you manage this, the kind of [divide the area into
Savannah: Yeah you know there are like little cupboards,
Yuzuki: Uuhh
Savannah: and I put my food on the very bottom,
Yuzuki: Uuhh
Savannah: and then there's another one, there are like four of them.
Yuzuki: You put the name in it?
Savannah: No, it was just decided when we moved in,
Yuzuki: Uuhh

Savannah-Yuzuki 5:1

Savannah is a German speaker, and Yuzuki is a Japanese speaker. The overlaps in Lines 9-11 may indicate that both Yuzuki and Savannah are actively engaged in the conversation. Yuzuki is interested in the situation that Savannah is describing. Hence, her question in Lines 9-10 can be considered as a strategy to show interest and request for more information. A similar pattern is repeated in Yuzuki’s utterance in Line 17. Savannah’s questions in Lines 9-10 and Yuzuki’s question in Line 17 therefore show a reciprocal active listenership in which the listener not only monitors the utterances, but is also actively engaged with his or her conversation partner. Yuzuki is conscious of the way she interacts with her partner.

According to the comment below, Yuzuki adjusts her strategy to overlap (interrupt) based on the cultural background of her conversation partner:

I don’t hesitate to interrupt someone, because most of my friends here are from England, Scotland or Ireland, and for people from Western culture, they are always interrupting and interrupting. That’s the way the conversation goes here. But if I talk to a Chinese student or students from any other Asian cultures, I think I’d wait for them to finish their sentences. Yeah I shift between culture to culture.

Yuzuki 5:1

According to the comment above, Yuzuki is aware that simultaneous speech is part of the social norms to join conversations in the Western culture. As a native Japanese speaker, Yuzuki recognises the differences between the way she listens and responds in her home culture and in the West. That is, Yuzuki’s strategy to interact changes based on the interlocutor’s background. Therefore, Yuzuki has developed discursive practices that are socioculturally adaptable and interpersonally relational, prioritising the cultural aspects of communication. This finding features strongly in Yuzuki’s interview (see Table 4:14). The table shows that Yuzuki highlights the culture element and the politeness element on six and
four occasions respectively. Meanwhile, in Savannah’s interview, she confirms her awareness of Yuzuki’s overlapping utterances in the extract:

She is really interested as to how we do it, because she doesn’t know it. She doesn’t live with other people... Now I’m no longer the only one asking the question. She interrupts me and says ‘well how do you really do that?’ So yeah, we are more interacting with each other I would say... I think it also has something to do with her being from Japan that this is a cultural thing, because the way I perceive people from Asia generally, very friendly, very quiet people that are not necessarily as open as I am, or other people from Western Europe.

Savannah 5:1

At an affective level, Savannah monitors the extent to which Yuzuki is engaged in the interaction by inferring her interest from overlaps. For Savannah, not only do Yuzuki’s overlaps signal her interest in the topic, but they also indicate that the discourse pattern is changing globally - from the initial mechanical question-answer-question pattern to the more interactive pattern as is described in her comment above. Savannah is more concerned with the development of discourse patterns, and is able to compare and contrast patterns across different stages in the interaction. Furthermore, Savannah’s preconception of her partner’s background also underpins the way that she interacts with Yuzuki. This is in line with Yuzuki’s understanding discussed earlier. Both Savannah’s and Yuzuki’s discourse patterns - overlaps, interruptions and questioning – are potentially shaped by their wider social and affective understanding of themselves as well as their partners.

The findings of the interaction data also suggest that L2 listeners’ awareness of collaborative completions as a discourse pattern may help to shape cognitive attunement. In other words, the process of L2 listeners contributing to collaborative completions also could signal agreement which may serve to regulate the discourse at a global level. In the following example, Mara and Harry discuss the stolen butter issue.

Mara: Yeah, did you just talk to him about it and stuff? Did your whole flat talk to him about it or?
Harry: Well there's a problem there, because there's an issue with Chinese people and confrontation.
Mara: Oh yeah
Harry: Culturally speaking, they do not want to confront people. They are not the confronting type
Mara: the confronting type
Harry: the confronting type. I think that that might be a cultural thing. In my case, since I'm from Latin America, you just went like that <gesture>,
Mara: That's not okay.
Harry: probably like yeah you have to respect people's things, and you know,
Prior to this extract, Mara only provides minimal responses to Harry’s account of his unhygienic flatmate. Her questions in Lines 1-2 mark the fact that the interaction has become more interactive. Furthermore, Mara’s utterance in Line 8 complements Harry’s previous unfinished utterance, which is an example of Mara actively participating in the interaction. Harry subsequently confirms Mara’s completion by repeating it. Mara comments on this instance of completion in the following comment:

I guess it was to show that I understood what he wanted to say. Yeah, it just began to show him that I did understand what he was saying and I did agree with him.

For Mara, the function of collaborative completions is to signal understanding and agreement. Mara’s response in Line 8 therefore, apart from acknowledging her own understanding of the preceding utterance, also provides Harry with the information about the degree of cognitive attunement between the two. This cognitive attunement contributes to the regulation their follow-up interaction at a global level. Harry echoes Mara’s understanding in the following comment:

She was affirming to my statement… It shows she can connect to what I’m saying, and it probably shows that she has had some similar experience… she made me feel that she understood the situation.

In Harry 5:1, Harry shares Mara’s view on collaborative completions in interaction. For Harry, Mara’s completion may indicate that she is able to establish a link between her understanding of the preceding utterance and her prior knowledge. The cognitive attunement between Harry and Mara therefore is reflected in the collaborative completion delineated above. This temporary attunement in the discourse and thought dimensions is the result of reciprocal monitoring and control between both participants. The interaction flows naturally from Line 9.

The following example illustrates a different type of collaborative completion. While this type of completion may also require a certain degree of cognitive attunement between both parties, it can be considered, to a large extent, to be based on L2 listeners’ discrepancy in terms of language proficiency. This is thus a unique feature for L2 learners. In the following extract, Megan and Jane discuss the stolen butter issue. Compared to the interaction prior to
this extract where Megan seemed to dominate the interaction with her elaboration on her current flat-sharing situations, here Megan deliberately opts to be the listener and contributes only verbally when necessary.

Jane: Probably yeah I will try first to, just to gather everybody, to invite everybody for, for instance, for a cup of tea,
Megan: Mhm
5 Jane: just to, to be polite,
Megan: Okay
Jane: and just to discuss. And also yeah we just, uh like everybody has his own space in the fridge so we obviously know
10 Megan: where it
Jane: Yeah, but I don't know what it will be, for instance, it will continue like
Megan: Mm
Jane: and you couldn't just notice who did it,
15 Megan: Mm yeah
Jane: Maybe if we’ve discussed it like once or twice, then I probably will write a letter to yeah like to our who home <gesture>
Megan: Porter?
20 Jane: No, uh <2> like the girls who you know work well not work in the dormitory but
Megan: Resident assistant.
Jane: Yeah resident assistant, and I will go to discuss with them probably.
25 Megan: Okay
Jane: But I I’m always more like 'oh I will do this and this', but usually I just do it in my mind, and do nothing like I don't like get angry with other people.
Megan: Okay.

Megan-Jane 5:1

Similar to the minimal responses that Jane has provided in earlier parts of the interaction, in this extract Megan also provides minimal responses as she listens to Jane from Lines 1 to 15. However, Megan listens very attentively as can be illustrated by her utterance in Line 10 in which she predicts Jane’s utterance. This is the beginning of the dyad working in a collaborative manner. Although verbal contributions may still seem imbalanced, the fact that Megan actively adjusts her ways of listening shows her awareness of the dialogical nature of the listening process. Worthy of particular mention is the part where Jane has trouble thinking of the word ‘resident assistant’ in Lines 16-23. She uses a combination of hand gestures, eye contact and hesitations as strategies to signal her request for assistance. Megan notices the linguistic difficulties that Jane is experiencing from Line 16:

I think at this point when she was talking, it dawned on me more that she's not too fluent in English. I need to listen to her more, ... I need to like pay more attention, so
she can think and talk more rather than me chipping in and interrupting what she's saying … When she said ‘the girl that works’, I thought okay she’s missing the, she’s trying to remember the word.

Megan 5:1

Not only does Megan listen to Jane’s elaboration attentively, she also monitors Jane’s language competence on an ongoing basis. Megan adjusts her way of interacting with Jane so that she could direct more attention to the listening process. For example, she deliberately avoids overlapping and talking too much. Megan offers to complete Jane’s utterance in Lines 19 and 22. Megan’s active prediction and completion of Jane’s thought and discourse in the listening process requires a certain degree of cognitive attunement in which the monitoring of both oneself and the other is crucial: Megan monitors her own verbal contributions as she directs her attention to the evaluation of Jane’s language competence.

In this section, I have focused on L2 listeners’ understanding of the co-regulation of two particular discourse patterns – overlaps and collaborative completions. The findings suggest that overlaps and completions at the discourse level are often linked to the co-regulation of thought processes. In other words, beyond the discursive functions, overlaps and completions could indicate L2 listeners’ awareness of the monitoring and control process and the extent to which cognitive attunement is achieved in the joint creation of shared understanding. The listener, as the co-regulator of the discourse, apart from regulating his/her own understanding of the utterances, also regulates the interlocutor and the discourse as a whole (see also Section 5.2).

5.1.2 The negotiation of shared understanding

Having outlined some of the key aspects in the creation of shared understanding, this section aims to exemplify the negotiation process. More specifically, the discussion will focus on instances where communication is not assumed, and meaning has to be negotiated. The first example is from the Savannah-Yuzuki dyad. The participants negotiate for a shared understanding after Yuzuki has used the singular pronoun ‘she’ when referring to Savannah’s flatmates. This is the first instance that this happens.

Yuzuki: She didn't, didn't care about that or?
Savannah: No no, like I was living, the problem was I was living with undergraduate students in their first year,
Yuzuki: Mm
Savannah: [so, they were just moving out of their home,
Yuzuki: [Yeah that happens.
Savannah: and they were used to mummy doing everything: doing the cleaning, doing the cooking, doing everything,
Yuzuki: Ah
Savannah: and now they had to do all of it by themselves,
Yuzuki: Mhm
Savannah: and yeah just didn't do it.
Yuzuki: Did she make any progress during the year?
Savannah: No no.
Yuzuki: No?
Savannah: –Also no, as I said, I was living with 8 people,
Yuzuki: Uhh
Savannah: and, there was one other girl uh and I we used we tried
to clean everything in the mutual room,
Yuzuki: Mm
Savannah: all thing, but at one point [you
Yuzuki: [So you guy’s mum? Yeah. <laugh>
Savannah: Yeah yeah, we were the apartment Mums, yeah that’s <2> a
good way of putting it. No, we did it, and at one point
we stopped doing it because it’s like it’s not our job,
Yuzuki: Mm.
Savannah: and then–
Yuzuki: –It’s not reasonable.
Savannah: No it’s not.

Savannah-Yuzuki 5:2

Prior to this extract, Savannah has introduced her dirty flatmates in Wales as an example of
the cleaning issue. Yuzuki’s question in Line 1, the overlap in Line 6 and the three receipt
tokens show that she is actively engaged in the listening process. However, it is Yuzuki’s use
of the singular pronoun in her question that makes Savannah feel unsure about Yuzuki’s
understanding. Savannah re-introduces her past flat-sharing experience without correcting
Yuzuki’s pronoun usage directly. What is interesting is that following Savannah’s implicit
feedback, Yuzuki continues to use the singular pronoun ‘she’ in her question in Line 13.
Savannah emphasises the fact that she lived with eight people (Line 16). Again, it is
Savannah’s indirect way of pointing out her confusion about Yuzuki’s linguistic choice. In
Savannah’s interview, she discusses her temporary feeling of confusion regarding Yuzuki’s
linguistic choice:

I think the problem I had here was that she referred to them as ‘she’, she said ‘she?
’did she make progress?’, and in my mind, I have established earlier in the
conversation that I was living with eight people, so I think that’s what confused me a
little bit, and probably confused her, too … I didn’t know, ‘are we on the same page?’
‘does she understand what I’m trying to communicate?’ … See here I’m trying to, I’m
not correcting her directly, but I’m referring to back when I said it earlier … trying to
re-establish that we’re not talking about one person, but actually, a whole bunch of
dirty roommates.

Savannah 5:2

Savannah’s comment shows that she is aware of monitoring the ongoing shared
understanding and regulates the discourse accordingly. Having noticed Yuzuki’s use of the
singular pronoun instead of the plural one when referring to her flatmates, Savannah opts to
correct her implicitly by offering further explanations about the situation in her previous flat. Similar to her response earlier (Line 2), Savannah’s strategy is to re-iterate the common ground that she was living with a group of people rather than one person in an implicit manner. Apart from monitoring Yuzuki’s linguistic choice, the comment above indicates that Savannah also monitors Yuzuki’s understanding. Savannah regulates Yuzuki’s understanding by reformulating her account in the hope of establishing a shared understanding between the two.

Despite Savannah’s temporary confusion and Yuzuki’s seemingly erroneous use of a pronoun, the overlap in Lines 21-22 and the metaphoric question ‘so you guy’s mum?’ suggest that Yuzuki has indeed understood the meaning of Savannah’s account. Savannah’s responses and confirmations in Lines 23-24 and Line 29 also indicate that the pair is able to communicate in a coherent manner. According to Yuzuki’s subsequent interview, she assumes the role of the listener when Savannah starts to talk about her flat-sharing experience in Wales whereby Yuzuki is very aware of the importance of showing understanding as the listener:

\[\text{I thought she’s really into this topic, and she’s back to her memory on, she’s back in Wales, so, so I thought I should be the listener this time, and it’s important to show my understanding to the problem… I opened my eyes to show, show that kind of feeling - surprising.}\]

Yuzuki 5:2

Here Yuzuki monitors Savannah’s level of interest, and subsequently adopts the role of the listener. She is aware of the importance of showing understanding when listening to her partner. She utilises strategies such as questioning, receipt tokens and even facial expressions to show her attentiveness and understanding. Compared to Savannah who is primarily concerned with the monitoring of the other’s language usage, Yuzuki highlights the listener’s responsibility as a co-regulator of the discourse (see also Section 5.2).

The analysis of Savannah and Yuzuki’s interaction extract in tandem with their retrospective comments show that in the event of problems with language forms or proficiency issues, the communication can still be maintained provided that the interlocutors negotiate with each other in a reciprocal manner. In this example, Savannah’s and Yuzuki’s awareness of the co-regulation process goes beyond the negotiation of linguistic meanings; Savannah monitors Yuzuki’s understanding and reformulates the way that her account is presented, whereas Yuzuk monitors Savannah’s level of interest in the topic and understands the importance of showing understanding in the listening process.
Compared to the Savannah-Yuzuki dyad presented in the preceding example, the negotiation of shared understanding in the following example is more direct. In the extract below, Nicole and Gary discuss the solution to the rent/bill issue. The interruptions, overlaps and hesitations demonstrate that the listener monitors and adjusts the utterances of him/herself on an ongoing basis during the negotiation process.

Gary: 'One of the flatmates never pays the rent/bills on time’. Mm. 'In fact, the landlord might come to talk to you about this.’ Mm possible solution? Move the flat? <laugh>

Nicole: <laugh> Yeah <2>

Gary: Because yeah that's quite a big thing.

Nicole: Yeah I think for the rent, probably fine because sometimes the landlord have the individual contract with [individual flatmate]

Gary: [Yeah exactly, but for bills [someone

Nicole: [they share

Gary: Yeah it's all shared, so someone has to pay all the bills, then that's not that's not good. <4> Yeah I would I would

Nicole: Yeah

Gary: I would yeah consider-

Nicole: -You can't really force people to give you money

Gary: Yeah

Nicole: whenever you want.

Gary: Yeah I know. I I would I would consider moving the flat. That would be my solution because if if this continues for a long time then

Nicole: Yeah

Gary: it's it's a problem. There's no point kind of stressing out about it.

Nicole: But if it's just like one week.

Gary: Yeah, but it's says like 'they never pay the bill on time' so.

Nicole: Oh

Gary: That means that it's a long-standing problem so.

Nicole: Yeah yeah

This extract exemplifies how shared understanding is negotiated. Gary introduces the issue, and offers a solution as early as Line 3. The remaining part of this extract sees Gary and Nicole negotiate the suitability of this solution. One noticeable feature throughout the extract is the pattern of interruptions and completions. For example, Nicole’s overlapping completion in Line 11 may suggest the active listenership in which she contributes to, and participates in, the interaction. In Lines 17 and 19, Nicole interrupts Gary’s utterance, and points out issues that Gary’s solution might cause. Not convinced by Gary, Nicole poses another argument in Line 26. One prominent feature in Gary’s discourse is hesitation.
Although Gary offers his solution to the rent/bills issue very early, he does not seem to want to impose his idea to Nicole. Gary’s hesitations include the pause in Line 13 and the self-repetitions in Lines 13-14, 20-21, 24. Gary’s utterances are regulated by his continuous monitoring of Nicole’s understanding and the level of mutual agreement between the two as the comment below illustrates:

When I initially mentioned, I think she seemed not very receptive, so I was hesitant to bring it back again … But maybe she didn’t realise that it was long-term solution, and I think I mentioned that later.

Gary 5:2

This comment shows that Gary is aware of Nicole’s reception of his proposed solution. His subsequent utterances therefore consist of a number of self-repetitions and pauses. These features represent the process of negotiating shared understanding at the discourse level. The negotiation of shared understanding also involves Gary monitoring Nicole’s understanding whilst regulating the discourse. Moreover, Gary is aware of the task demand as he points out the task requirement to Nicole explicitly (Lines 27-28). Nicole reflects on the use of overlap in the interview comment below:

I know I’m interrupting, I was interrupting him, but sometimes I consider it’s my problem that I’m thinking by myself and speaking it loud without like considering people around talking, yeah.

Nicole 5:2

The comment above shows that Nicole is aware of the interruptions and overlaps initiated by herself. She considers them to be inconsiderate. This understanding is in contrast to the view provided by other participants in this study, especially Yuzuki (see Section 5.1.1), who adapts to the changing functionality of interruptions and overlaps across different cultures. As was discussed earlier, Yuzuki deliberately interrupts or overlaps with her partner in order to participate in the conversation when she communicates in English.

The findings presented in this section suggest that indeed, for L2 learners, proficiency issues can sometimes lead to the listener’s temporary feelings of confusion; the negotiation of shared understanding may go beyond the discourse level. The listener’s awareness of his or her role as the co-regulator of the interaction and the continuous monitoring of the other’s understanding are also crucial in the negotiation of a shared understanding. The next section will further explore the notion of the listener as the co-regulator of the discourse.
5.2 *The listener as the co-regulator of the discourse*

The preceding section has exemplified L2 listeners’ co-construction and negotiation of shared understanding in action and the ways in which their awareness of the discourse, thought and the social-affective dimensions contribute to this dialogical process. The present section seeks to explicate the notion of the listener as the co-regulator of the discourse through the means of the regulation of verbal contributions. Such regulation involves the listener in planning, monitoring and maintaining the balance of verbal contributions. The section also explores the way in which L2 listeners regulate imbalanced contributions.

In the following extract, Savannah and Yuzuki continue with their discussion about the party issue. Although the pair has already agreed on a solution, Savannah decides to extend this discussion and introduces her past experience at a Latin American party. The example presents findings with regard to L2 listener’s awareness of planning the local as well as global levels of the discourse.

Savannah: I was invited to a to a party by someone from Latin America,
Yuzuki: Mm
Savannah: and he said the party would start at 8, which I thought was really early,
Yuzuki: Mm
Savannah: so knowing that people from Latin America start showing up late,
Yuzuki: Mm
Savannah: we showed up at 10, most people didn't show up until midnight,
Yuzuki: Mm
Savannah: so that whole cultural <gesture>
Yuzuki: Yeah midnight is better, and always, they wouldn't go back um even at 2 o'clock in the morning,
Savannah: Mhm
Yuzuki: so, try to imply to <gesture> <laugh>
Savannah: Yeah like <laugh> -
Yuzuki: - like personal feeling like ['Please' <laugh> <gesture>
Savannah: [slowly, kind of very subtly, yeah I know. <laugh> <gesture>

Savannah-Yuzuki 5:3

In the first half of this extract (Lines 1-13), Yuzuki’s responses ‘mm’ signal her listenership as Savannah’s account unfolds. Line 13 is an instance of the ellipsis where Savannah initiates a turn with only the subject ‘that whole cultural’, which is followed by hand gestures. She assumes that Yuzuki would have a similar implicit understanding of what she means by cultural difference. The use of the receipt token ‘yeah’, followed by further illustrations, indicates not only Yuzuki’s acknowledgement of Savannah’s assumption, but also her
understanding of the other’s intended meanings. Yuzuki’s contributions therefore may be attributable to the fact that meaning and understanding are co-constructed or negotiated reciprocally.

In addition, Line 13 marks the end of Savannah leading the conversation. Yuzuki’s monitoring of Savannah leads her to shift her role in the conversation. This may be guided by her view of how responsibilities should be shared in the listening process. The anaphoric use of the pronoun ‘they’ in Line 14 when referring to most Latin American people shows that Yuzuki is able to communicate with Savannah in a coherent manner. Moreover, the mixture of hand gestures, ‘laugh’, latching and incomplete utterances from Lines 17 to 21 could be interpreted as the process of the pair achieving a level of joint understanding, which may be due to politeness as Yuzuki’s comment below suggests:

I avoided direct expression to be more polite. I wanted to say 'please go back home', but it sounded more offensive, so I just implied by using gestures... I was quite happy that she understood what I wanted to say.

Yuzuki 5:3

Compared to Savannah, Yuzuki is more concerned with the fact that they have just met and that being polite is vital. As her comment indicates, the use of elements in the local discourse dimension such as hand gestures, completion is a way of showing politeness, which further demonstrates her awareness of the interconnectedness between the discourse dimension and the social-affective dimension. The politeness element in the social dimension features quite heavily in Yuzuki’s data. Table 4:14 in Chapter 4 shows that it occurred 4 times in her interview data. The strategy to use these local discourse elements contributes to the local planning of the discourse. In contrast, Savannah demonstrates her awareness of the continuous monitoring of the discourse at a global level:

In the beginning I was the one asking the questions, and encouraging her to talk, well then here yes, I'm also the one who's, you know, participating more in the conversation by providing additional information and not just the questions.

Savannah 5:3

Not only is Savannah aware of her own role in the conversation, she is also aware of Yuzuki’s. Savannah shifts her role from being the active listener who encourages the other to talk to being the active contributor. Her deliberate planning of participation in the listening process is relational to her understanding of Yuzuki’s role in the interaction at a global level.
The analysis of the extract above shows that both Savannah and Yuzuki are concerned with the listeners’ contributions and roles in the discourse. While Yuzuki prioritises the planning of the discourse at a local level, Savannah highlights the planning of the discourse at a global level. This finding is consistent with what was revealed in Table 4:14.

The findings presented in the following two extracts explore this issue further. More specifically, attention is paid to the ways in which L2 learners’ regulation of verbal contributions is linked to the regulation of discourse patterns.

In the next extract, Megan and Jane discuss the stolen butter issue. This extract is taken from the middle of their discussion. Prior to it, Megan has been elaborating on her current situation in the flat and the solution that they have agreed on. As Jane was listening to Megan, she only provided minimal responses (occasional nods or the response token ‘mhm’). In this extract, however, Jane begins to produce verbal contributions beyond minimal responses from Line 4.

Megan: and you have to use somebody's, so and then the person knows when I'm borrowing these. <6> So what do you think, assuming you find yourself?
Jane: Um mm I mean probably if it will be once or twice
Megan: Mm
Jane: I will think that somebody just made a mistake,
Megan: Mhm
Jane: so I will definitely do nothing. These things happens, like it was also some disappeared all my fruit,
Megan: Okay
Jane: and I was like 'What?' and then I found probably like cleaning lady clean kitchen,
Megan: Oh
Jane: she just mixed boxes,
Megan: Oh, okay

Megan-Jane 5:2

In the example above, the six-second pause is quite significant. Following the pause, Megan directs a question to Jane in an explicit way (Lines 2-3). Interestingly, Although Megan’s question is incomplete: ‘so what do you think, assuming you find yourself (in that situation)’, Jane understands the meaning, and responds accordingly. Megan adopts the role of the listener from Line 4 as Jane elaborates on her opinions. To a certain extent, the role of the listener is negotiated in an explicit way. In other words, Megan deliberately asks Jane the question in Lines 2-3 in order to elicit more verbal contributions from her. Megan’s comment below illustrate her thought processes at the moment:
It occurred to me that I was doing most of the talking, and then I realised that the task was supposed to be collaborative… During that pause I was thinking 'okay, how do I bring her into the discussion?'

Megan 5:2

Megan is aware of the imbalanced verbal contributions between Jane and her. This is the result of her continuous monitoring of the global discourse pattern. Her decision to ask Jane the question therefore is a means of changing the pattern so that they can have a more balanced distribution of contributions. Megan’s strategy to question Jane about her view on this issue suggests her awareness of the local discourse element question and its function in regulating the discourse pattern. Jane, in the meantime, expects a question from Megan as her comment from the follow-up interview illustrates:

Now she asked me a question, okay yeah, I was waiting for her question… She asked to like, in a way to give initiative to me.

Jane 5:1

Jane’s comment above complements Megan’s comment earlier. Jane waits for her partner to ask the question so that she can answer the question. The fact that she is able to comment on the process shows that she understanding of the function of questioning. Her verbal contributions in the extract above, however, can be considered to be relatively passive or other-initiated. Therefore, the discourse pattern of the interaction, including Jane’s verbal contributions is, to a large extent, regulated by Megan.

As a recurring theme in the interview data, L2 learners’ use of verbal contributions to regulate discourse patterns is often perceived as a shared responsibility. The extract below is another extract from the Savannah-Yuzuki dyad. This is the opening of their interaction in which they discuss the party issue in flat sharing. This extract exemplifies L2 listeners’ awareness of the responsibility to make verbal contributions in order to regulate discourse patterns.

Savannah: Have you ever had a problem with a roommate or flatmate who invites friends all over the like over all the time?

Yuzuki: Mm. I live in the Sugarhouse, and I live in a studio, Savannah: <nod>

Yuzuki: so actually I don't have this kind of problem for me, but I suppose I have a couple of friends who is always or:: always organise the party downstairs,

Savannah: Mhm.

Yuzuki: and it might be the problem so.

Savannah: So you don't hear people like in their apartment next to you having parties? <gesture>
Yuzuki: Yes yes yes.
Savannah: You do?
Yuzuki: Mhm. <1> I'm not organising party in my flat, but my next door, the person from, who lives in next door organise party sometimes.
Savannah: <nod>
Yuzuki: It's a bit noisy but, and I don't care about that.
Savannah: So you haven't haven't really talked to him about it, have you, or her?
Yuzuki: No.
Savannah: No, it's not that bad.
Yuzuki: No, not that bad.
Savannah: Okay.

Savannah-Yuzuki 5:4

In this extract, Savannah assumes the role of the listener following her initiation of the conversation. A series of verbal and nonverbal feedback, such as nodding, backchannels and questioning, are used. A salient feature of the example is that Savannah, as the listener, actually initiates new turns (Line 11 and Lines 20-21). Her verbal responses serve the function of shaping the global pattern of the interaction. Yuzuki, on the other hand, does not ask Savannah any questions. Her utterances are either explanatory or confirmatory. This pattern is consistent throughout this extract, and is very similar to the pattern in the Megan-Jane dyad I discussed in the preceding extract.

From Line 11, the negotiation of meaning becomes more explicit. Savannah initially predicts that Yuzuki cannot hear the noise of her neighbours having parties (Lines 11-12), but Yuzuki’s affirmative response leads Savannah to use a confirmation check by asking ‘you do?’ After a brief pause, Yuzuki offers further clarification of her situation. The whole extract shows the cyclical process of how Savannah, as the listener, assumes, revises and confirms her thoughts. An array of metacognitive strategies such as monitoring, predicting and revising contributes to this discourse pattern. Savannah’s verbal contributions in this extract, though imbalanced compared to Yuzuki’s, highlight the deliberate control of the discourse so as to support her partner. This collaborative endeavour can also be explained by her nonverbal responses (Lines 5 and 14) and the hand gestures in Line 12.

Therefore, apart from the orchestration of metacognitive strategies, Savannah is also responsible for regulating the discourse pattern. Taken from Savannah’s retrospective interview, the following comment represents Savannah’s perception of the monitoring and control process:

I was just like asking her if she can like hear the people next to her, as a means of, you know, keeping the conversation going, and probably not having an awkward
silence ... I think at the beginning of the conversation, I was the one asking questions and encouraging her to keep going.

Savannah 5:4

Rather than being concerned with local linguistic meanings, Savannah uses questions strategically to encourage her partner to talk. The comment suggests that not only is Savannah actively engaged in the listening process, but she also has a sense of responsibility for maintaining the flow of the interaction. This sense of responsibility, albeit not evident in this very extract, is shared by Yuzuki. In her interview, Yuzuki echoes the importance of the listener’s responsibility to maintain the flow of the conversation:

I think both of us have the responsibility to talk, and in my understanding, either of us shouldn’t be the dominant in the conversation, and in my understanding I have to talk as much as she does, and I have to let her talk as much as I do so.

Yuzuki 5:4

According to the comment above, Yuzuki shares Savannah’s view, in that she recognises her responsibility to regulate the discourse pattern as the listener. The analysis of the preceding two extracts indicates that the listener’s awareness of regulating the discourse pattern in terms of balancing verbal contributions is often related to the strategy of asking questions at the discourse level. L2 learners’ awareness of the listener as the co-regulator of the discourse entails that the responsibility to make verbal contribution may be shared and attuned bilaterally.

Having examined L2 listeners’ understanding of the ways in which they maintain and balance discourse patterns, the following two extracts discuss the regulation of imbalanced contributions. This study suggests that listeners’ lack of verbal contributions does not necessarily indicate a lack of interest or attention. But rather, imbalanced verbal contributions can still indicate that the listener is actively engaged in the interaction. The following extract is the beginning of Caitlin and Lena’s discussion about the cleaning issue.

Caitlin: You want to do number 4 again?
Lena: Mhm. <4> You probably talk to people, just tell or make a schedule or something like that about who cleans.

Caitlin: I had that problem. I would always clean the kitchen, and every morning that I wake up, and it would be a mess, and I mean I was fine with the kitchen because you know I make a mess in the kitchen as well, but I clean afterwards,

Lena: <nod>

Caitlin: so I would clean no matter what. But when it came to the bathroom, ah it was a bit too much, so one of my flatmates actually made a sign and telling the flatmates
who was making a mess to actually clean after
themselves,

15 Lena: <nod>
Caitlin: and like do something, and it kind of resolved the
problem to actually have the sign,
Lena: <nod>
Caitlin: because they were paying attention and like,
Lena: <nod>
Caitlin: they knew that if not they would annoy other people.

Lena-Caitlin 5:1

As soon as Caitlin introduces the new topic, Lena jumps directly to the solution. Caitlin, on
the other hand, assumes the floor by introducing the situation in her flat. The prevailing
feature in this extract is that Lena’s responses as the listener are minimal: only occasional
nods. Moreover, this pattern is consistent throughout almost the entire interaction. Lena has
a tendency not to ask questions in interactions as her comment in the subsequent interview
suggests:

I’m quite aware I always do that (asking questions)... I think it’s like personal issue...
Yeah I usually don’t ask questions. I’m very, yeah I don’t ask. It’s not that I would not
be interested but I always expect people would like to tell me that they would tell me,
so I don’t want to be annoying or. But on the other hand, when people ask me, I
don’t find annoying, so I don’t know yeah.

Lena 5:1

The comment indicates that Lena is very aware of her tendency to avoid asking questions in
the listening process. In fact, not only does she not ask questions, but she expects her partner
to contribute voluntarily. This expectation of the other questioning is in sharp contrast to the
majority of the other participants in this study for whom the use the questioning strategy
fulfils a variety of functions (cf. Savannah). Caitlin also comments on her perception of this
prevailing pattern in her interview:

I guess I noticed a bit, but then not that much, well not to the point that I would get
annoyed that she didn’t ask any questions at all, because obviously we had a
conversation before, I talked about my own experiences. After a while, I wasn’t
feeling too uncomfortable next to her talking... maybe the first question I was a bit, I
didn’t know what to expect so yeah.

Caitlin 5:1

Although Caitlin is aware of the lack of questioning from Lena in the interaction, she is able
to adjust her expectations and level of comfort. Caitlin’s discourse adjustment is relational
and reciprocal to her partner’s characteristics. In the meantime, while Lena’s responses may
seem minimal compared to Caitlin’s, she actively empathises with Caitlin by positioning
herself in that situation. The following comment illustrates this interpretation:
... if it (the solution) would work in our flat, we should make a sign on the door which would say. I don't know actually what it would say, but yeah, and then yeah, I was wondering what the sign would say... Yeah I was thinking if it would work in our flat or if we should set up a rota.

Lena 5:2

The fact that Lena forms a mental image of Caitlin’s account is essential for achieving a shared understanding. In terms of listeners’ verbal contributions, Lena’s participation in the interaction may seem quite passive, as no utterance is produced by her from Line 4. However, looking beyond the discourse level, Lena is actively engaged in the listening process. She forms mental images as she listens to Caitlin, and situates herself in the scenario.

In sum, the analysis of the extract above suggests that although Lena and Caitlin’s expectations of discourse contributions might be misaligned, Lena’s active engagement and Caitlin’s adjustment of her expectations enable the conversation to flow without communication breakdown. In line with this view, the following example explores another possible explanation for the regulation of imbalanced verbal contributions in the listening process. The extract below is the beginning of Kailee and Tara’s interaction.

Kailee: Okay so, do you have any preference as to which of these to choose first?
Tara: No actually no. It's the same for me.
Kailee: Um well, I'm sharing my flat here with this girl from Germany.
Tara: Mhm
Kailee: So far it's been going reasonably well, though there have been moments I've I've not been happy sharing.
Tara: <nod>
Kailee: Um I suppose it's due to the limitations that money imposes, because I would prefer to live by myself but,
Tara: Mm
Kailee: but it's much cheaper to share with somebody, so obviously you run into some of these problems.
Tara: <nod>
Kailee: I suppose they're unavoidable, and for instance uh food was also a problem um. I had previously never had any experience sharing a flat with anybody. It's the first time I've done this,
Tara: <nod>
Kailee: and I never really set out to clarify things right from the start
Tara: <nod>
Kailee: and say we should do this rather than that. I just went along saw what happened, and food sharing turned out to be a problem because I was buying things and in my head there was this image of what things I had already in the
house, but as I came home certain things I just found missing, and at one point it got really really annoying,

Tara:

Mm

The distinct feature in the extract above is that Tara’s verbal contributions are limited to occasional nodding and response tokens such as ‘mhm’, ‘mm’ from Line 4. It is therefore evident that there is a significant difference between Tara’s and Kailee’s contributions to the conversation. Kailee’s question in Lines 1-2 signals her intention to negotiate their collaborative approach to the task explicitly. Kailee’s decision to initiate the conversation and to ask Tara about her preference shows her awareness of planning the discourse at a global level. This is illustrated by her comment below:

Usually it seems like I have this tendency to take over conversations, and I kind of try to make sure it wasn’t the case … When I chose the food problem, the second one on the list, I was sort of trying to make this hierarchy of more important problems in my head. I didn’t take them in their order, which she tended to do, and I thought that was quite interesting, so from that I sort of inferred that she was more detached from the subject.

Kailee’s comment above indicates that although she tries to avoid dominating the conversation, her attempt is unsuccessful. The interaction extract shows that she actually produces significantly more utterances than Tara. Given that this is the beginning of their discussion, Kailee is primarily concerned with the sequencing of the flat-sharing issues to discuss. Her intention to organise the issues into the order of importance indicates her awareness of planning in the discourse and the thought dimensions. Moreover, she is also aware of the difference between her and her partner’s approaches to the task. Tara, on the other hand, comments that she is mainly concerned with the evaluation of Kailee’s linguistic competence at the beginning of their interaction:

I was pretty much occupied by her own knowledge of English, right? I was thinking about how she expressed herself, and what kind of words she was using or I was analysing her in a way … maybe I was competing in a way … especially, yes, when it comes to foreign languages.

Rather than paying attention to the sequencing of the task, Tara evaluates Kailee’s English language proficiency whilst listening to her. According to Tara, she applies this strategy when she listens to speakers for whom English is a foreign language. She sometimes even competes with the other. It is worth noting at this point, that she is the only participant in
In this study who feels the need to compete in communication. Tara subsequently comments on her role as the listener:

Well I love being a listener. That's my personality first of all. It has nothing to do with the language... It's always something funny when one person is more active than the other actually.

Tara 5:2

The comment above reveals that Tara monitors the imbalance in verbal contributions. She attributes this imbalance to her personality rather than her lack of language proficiency. To a certain extent, both Tara and Kailee establish the link between imbalanced contributions and personality differences. For Kailee, it is the tendency to dominate the conversation; for Tara, it is the tendency to take up the role of the listener. Their respective roles in the interaction extract above therefore are complementary: Kailee is responsible for leading the conversation, whereas Tara listens to and acknowledges Kailee’s verbal contributions. More importantly, their respective roles are assumed implicitly rather than negotiated explicitly, resulting in the seemingly imbalanced verbal contributions in the extract.

This is another example of the argument I put forward earlier regarding the regulation of the discourse. Whilst the lack of verbal contributions may suggest that the listener adopts a passive role in the listening process, it can also be the result of their misalignment in the monitoring process. In this case, Kailee is primarily concerned with planning the discourse and sequencing the task; Tara focuses on evaluating Kailee’s English competence. Tara’s emphasis on the evaluation of her partner’s English competence is consistent throughout the entire interaction (see also Table 4:15). The misalignment in the monitoring process is complemented by the fact that they are able to assume dialogical roles in listening, which ensures the natural flow of the interaction.

In this section, I proposed the notion of ‘the listener as the co-regulator of the discourse’. This notion builds on the findings presented in the preceding section regarding the co-construction and negotiation process in which L2 listeners create shared understanding. I argued that it is the listener’s monitoring and control of verbal and non-verbal contributions that helps to shape and regulate the discourse. In my discussion, I focused on L2 listeners’ verbal contributions and the way in which they were utilised for planning, monitoring, regulating and maintaining the balance of the discourse. I also examined instances of imbalanced verbal contributions and how listeners assumed reciprocal roles in the conversation to ensure the flow of the interaction. In the next section, I will outline two
specific kinds of negotiation in discourse: the negotiation of sequencing and the negotiation of transitions.
5.3 Negotiating sequencing and transitions

5.3.1 Explicit negotiation

The findings from the preceding two sections in this chapter have concluded that listening involves the co-construction and negotiation of shared understanding in which the listener is the co-regulator of the discourse. This section looks at a specific co-regulation feature in the discourse – the negotiation of sequencing and transitions. My findings show that L2 listeners in this study were often engaged in either more explicit or more implicit negotiation of their approaches to the task. In the following two extracts, Harry and Mara negotiate the sequencing and transitions of the discourse in an explicit manner. The first extract is from the beginning of their interaction.

Harry: Okay shall we go?
Mara: Sure, from one to five?
Harry: From one to five yes.
Mara: Yeah, okay. Okay um so the first one is 'some flatmates like to invite friends and organise parties at night without asking others first.'

**Harry-Mara 5:2**

In the extract above, Harry initiates the conversation. Mara follows up by confirming the sequencing of the issues to be discussed. Harry then repeats Mara’s proposal to show his agreement. Mara thus goes on to read the first issue in the task. On the discourse level, the interaction between Harry and Mara flows naturally – there are no undue pauses, overlaps or communication breakdown. In the following comment, Harry comments on his initial thought process:

Okay, at the point I wasn't even, I didn't even need to tell her what I was thinking ... because at first it would be polite to let the lady choose the order; and second because it would be good for us to have an order to talk to.

**Harry 5:2**

This comment shows that not only does Harry monitor Mara’s personal traits and observe conventional social rules, but he also monitors the way that they approach the task. Given that this is the opening of their interaction and that they have just met, Harry realises the importance of both the social dimension and the global planning of the discourse. On the one hand, his listening process is regulated by his awareness of the gender difference between himself and his partner. Giving up the opportunity to regulate sequencing is the direct result of his awareness of this social dimension. On the other hand, Harry understands the importance of sequencing at the start of the interaction. Compared to the
other dyads, the negotiation here is explicit on the local level. This explicit negotiation of sequencing is socially underpinned by Harry’s understanding of communication.

From Mara’s perspective, there is a certain degree of hesitation. Mara’s hesitation in Line 4 ‘yeah, okay. Okay um so …’ may indicate her uncertainty. Eventually, she chooses to read out the first flat-sharing issue. In the following comment, Mara elaborates on her thoughts at the beginning of the interaction:

Okay honestly, I didn’t know how he wanted to go about it. I thought I was like ‘did you want to start in different orders or what’. That’s why I made it clear. I was like ‘one to five?’ … I thought like cos he kind of sat back, and I was like okay so maybe he’s waiting for me to read them out.

Mara 5:2

Similar to Harry, Mara is concerned about the sequencing of the task at this stage. The temporary uncertainty leads to her strategy to clarify their common approach to the task. Mara monitors and regulates the discourse by articulating her thoughts explicitly, which contributes to the negotiation of the sequencing. What is interesting here is that Mara uses the phrase ‘from one to five,’ assuming that Harry knows that she is referring to the sequencing of the task. Harry’s repetition followed by confirmation in Line 3 demonstrates that the mutuality is shared by both speakers. Mara’s strategy to take the initiative to read out the first issue is the result of her monitoring Harry. Her utterance in Line 4-6 can be considered to be relational to her partner.

The analysis of this extract therefore suggests that although the negotiation of sequencing may seem explicit, a certain degree of implicit sharedness is embedded within. The coordination between explicit negotiation and implicit sharedness is crucial to both Harry and Mara as listeners. The second extract from the Harry-Mara interaction demonstrates the explicit negotiation of transitions.

Harry: I mean if it's not working, you have to tell people.
Mara: Yeah yeah, like she'll tell me whatever.
Harry: Yeah, there is also one guy from the United States. He's also doing philosophy, and he's clean as well, so we get along, but out of 14 people if one is a mess, then the whole flat looks like a mess.

Mara: Yeah yeah absolutely.
Harry: Shall we move on?
Mara: Yeah sorry, 'One of your flatmates like to play loud music with the volume turned up. Sometimes you can hear the music in your room especially after midnight'.

Harry-Mara 5:3
In this extract, Harry and Mara negotiate the transition from the cleaning issue to the noise issue in flat sharing. The pattern here parallels the pattern in the beginning of their interaction as was discussed earlier (see Extract Harry-Mara 5.2) – this extract also demonstrates how Harry and Mara negotiate the transition in an explicit manner. Prior to this, the pair has already reached an agreement about the cleaning issue. However, Harry continues to elaborate on his situation (Lines 3-6). Mara only offers minimal verbal responses in Lines 2 and 7. Harry seeks confirmation from Mara explicitly about whether they should move on to the discussion of the next flat-sharing issue in Line 8. In the following comment, Harry elaborates on his thought process:

I was aware that we have to move on, because I, even though I don't have a watch, I could notice that we have been, we might have been approaching the time limit, so I was leading her toward speeding up.

Harry 5.3

This comment shows that Harry monitors the timing of the task, which is the result of planning the discourse on a global level. Harry is aware of the timing and how it would have an impact on the pace of the interaction. Asking whether they should move on explicitly is his strategy to regulate the discourse. In response to Harry’s question, Mara feels uncertain as the following comment suggests:

Like you know when he said 'shall we move on?' Why did he ask me, like he just assumed I'll read it … I'm like he didn't take the initiative to read it, so I had to be like 'oh okay sorry, yeah I'll carry on' … I was like okay I've read them all out. I might as well just finish reading it.

Mara 5.3

Although Mara does not understand Harry’s intention of asking the question in Line 8, she apologises and reads out the next flat-sharing issue. As the comment indicates, Mara also reflects on her verbal contributions earlier in the interaction: she realises that she has read out all of the preceding issues. Mara is very much preoccupied by her role of reading the issues in the task. Harry, as was discussed earlier however, is primarily concerned with the timing. Later in the interview, Harry explains his thought behind asking that question:

I gave her the clue to do that. When we first start the conversation I said ‘shall we’, and I basically let her lead the conversation in that regard… She's in law school. She wants to express, I mean, lawyers tend to express some desire to control the discussions, and if you can make them feel comfortable while doing that, I'll do it.

Harry 5.4
According to Harry’s second comment, he is willing to let Mara read out all the issues because of her social background – her profession as a lawyer. Moreover, he takes the affective dimension into consideration. By giving up his turn to read the next issue, he creates an environment which, he believes, is more comfortable for his partner. His utterance is therefore the result of an understanding of social and affective dimensions. This is in line with the findings in Chapter 4 (see also Table 4:22).

The analysis of the preceding two extracts shows that on the discourse level, the sequencing and transitions between Harry and Mara might seem smooth (no communication breakdown), yet the negotiation often had to be made explicit. Both Harry and Mara were aware of the thought processes of themselves as well as the others. However, their awareness was not reciprocated. Harry’s regulation of sequencing and transitions was derived from his awareness of social and affective dimensions, whereas Mara’s regulation was the result of her understanding of her role in relation to Harry.

5.3.2 Implicit negotiation

The following two examples present findings with regard to the more subtle and implicit negotiation of sequencing and transitions. The first example looks at the transition between the bill/rent issue and the cleaning issue in the Rachael-Tanner dyad. Prior to this extract, Rachael and Tanner have agreed on a solution to the bill issue. However, in the following extract Rachael redirects their attention back to the same issue when Tanner attempts to move on to the next issue.

Rachael: But this seems a little strange 'He never pays the rent on time'. Maybe it's better for us to inform him in advance or?
Tanner: Yes yes yes. That's that's a very good option. That's a very good option.
Rachael: Yeah, or I think about the flatmate maybe can get together to talk about issue, so 'every uh everyone except you didn't pay the rent on time, so maybe if you've forgotten or something’?
Tanner: Yes yeah, that's a very good thing. In terms of cleaning some flatmates [never
Rachael: [But but he will he or she will feel unhappy right?
Tanner: Yeah I think but he or she has to be responsible also because you share the same place, and the rent has to go on time, on time,
Rachael: Yeah
Tanner: and if all of you are evicted from the house because of not paying rent then it's the fault of all of you yeah?
Rachael: Mhm

Rachael-Tanner 5:1
As I mentioned earlier, this extract is preceded by the fact that the pair has already reached an agreement on the bill/rent issue. However, the fact that Rachael re-iterates the issue shows that she is not yet ready to move on to the next issue. She offers two new solutions to the problem to which Tanner responds positively. In Lines 10-11, Tanner attempts to move on to the next flat-sharing issue. The overlaps in Lines 11-12 are followed by Rachael continuing to elaborate on the previous issue despite Tanner’s apparent intention to move forward. Rachael discusses her interruption (overlap) in the following comment:

I just can't speak it out very quickly when my mind has thought about something. Obviously it is a little slower in output, but maybe he thinks I have already finished my sentence, but it's not (finished).

Rachael 5:1

Rachael is aware of her own lack of linguistic proficiency in English and its impact on the utterances that she produces. According to her, not being able to formulate responses in time contributes to the constant interruption pattern in the interaction. Rachael is primarily concerned with the local and individual monitoring and control of the discourse, paying little or no attention to the macro level of the discourse such as transitions. Tanner also notices the recurring interruption (overlapping) pattern in Rachael’s discourse and comments on this below:

This is one point where maybe she had, you know, that one idea again, so she wanted to communicate it, and she applies the same interjection yeah, interjection method that she has been using from, from the beginning.

Tanner 5:1

In this comment, Tanner discusses his awareness of the interruption (overlapping) pattern in Rachael’s utterances. He compares this specific instance to the other overlapping interruptions that Rachael has used in the preceding part of the interaction. At this point, Tanner has developed the strategy to accommodate this recurring pattern. Therefore, although Tanner proposes in Lines 10-11 that they should move on to the next topic, he negotiates the transition with Rachael in an implicit manner. In fact, it can be even argued that there is only minimal negotiation, as Tanner subsequently offers further explanations in Lines 13-15 and again in Lines 17-18 in response to Rachael’s utterances. In other words, Tanner’s regulation of his thought processes and the discourse is relational to the discourse of his partner. Hence, the transition to the next flat-sharing issue is postponed.

The analysis of the extract suggests that the negotiation of transition may be implicit, yet it requires at least one party in the conversation to be aware of the misalignment. In this case,
Tanner notices the interruption pattern that Rachael tends to apply from the start. His signal of transition (Lines 10-11) is his way of negotiating discourse patterns, which also contributes to the flow of the interaction. Rachael and Tanner negotiate the transition in an implicit manner, which is in contrast to Extract Harry-Mara 5:3.

In the second extract about the implicit negotiation of sequencing and transitions, Kailee reintroduces her German flatmate after having mentioned her in the preceding part of the interaction. This extract reveals that not only is Kailee aware of the sequencing of the task from her own perspective, she also compares her assumptions with those of her partner’s. This highlights the reciprocal aspect of the co-regulation process.

Tara: What about parties? Some flatmates like to invite friends.
Kailee: Um she's relatively quiet, and she's only managed to invite one person over once who I really liked,
Tara: Mm
Kailee: and who was this other friend of hers and we all had a chat, all three of us, and I've never had any problems with that. How about you?
Tara: Well, I don't think it, I can't see that as a problem actually if you are. Well again it's it depends on who you are while you are sharing the apartment with. If you are a student, I just suppose that.
Kailee: What if say you had an exam [the next day or something? Tara: [Okay, it struck me. Well the solution would probably be just to talk to her then, or the one who you're sharing the flat with?
Kailee: Mhm
Tara: I don't know.
Kailee: Or maybe if they really don't understand, then nobody wants to leave, then just go to the library or something
Tara: Mm

Tara-Kailee 5:2

Tara initiates the party issue in this extract. Kailee uses her current German flatmate as an example to illustrate the issue. At the end of her long monologue in Line 8, she directs the question to Tara. Tara expresses a relatively neutral attitude towards this issue initially. Kailee, however, offers a more extreme example in Line 13. This extract is from the middle of the interaction between Tara and Kailee. Prior to this extract, the pair has already discussed another flat-sharing issue on the list. Kailee is conscious of the regulation of sequencing at this stage, yet neither Tara nor Kailee has mentioned their plan for the task. Kailee comments on her expectation of Tara below:

I was rather expecting her implicitly sort of to pick out something she thought was important, and I was looking in the middle of the list somewhere, and then I realised
she had started very, in this organised manner from the start so. I thought that was kind of interesting - that moment where I realised that she’s just going to take it in order.

Kailee 5:2

Kailee’s strategy to prioritise certain flat-sharing issues means that she disregards the existing order of the issues on the list. Hence, she has chosen an issue that is not the first one on the list prior to this extract. Moreover, according to the extract above, she expects Tara to do the same. Contrary to her expectations, however, Tara decides to return to the first issue on the list. This may be the result of the diverging thought processes between the two.

Kailee’s two open-ended questions in Lines 8 and 13 respectively is her strategy to gauge Tara’s view of sequencing as the comment below suggests:

She seemed very like I would say very detached and didn’t really take this party problem very seriously, and I wanted to see if she would give way or not, with this example of the next day exam, so that was sort of testing the ground to see what she really thinks.

Kailee 5:3

Kailee’s second comment complements her first one. Due to the lack of explicit negotiation of sequencing in the interaction, she utilises the strategy to give up her turn deliberately and asks questions in order to elicit more information from Tara about sequencing. Questioning therefore serves as Kailee’s strategy to regulate the sequencing of the discourse implicitly. In other words, from Tara’s answers Kailee is able to evaluate Tara’s approach to the task without explicit negotiation.

This section has outlined the two approaches to looking at L2 listeners’ negotiation of sequencing and transitions in interaction. Both approaches require the listener to develop an awareness of reciprocally monitoring and control of him/herself as well as of the interlocutor. The next two sections will examine the management of two types of misalignment in thought and communication – the unexpected and disagreement.
5.4 Managing the unexpected

5.4.1 Accommodation

The preceding three sections of this chapter have discussed the themes in relation to the ways in which shared understanding is jointly created, the important role that the listener plays in the interaction, and the negotiation of sequencing and transitions. These findings have offered some new insights into L2 learners’ understanding of how co-regulation is achieved in the listening process. This section examines the management of the unexpected in the interaction. In Chapter 4, I have categorised the expectation element under the thought category (see 4.1.3), and maintained that my data indicate that the expectation element is primarily referring to the data bits in which participants’ expectations are misaligned – the unexpected. The findings presented in Chapter 4 also show that the expectation element occurs 25% of the times compared to the other eight elements in the same category (see Table 4:3). Furthermore, my analysis of the participants’ awareness of the interconnectedness across dimensions and between dyads suggests that the interviews in eight out of ten dyads have featured the expectation element heavily (see Section 4.3 for details). This section aims to explore this issue further by linking the interaction data to the interview data. It reveals the complex monitoring and control processes in which L2 listeners manage expectation misalignment. The first extract is the continuation of the Tara-Kailee extract discussed in Section 5.2. Prior to this, Kailee has presented the issue about her German flatmate stealing her food. Tara therefore introduces the labelling tradition in Norway as a solution to the issue.

Tara: You know there’s a tradition in Norway that people usually, they write down names on food.
Kailee: Oh they put labels and stuff.
Tara: Yes
Kailee: Oh yeah cool.
Tara: But I was always irritated by that.
Kailee: Uh
Tara: I think why do you have to? I mean.
Kailee: Mm yeah, [I can understand.

Tara-Kailee 5:3

Although this is only a snapshot of the interaction between Tara and Kailee, the extract above portrays how expectations are misaligned between the two participants. Not only does Kailee summarise the Tara’s solution, but she actively predicts Tara’s preference to the solution (Line 5). However, this is in contrast to the response that Tara has provided in Line 6. Kailee’s subsequent responses ‘uh’, ‘mm yeah’ in Lines 7 and 9 indicate a certain degree of
hesitation. In her interview, Kailee discusses her thought process during the listening process:

I thought well she was mentioning this labelling procedure in Norway. She used I thought a relatively neutral tone and I saw it as mentioning the labelling procedure as a sort of solution or ... but it's amusing because afterwards she says 'that's really annoying.' Yeah I didn't see that one coming. I was surprised... I guess I just took her point in, and again went back to that strategy of trying to accommodate things.

Kailee 5:4

As the listener, Kailee actively predicts Tara’s preference with regard to the solution to the stolen butter issue. However, her prediction and expectation are misaligned with Tara’s. Here the misalignment of expectations is two fold. On the one hand, Kailee expects Tara to offer a suitable solution. On the other hand, the solution that Tara proposed turns out to be against Kailee’s prediction. Kailee’s comment above therefore highlights the misalignment of expectations between Tara and Kailee. In addition, the comment indicates that as Kailee realises this misalignment, she tries to accommodate Tara’s thought. As the comment suggests, Kailee manages the unexpected by using the accommodation strategy, a strategy that she has used before, to negotiate the expectation misalignment. The fact that Kailee is aware of this misalignment, and tries to put Tara’s viewpoint into perspective, not only demonstrates her active participation and listenership, but also illustrates how Kailee constructs and negotiates meaning with her partner in order to establish shared understanding. The following extract further exemplifies L2 learners’ management of the unexpected in the listening process. In this extract, Fiona and Maria discuss the cleaning issue.

Fiona: Do you, cos I'm, we don't have a rota, and I'm, I really want to introduce one, but so far my flatmates have been like 'yeah yeah you know I don't think it works,' and I'm really, I reached to the point where I was like ‘no it doesn't work anymore.’

Maria: <nod>

Fiona: But I think that even if we have one, it's probably not always going to work, so what do you do? Do you just say 'look, you didn't do your job although it's your turn?'

Maria: I mean it's, I mean it's you know I have the comfort of having flatmates who are really kinda, I am the one who's not really that, very kinda dedicated to the rota so to speak. I mean I wouldn't say I get bullied into doing this, but I kinda, I see how hard they worked to, you know preserve the cleanliness, and so I just go 'okay like, this is just unfair not to do it.'

Fiona: Alright, so it's more you [who has

Maria: [It's kinda like you know I feel bad,

Fiona: Okay
Maria: because they clean, and then you know I don't want them to be left you know in a dirty bathroom or whatever, so you know.

Fiona: Yeah, so it's not like you're the one who has to remind other people.

Maria: No, definitely not.

Fiona: Okay. Okay. <laugh>

Maria: <laugh>

Fiona: Well it's good if that other person has a sense of you know I should do something as well, then it's good but if they don't then.

Fiona-Maria 5:1

Fiona starts the discussion about the cleaning issue. There are a few instances of false start, such as ‘do you, cos I’m’ and ‘I’m’ in Line 1 and I’m really, …’ in Line 4. They may be indications of a certain degree of hesitation on Fiona’s part. After elaborating on the cleaning situation in her current flat-share, Fiona seeks Maria’s opinion explicitly (Lines 8-9). Maria’s response to Fiona’s question in Lines 10-16 also shows a certain degree of hesitation: the self-repetition ‘I mean it’s’ and hedging ‘you know’, ‘really kinda’, ‘very kinda’, ‘I kinda’ may suggest that she is in the process of formulating a coherent account. However, contrary to offering a solution to the cleaning issue, Maria admits that she is the one who has been causing the issue so far.

From Line 17, Fiona begins to realise that it is Maria who does not like to do the cleaning in her flat. This is against her earlier prediction that they are both the victims of dirty flatmates. Although Fiona tries to summarise Maria’s response in Line 17, her utterance is interrupted by Maria (Lines 17-18). Maria uses the overlapping interruption as an opportunity to explain her current situation. In Lines 23-24, Fiona explicitly confirms her understanding again. In the following comment, Fiona elaborates on her thought process:

I was I think up until this very last sentence. I was hoping that she would give me a solution to the problem. She didn't. She said, 'yeah I'm the one who, you know, doesn't always clean or whatever.'

Fiona 5:1

In the comment above, Fiona outlines her expectation of Maria with respect to the solution to the cleaning issue. Fiona expects a solution from Maria, but instead, the information that Maria gives suggests that she is not very keen to clean the flat. According to Fiona’s comment, this is a surprise as she has assumed that Maria would not like living in a dirty flat either. In Maria’s interview, she comments on her thought processes at the moment:
I totally agree with her, because I can sympathise, you know. As much of a messy person I am, I do sympathise with people who like their stuff clean.

Maria 5:1

This comment shows that Maria understands the importance of cleaning. Moreover, she monitors the agreement between Fiona and herself. Maria’s responses from Lines 12 to 25 mainly serve the function of explaining her willingness to understand the cleaning issue from other people’s perspective. The ‘okay, okay’ and ‘laugh’ in Lines 26-27 indicate that despite the pair holding different opinions on the issue, they work in a collaborative manner and create a polite and comfortable environment as Fiona’s comment underlines below:

I don't want to be rude to her, because I don't know her, cos I don't want to, you know, I don't want to be unfriendly. Cleaning is something either you do or you don't do, it's more closely related to her personality rather than just an opinion.

Fiona 5:2

Fiona is aware of the importance of her newly formed relationship with Maria, in which maintaining a comfortable environment is vital. According to the extract, both participants realise what is expected in the conversation. However, the comment above suggests that Fiona manages the unexpected by neutralising her contempt for dirty flatmates. Therefore, she ends the interaction extract in such a way that not only reflects their mutual relationship on the social level, but also accommodates Maria’s feelings on the affective level (Lines 28-30). Fiona’s management of the unexpected in the listening process is shaped by her understanding of the social-affective dimension of co-regulation.

Similar to the first two dyads, the interaction extract presented below also serves as an exemplification of L2 listeners’ management of misaligned expectations. This is the beginning of Megan and Jane’s interaction. They negotiate the sequencing of the task and discuss the cleaning issue.

Jane: Yeah mm. Do you have any of these problems because I didn't?
Megan: Yeah. Mm uh. I would yeah not, especially, maybe two has been experienced in my flat.
5 Jane: Mhm
Megan: Then, <3> okay, not three, yeah then four.
Jane: Mhm
Megan: Yeah four is also an issue in my flat. Yeah.
Jane: So maybe we will discuss something more
Megan: Yeah
Jane: like more personal because for me it's very difficult to think. I never had any of these problems.
Megan: Oh really?
Jane: Yeah.

10
Megan: Okay.
Jane: So what do you usually do when you like solve for solve this problem 4?
Megan: Mm for anything, never cleans anything.
Jane: Mhm
Megan: Yeah we haven't finished solving the problem. We are still
Jane: <laugh>
Megan: we are still working on it anyway, but I think for my flat we're, we tried to talk about it,
Jane: <nod>
Megan: to mention it, and it seems like the whole issue is revolving around a single person.
Jane: Mhm
Megan: Yeah the issue of cleaning, and not yeah, we try to keep
the kitchen clean because we share the kitchen maybe.
Jane: Mhm.

Megan-Jane 5:3

The findings regarding L2 listeners' negotiation of sequencing have been delineated in Section 5.3. In this extract, Megan and Jane are engaged in a more explicit negotiation of sequencing. Jane opens the conversation by asking a question in Lines 1-2. She also detaches herself from the task by indicating that she has never experienced any of these flat-sharing issues when she says ‘… because I didn’t.’ Following Jane’s question, Megan uses ‘mm, uh’, a false start ‘I would yeah not, especially’ in Line 3 and the pause in Line 6 may show a certain level of hesitation, which is due to her surprise at Jane’s preceding utterance as the comment below elaborates:

I think it was a little surprising for me that she’s never come across any of the issues. I was like ‘okay’… at the beginning I thought, when I read it at first I thought, I thought, probably we’ll go through each one.

Megan 5:3

This comment suggests that Megan was surprised at Jane’s immediate withdrawal from the task. As the comment indicates, Megan’s original plan was discuss the issues in order, but this contradicts Jane’s proposal in Lines 9-13. Megan’s response in Line 13 ‘oh really?’ could indicate that she has not expected the preceding utterance. Although the extract may be seen as the participants negotiating the sequencing of the task in an explicit manner, the strategy that Megan uses to manage the unexpected is rather implicit. She accommodates Jane’s thoughts and carries on with the discussion about the cleaning issue (Line 18). Megan’s management of the unexpected is similar to Kailee and Fiona in the preceding examples provided. In comparison to Megan, Jane is primarily concerned with the individual regulation of thoughts at this stage as the following comment illustrates:
Because it's more, for me I'm always trying to find something interesting in the tasks, and theoretical thoughts are less interesting than practical ones where you could discuss real matters.

Jane 5:2

According to this comment, Jane is not comfortable with discussing hypothetical issues, hence she suggests that they only discuss issues that are relevant. Her discourse and ways of approaching the task are influenced by her metacognitive experiences. Jane’s feelings of difficulty and lack of on-line task specific knowledge lead to her proposal to sequence the task in a certain way. While listening to Megan elaborating on her current situation with the cleaning issue, Jane only provides minimal responses (Lines 18-31). But as the comment below shows, Jane’s listening process is still active; she tries to construct shared understanding with Megan:

So in a way for me, it was very interesting, because obviously her solutions is different from my solutions, and it was very interesting … it was interesting to listen first, and see if there will be like something in common with my thoughts or what I would do.

Jane 5:3

Although Jane has detached herself from the conversation earlier, this comment suggests that as she listens, Jane monitors her own ongoing level of interest. Moreover, she monitors the agreement between the two. Jane’s conscious decision to listen first enables her to monitor the commonality between her thoughts and her partner’s. This indicates that Jane is attentive in the listening process despite of the minimal responses offered in this extract.

5.4.2 Directed attention

In the first part of Section 5.4, I have explicated L2 listeners’ management of the unexpected in the interaction. This can be achieved by the listener accommodating the other’s thoughts or opinions, which many involve the monitoring and control on the social and affective levels. The following part will look at another way for L2 listeners to manage the unexpected in interactions – directed attention. The strategy to direct one’s attention to an area that is not necessarily the meaning of an utterance or utterances while maintaining the flow of communication shows that the listener is able to orchestrate cognitive resources in such a way that goes beyond the local discourse and comprehension level. The example below is taken from the end of the interaction between the Harry-Mara dyad. In this extract, despite the fact that the expectations of attention are misaligned between the two participants, both Harry and Mara are able to communicate and reach an agreement in the end.
Harry: Yeah, yeah it's a matter [of Mara: [It's a matter of
Harry: how to live with other people. Mara: Yeah, it's a matter of respect pretty much.

Harry: Yes, that will be for me as well. I would knock on the door and say 'yes, please [turn it down'
Mara: [Can you please turn it down
Harry: And it's enough, you know like. I've never been in that situation. Well yes with my sister, but

Mara: That's family
Harry: That's family.
Mara: Yeah I do that [with my brother.
Harry: [And she will be like 'oh you know what, that bothers me because you you always just had funs', and I'll be like 'Mom, she doesn't let me study', you know, 'I want to be a better student, and she doesn't allow me', and my Mom will make her turn it down.

Mara: <laugh>
Harry: But in this situation, it's yeah each man by, no, each man by himself. You cannot call your mother to fix it.
Mara: <nod>
Harry: We reached the end of it.
Mara: Yep.

Harry-Mara 5:4

There are two instances of other-repetitions from Lines 1-11. In Line 2, Mara repeats Harry's utterance; in Line 11, Harry repeats Mara’s utterance. These two repetitions by Mara and Harry respectively may be indications that both participants are attentive at the beginning of the extract. Mara’s verbal contributions in Lines 4 and 7, where she completes Harry’s preceding utterances, may suggest that the pair work collaboratively in order to co-construct a shared understanding (see also Section 5.1). However, from Line 13, Mara only responds minimally to Harry’s long monologue from Lines 13 to 20. The ‘laugh’, and ‘nod’ and ‘yep’ in Lines 18, 21, and 23 that Mara produces may seem to be supportive, but in actual fact, Mara’s attention has been shifted away as the comment below illustrates:

I zoned out... because I don't know I felt like we had a time like constraint... he said this point about his family, so I was like okay, but then he carried on talking, and I was like 'okay are we going to like,' so I had to turn on again and keep on listening to this point... I didn't want to be rude or... I knew he would keep on saying the same thing, so I just wasn't bothered.

Mara 5:4

This comment indicates that Mara directs her attention away from listening to Harry elaborating on his experience about his family from Line 13. For one thing, she is concerned about timing for the task. More importantly, she thinks that they have established a shared understanding about family as an exception earlier in the conversation, so she expects Harry to reach the conclusion rather than to keep explaining his past experience. The diverging expectations that Mara and Harry have developed shows that they is not managed explicitly
in this case. Mara is aware of her relationship with Harry, so she still pretends that she is listening by offering occasional minimal responses. In a way, Mara’s provision of minimal responses is similar to those provided by Jane on the discourse level (see the preceding extract). However, they represent two distinct purposes: for Mara, they are devices to feint the listening process because the attention has shifted away; for Jane, minimal responses signal that she is interested as she constructs a shared understanding actively.

The analysis of this extract shows that Mara, as the listener, is aware of the complex process involved for her to understand her partner’s message. Moreover, when expectations are misaligned, she directs her attention away from interpreting the message. Nevertheless, Mara still provides Harry with a variety of responses which can be regarded as evidence of the listener’s co-regulation on the discourse level.

This section has explored L2 listeners’ management of the unexpected in the interaction. The findings both in this chapter and in Chapter 4 foreground the importance of this process in listening. The awareness of the unexpected, or the misalignment of expectations, may be related to the listener’s strategies either to accommodate the other’s thoughts or to direct away the attention. These strategies contribute to the listeners’ implicit co-construction and negotiation of shared understandings. In addition, the findings suggest that as L2 listeners co-construct and negotiate a shared understanding, they may also monitor the disagreement in discourse, and utilise strategies to regulate the disagreement. The final section of this chapter presents findings concerning L2 listeners’ understanding of disagreement in the interaction and the way in which they orchestrate the use of strategies in the discourse, thought and social-affective dimensions to manage disagreement.
5.5 Managing disagreement

5.5.1 Expressed disagreement

This section explores L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in relation to the management of disagreement in interaction. The findings of the interaction data show that not only are participants in this study engaged in the co-construction and negotiation process when understanding is shared and reciprocated, they may also be engaged in the process when understanding is not shared or reciprocated. That is, L2 listeners may develop divergent views on certain topics during the interaction, and subsequently adopt different strategies to regulate their thinking. My fine-grained analysis of the interaction data reveals that L2 listeners are generally concerned with managing two types of disagreement: expressed disagreement and tacit disagreement. The first part of this section draws from the findings regarding expressed disagreement. This is the type of disagreement which is signalled explicitly in the interaction. In the first example, Harry and Mara discuss the noise issue. This is the beginning of their interaction.

Harry: Yeah, have you suffered from that?
Mara: <5> Um, not really, I think it's mostly me wanting to invite my friends over.
Harry: Yeah I will say the same thing.
Mara: Yeah um, I don't know, a solution I guess would be talk it out first, with your flatmate?

Harry-Mara 5:5

This extract demonstrates how Harry and Mara manage the disagreement in their interaction. The five-second pause and ‘um’ in Line 2 in Mara’s response may indicate that Mara hesitates when trying to formulate an appropriate utterance that disagrees with Harry’s assumption. In the following comment, Mara elaborates on her expressed disagreement ‘not really’ in Line 2:

A stranger meeting a stranger, you would never really think someone would be like ‘are you the one suffering from it’. What if I was actually the one who was causing this, so yeah I was a bit, wow, yeah … Later, I was shocked that he said ‘I do the same thing’ even though he said ‘have you suffered from it’… I’m guessing he’s trying to judge what kind of character I was, so he could answer what I wanted.

Mara 5:5

According to this comment, Mara monitors her relationship with Harry in the interaction - she is aware of the fact that they have just met. Moreover, the use of the word ‘suffer’ in Harry’s utterance in Line 1 gives the question a negative connotation, which seems to
suggest that he used to be the victim of a noisy flat. Mara’s comment above highlights the way he manages the unexpected in the listening process. On the discourse level, the unexpected is evident through the pause, hesitation and explicit disagreement in Line 2-3. Also in this comment, Mara elaborates on her concerns about Harry’s subsequent utterance in Line 4. Although Harry uses the word ‘suffer’ earlier, when hearing that Mara is usually the one causing the noise issue, he changes his mind by saying that he is in the same position as her. For Mara, this is another point in which she disagrees with Harry. More specifically, Harry’s use of ‘suffer’ and his utterance in Line 4 contradict each other. Mara’s level’s unexpectedness increases as she listens to Harry’s response in Line 4. In Lines 5-6, she uses phatic responses ‘yeah um, I don’t know’ to acknowledge Harry’s preceding utterance, and immediately moves on to the solution to the flat-sharing issue. Mara’s strategy to direct the attention from discussing the issue in detail to finding a solution is related to the way that she manages the misalignment of expectations between the two (see also Section 5.4). In the following comment, Harry elaborates his thought processes:

Even though my flatmates do have some meetings, I think I am the one who organises most of the parties. Yeah that’s fine that she would say that. I can easily relate to that.

Harry 5:5

Harry confirms that he actually has the past experience of causing noise when organising parties. Furthermore, this comment shows that Harry is aware of the connections between the reflection on prior knowledge and the co-construction of ongoing shared understanding during the listening process. Therefore, unlike Mara, Harry’s positive response in Line 4 demonstrates his approach to agree with Mara in an explicit manner, which may be due to his intention to work collaboratively with his partner. The analysis of this extract indicates that both Harry and Mara are engaged in the management of expressed disagreement. Harry prioritises establishing the link between his reflection on the prior knowledge and his partner’s message so that he can create a collaborative environment for shared understanding to be achieved. Mara, however, recognises the disagreement in the listening process. In addition, Mara’s understanding of Harry is informed by her monitoring of their relationship in the social-affective dimension, which helps her to regulate discourse and thinking in such a way that facilitates the interpretation of Harry’s utterances in the interaction.
In the next example, the disagreement between participants is more explicit compared to the Harry-Mara dyad. The following extract is taken from the beginning of Caitlin and Lena’s discussion on the rent/bills issue.

<5>
Caitlin: Never pays the rent.
Lena: I would just put it on <1> his account, and he'll pay all the rent.
5 Caitlin: Oh like a direct debit account?
Lena: Yeah, or like he's responsible for doing [this
Caitlin: [but if it's been like <2> if it's like several months
like that, wouldn't you tell the landlord, like complain
to them that's not your fault that the rent is not paid?
10 Lena: No, I don't think so. I don't think I'll complain I
wouldn't complain to the landlord because he has nothing
to do with it. He just wants his money for the flat.
Well I think I would just put the responsibility of
paying the bills on the person who is actually not
paying it,
15 Caitlin: <nod>
Lena: so he would be responsible for the whole flat, which may
increase his responsibility. But on the other hand, if
he doesn't pay it at all, then he would not pay it
anyway.
20 Caitlin: Yeah, that's why like by talking to the landlord, you
can say 'well that's his fault. Maybe you should kick
him out' or you know, kind of. [That's a bit extreme,
25 Lena: [Yeah
Caitlin: but that's one way, [and it's
Lena: [But then
Caitlin: if he doesn't pay, I think.
Lena: But then you'll have to find another flatmate, or pay
more.
30 Caitlin: Yeah that's true as well.

Lena-Caitlin 5:2

Caitlin initiates the discussion after a five-second pause. The long pause may be due to the fact that neither participant has had personal experience with this topic. Therefore, unlike the previous flat-sharing problems where they discuss personal experiences first, Lena offers a solution as early as Line 3. Lena and Caitlin’s approach to the task in this example is similar to Harry and Mara’s in the preceding example. In Line 5, Caitlin reformulates Lena’s preceding utterance, which shows that shared understanding has been achieved. In Line 7, Caitlin interrupts Lena’s utterance with the use of the conditional structure ‘but if’, pause and self-repetition ‘if it’s like’. On the discourse level, this suggests her disagreement with Lena’s solution explicitly, but in a subtle manner. Lena, however, disagrees with Caitlin in a more direct manner (Lines 10-12). The repetitive use of ‘I don’t think’ signals Lena’s insistence. Moreover, she reiterates the importance of giving the flatmate the responsibility (Lines 13-20) as a solution to the rent/bills issue. The disagreement continues from Line 21.
The overlapping interruption initiated by Lena in Line 26 furthers her argument that she has proposed earlier. Later in the interview, Caitlin comments on her thoughts at the moment:

> Yeah we had opposing views as well, because she wanted to deal with the flatmate, and I think I would've gone through to the landlord... I'm not as smiley maybe as previously so yeah.

*Caitlin 5:2*

Caitlin is more aware of the monitoring and control of the agreement and disagreement in the interaction. Table 4:21 (see Section 4.3) shows that the *agreement* element in the global discourse category occurs 5 times in Caitlin’s interview. The comment above illustrates this finding. The comment shows that although Caitlin disagrees with Lena, her responses are less direct, and include the ‘less smiley’ facial expressions. Caitlin only nods once in Line 16 during Lena’s monologue. Caitlin comments in the subsequent interview that her attention has shifted while listening to Lena’s elaboration:

> I'm looking at the ceiling because I don't really understand what she's saying. No I didn't understand that sentence, that particular sentence. I was trying to, I think mixing the words to see if it would make sense, but I think I was still listening to what she was saying, trying to listen a bit more.

*Caitlin 5:3*

According to the comment above, due to Caitlin’s confusion with her partner’s utterance, she directs her attention to the environment. Yet she still tries to infer the meaning of Lena’s utterance by ‘mixing words’ in the listening process. Apart from the confusion on the semantic level, Caitlin’s attention shift may also be attributed to the explicit disagreement between the two. However, rather than taking a passive role, Caitlin actively co-constructs meaning with Lena in the listening process. She utilises the semantic resources that are available and develops an understanding that helps her to gradually direct her full attention back to Lena. Hence, the communication flows from Line 21.

My analysis of the extract above focuses on how Caitlin manages the more direct disagreement with Lena. Caitlin monitors the development of the ongoing disagreement between the two, and adopts strategies to direct her attention away when there is a confusion in her understanding. However, she still maintains an active listership, and tries to interpret Lena’s message. Caitlin’s management of directly expressed disagreement demonstrates the importance of the listener being the co-regulator in the co-construction and negotiation of shared understanding (see also Section 5.1 and Section 5.2). The second part of this Section explores L2 listeners’ management of more tacit disagreement.
5.5.2 Tacit disagreement

Table 4:23 in Section 4.3 has revealed that the *agreement* element in the global discourse category features heavily in both Fiona’s and Maria’s interviews, occurring 5 times in each interview. This finding, to a certain extent, suggests the role that the monitoring and control of agreement/disagreement played in both participants’ listening process during their interaction. In the next example, Fiona and Maria discuss the noise issue. The analysis of this extract shows that although there is disagreement from the very beginning of the interaction, Fiona and Maria deal with it in a rather tacit manner.

Maria: How about the live music issue, ah when someone just loves to play music really really loud, especially after midnight? I don't think I can handle this.
Fiona: I think I'll just go over, and knock on their door and say like 'I'm trying to sleep'. I think that's yeah, I think it's not such a big issue.
Maria: I mean yeah, I mean especially it's not just, it's not just for your flat, it's also for your neighbours,
Fiona: Mhm
Maria: because you know you can get in trouble for this.
Fiona: Mm
Maria: So I would just suggest using headphones really.
Fiona: Yeah, that's a good idea.
Maria: I mean what else?
Fiona: Yeah, it's a good idea. Or else I guess it's if it's your own flatmate who comes over to say 'turn it down please', and it's, it's still better than if it's your downstairs neighbour.
Maria: Yeah definitely, so you kinda kinda go to their room, and kinda say 'if I can hear it, there's a chance someone else can hear it as well, and that can, you know get us in trouble, so we don't want to do it.'
Fiona: I guess headphones are a good idea.
Maria: Yeah but you know some people like to dance when they listen to the music.
Fiona: <laugh> Well they should get headphones, or they should just you know put their iPhone in their pocket or whatever.
Maria: Yeah that's true. <laugh>
Fiona: <laugh>

Fiona-Maria 5:2

Maria introduces the noise issue in flat-sharing from Lines 1 to 3, and offers her opinion on it in Line 3. It is interesting to see that immediately after Maria has introduces the topic, Fiona moves to offering the solution (Lines 4-6). This pattern is unusual in the interaction between the two as they often tend to discuss the problem in detail before starting to consider a solution. In addition, Fiona’s utterance ‘I think it’s not such a big issue’ in Lines 5-6 indicates her tacit disagreement with Maria’s earlier statement (Line 3). From Line 7, the disagreement
continues. Maria’s hesitation in Line 7 shows that she has noticed Fiona’s divergent opinion. However, she carries on explaining her case. In Line 12, Fiona offers a solution to the issue.

Even though Fiona does agree with Maria in terms of their tolerance of the noise issue, her responses to Maria’s solution seems positive on the discourse level. In Line 13, she says ‘yeah, that’s a good idea’, and she repeats or reformulates the same expression three more times in Lines 15, 23 and 26 respectively. Towards the end of the extract, Fiona and Maria agree on using the headphones and laugh together. Both participants deal with disagreement in such a subtle way that no explicit and direct opposition is expressed. In their separate interviews, however, they comment on their awareness of the disagreement:

When she said ’oh after midnight,’ I was like, cos I like staying up late, so for me midnight it’s not that late, so I was like ‘okay well, you know.’ … I don’t know why I keep repeating ’yeah it’s a good idea’, because although I agree, it’s not something I would suggest, I think, … I guess I was just trying to. Maybe I didn’t really know what to say anymore.

Fiona 5:3

This comment reveals that during Fiona’s listening process, she reflects on her prior knowledge, and notices the disagreement. However, rather than expressing her disagreement explicitly, Fiona decides to acknowledge Maria’s suggestion. The responses such as ‘mhm’, ‘mm’, ‘yeah, that’s a good idea’, and ‘that’s true’ may be Fiona’s way of managing the disagreement. The comment above also shows that Fiona feels confused about her overwhelmingly positive responses to Maria’s suggestions. In spite of the disagreement, Fiona communicates with her partner in a collaborative manner. She uses these positive reinforcements to signal her listenership and to co-regulate the discourse. Maria also discusses her awareness of the disagreement in this extract:

She says ‘it’s not a big issue’. I’m like ‘mmm’ … I think it’s a big issue. I don’t agree here, then again because of my personal experience.

Maria 5:2

This comment illustrates Maria’s awareness of the reflection on prior knowledge, the ongoing disagreement and the connections between the two. Similar to Fiona, Maria also recognises the tacit disagreement; moreover, she attributes the disagreement to her past experience in flat sharing. This can be regarded as her strategy to understand the differences between the two. In Maria’s account of the solution to the problem, she uses ‘just’ and ‘really’ to soften the tone because she is aware that the solution that she is proposing differs from what Fiona has proposed.
This section has explored L2 listeners’ awareness of disagreement in the interaction, and the strategies that they adopted in order to manage disagreement. The findings have revealed that L2 listeners tended to manage two types of disagreement: expressed and tacit disagreement. The management often required listeners to utilise a range of strategies across the discourse, the thought and the social-affective dimensions. The next section brings this chapter to a conclusion.
5.6 Summary

This chapter has explicated L2 listeners’ cognitive attunement through the regulation in discourse. One of the predominant discourse features that may indicate the degree of attunement is overlapping completions. As Section 5.1 illustrated, overlapping completions often indicated that the listener was engaged in the interaction, which might signal active listenership, they also reflected on their prior knowledge. Here prior knowledge not only refers to the listener’s declarative sociocultural knowledge, but it refers to the shared understanding established in the immediate context of the discourse.

The findings presented in Section 5.2 explored the issue of the listener as the co-regulator of the discourse. More specifically, attention was paid to L2 listeners’ co-regulation of the balanced and imbalanced verbal contributions and the ways in which this co-regulation shaped the patterns of the discourse. Co-regulation involved the monitoring of linguistic meanings embedded in the local message, as well as the regulation of the discourse at a global level. My findings suggested that L2 listeners often perceived balancing and maintaining verbal contributions to be a joint responsibility. This foregrounded the notion of the listener as the co-regulator of the discourse. Section 5.3 outlined the two approaches to understanding the co-regulation of sequencing and transitions: the more explicit approach and the more implicit approach. In former approach, the strategies to negotiate often had to be made clearly. In the latter approach, the strategies were rather subtle.

Sections 5.4 and 5.5 examined L2 listeners’ reciprocal monitoring and control of the unexpected and disagreement in the interaction. The findings revealed that L2 listeners’ awareness of the unexpected might be related to their strategies to either accommodate the other’s thoughts or direct the attention away. These strategies contributed to the implicit creation of a shared understanding. However, the findings also observed that L2 listeners monitored disagreement in the discourse, and utilised strategies to regulate disagreement. With regard to the management of the disagreement in the interaction, this study argued that as L2 listeners were managing the two types of disagreement, they utilised a range of strategies situated in the discourse, the thought and the social-affective dimensions.

In this chapter, I have answered the second research question:
To what extent can L2 listeners’ understanding of the monitoring and control process be exemplified through their discourse?

Chapter 6 brings together the findings from the preceding two chapters and formulate a coherent theoretical framework. I offer a re-conceptualisation of L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in the listening process.
CHAPTER 6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction

The Literature Review chapter established that the existing literature on metacognition and L2 listening has made significant contributions to our evolving understanding of the thinking process in listening, but the focus tends to be primarily on the investigation into listeners’ individual psychological processes. They have failed to recognise the wider contextual and sociocultural aspects of metacognition in L2 listening (e.g. Field, 2009, 2011; Goh & Hu, 2014; Lynch, 2009, 2011; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). Having identified the gaps, the present study set out to address aspects which were often ignored previously. I explored L2 listeners’ awareness of the co-regulation situated within the discourse, thought and social-affective dimensions. This thesis thus contributes to the ongoing discussions and debates on metacognition and L2 listening.

This study has adopted a broader conceptual lens underpinned by a sociocultural and dialogical approach to communication and thought in general. Learners’ discourse was considered vital as it reflected reciprocal co-regulation in L2 listening. Chapter 4 explored the elements of L2 listeners’ awareness within the three dimensions as well as the interconnectedness between and across dimensions. The analysis revealed that L2 listeners’ awareness of the discourse dimension and the thought dimension were inextricably linked to the awareness of the social-affective dimension. Chapter 5 has examined L2 listeners’ co-regulation in the listening process through the analysis of their discourse. The findings highlighted the dynamic orchestration of cognitive, discursive and social-affective recourses. The findings foregrounded the notion of the listener as the co-regulator of the discourse in the creation of shared understanding. Moreover, Chapter 5 explicated L2 listeners’ negotiating process of sequencing and transitions and the ways in which they managed the unexpected and disagreement.

This chapter outlines a re-conceptualisation of metacognition in L2 listening termed ‘Metacognitive Discourse Awareness’ (MDA) (see Section 6.2). The construct encompasses L2 listener’s understanding of the co-regulation process within, between and among three interconnected areas: the discourse, the thought and the social-affective dimensions (see Section 6.3). This conceptualisation underlines the listener’s awareness of the reciprocal co-regulation of him/herself and his or her partner (see Section 6.4). The MDA framework argues that the listener often assumes an active role in the co-construction and negotiation of meaning process (see Section 6.5). Sections 6.6 and 6.7 discuss my contributions to
knowledge and the implications for future research. Section 6.8 reflects on possible limitations of my study in general and my re-conceptualisation. The thesis is drawn to a conclusion in Section 6.9.

In sum, my new conceptual framework adds to the existing body of literature and provides additional perspectives that help to further our understanding of metacognition and L2 listening. The following section outlines the definition of the framework.
6.2 Defining Metacognitive Discourse Awareness

This section brings together the various aspects of L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness in the co-regulation process discussed in the two Findings chapters. The Metacognitive Discourse Awareness (MDA) framework can be seen as a re-conceptualisation of L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness in the listening process. It builds on the existing literature on thought and communication (see Section 2.2), metacognition (see Section 2.3) and listening (see Section 2.4) reviewed in Chapter 2. Furthermore, it is also strongly informed by the findings from the present study (see Chapter 4 and 5). By drawing from a sociocultural and dialogical view of thought and communication as well as insights from my findings, this construct portrays an understanding of metacognition in L2 listening that is both intrapersonally and interpersonally co-constructed and negotiated. A basic definition of MDA can be offered as follows:

Metacognitive discourse awareness is the listener’s conscious understanding of the reciprocal monitoring and control within, between and across the discourse, the thought, and the social-affective dimensions. It highlights the listener’s awareness of the relational co-regulation of self and the other, and of the wider contexts in which the co-construction and negotiation of mutual sharedness is situated.

The three dimensions in the MDA framework, awareness of the discourse dimension, awareness of the thought dimension and awareness of the social-affective dimension, have been identified in Chapter 4. The listener’s awareness of the discourse dimension is related to his or her understanding of the local and global regulation of discourse. The listener’s awareness of the thought dimension involves his or her understanding of the ways in which thinking is organised and orchestrated so that effective communication can be achieved. The listener’s awareness of the social-affective dimension focuses on how the co-regulation process is socially and affectively embedded in the discourse and thought dimensions.

In defining MDA, I recognise L2 listeners’ understanding of the various components in the co-regulation process. While highlighting the complexities within each dimension, MDA also foregrounds the interconnectedness between and across dimensions which will be discussed in Section 6.3. In fact, it could be argued that these dimensions are interlinked in such a way that treating the dimensions as discrete elements would run the risk of oversimplifying the dynamic nature of this conceptualisation.

The three dimensions proposed in this study move beyond a conventional understanding of metacognition merely as an individual psychological process. Admittedly, the listener’s
understanding of the thought process is an important part of metacognitive awareness. However, the MDA framework argues that the regulatory function of discourse situated the wider social and affective context is also crucial to the process (see Section 6.3). Furthermore, the definition offered above suggests that MDA involves the mutuality between the listener and his or her partner. In other words, MDA entails the listener’s awareness of the reciprocal self in relational to the other. In particular, the listener often acts as the ‘co-regulator’ of the discourse (see Section 6.4).

It is also important to consider that at the centre of MDA there is the co-construction and negotiation process. In this study, a distinction has been drawn between explicit and implicit negotiations. Explicit negotiation is concerned with the listener’s overt effort to share and jointly achieve a mutual understanding. Implicit negotiation, on the other hand, is concerned with the ‘attunement to the attunement of the other’ (Rommetveit, 1974, 1992). In other words, the co-construction and negotiation of shared understanding may rest on ‘what is taken for granted’ under joint perspective taking and setting (Hagtvet & Wold, 2003, p. 193). This dialogical understanding of metacognition is consistent with the view of listening as a joint venture as was discussed in Section 2.4. As Linell argues, the responsibility of constructing meaning in conversation is shared:

No speaker is alone in authoring his utterance; to some extent she shares the responsibility for what gets said with her fellow conversationalist. Through the interplay of their actions, actors try to guide each other’s participation and understandings in dialogue. (Linell, 1998, p.77)

The construction of mutual understanding in dialogue is thus a shared responsibility between the speaker and the listener. This is in common with my findings. For example, both Savannah and Yuzuki underscored their responsibilities to regulate the discourse pattern as listeners. This responsibility was attuned bi-laterally (see Section 5.1). Linell (1998) further argues that the development of discourse is a joint construction: utterances only realise their communicative intention when they are produced dialogically by the participants within a certain context, and this context in turn is constituted by the dialogue. Along with this view, MDA prioritises the contextualised nature of co-regulation in the listening process, which allows the possibility to look at metacognition from a wider dialogical perspective, recognising the variability during the co-construction and negotiation process (see Section 6.5).
Essentially, it is not only the awareness of discourse, thought and social-affective dimensions that helps the listener develop an understanding of meaning and context, but also the awareness of the listener as the reciprocal self and the awareness of the listener regulating the other that contribute to the co-construction and negotiation process. Figure 6:1 provides a visual representation of the MDA framework.

Figure 6:1 The Metacognitive Discourse Awareness Framework

This section has provided an initial definition of metacognitive discourse awareness (MDA). The conceptualisation reflects a broader understanding of metacognition and the listening process. The following three sections will explicate the dimensions and scope of the MDA framework and link my discussion to the existing literature.
6.3 *The interconnected dimensions of MDA*

This section takes a detailed look at the three dimensions of MDA and their interconnections. Chapter 4 has portrayed the components in each dimension and the links with other dimensions, forming an interweaving pattern (see Section 4.2). While previous research on metacognition in L2 listening tended to focus on aspects of the thought dimension, much less research has been undertaken to explore the discourse dimension, the social-affective dimension and the interconnectedness. This study addresses this gap. Taking ahead this thinking, Section 6.3.1 discusses the discourse dimension.

6.3.1 *The discourse dimension*

The listener’s awareness of the discourse dimension refers to his or her understanding of the local and global regulations on the discourse level. This dimension involves the listener’s conscious awareness of the ways in which discourse patterns influence the listening process. The conceptualisation of the discourse dimension is underpinned by the sociocultural understanding of language as a cultural and psychological tool which mediates the internalisation from the interpersonal level to the intrapersonal level (Swain, 2006; Vygotsky, 1986; Wertsch, 1985). In the same vein, the listener’s awareness of the discourse dimension not only reflects an understanding of the regulation of his or her own discourse patterns in relation to the thought processes, but also reflects an understanding of the monitoring and control of the other’s language use and thoughts (see Section 6.4).

Details and specific exemplifications of this dimension have been provided in Chapter 4. This section takes on the discussion of the findings further by focusing on the trends and patterns emerging from the findings. As was foregrounded in Chapter 2, a consideration of the stage of responding is crucial to the listening process. Bakhtin (1986) maintains that there is an interdependency between reciprocal understanding and responding, and that ‘every utterance must be regarded primarily as a response to preceding utterances’ (p. 91). This view provides helpful insights into the ways in which the listener’s responses are always open to future responses, and how responses contribute locally and globally to the ongoing discourse as a whole. In the L2 literature, Goh and Hu (2014) suggest that ‘responses, which indicate partial agreement or disagreement, are particularly interesting because they indicate a lack of certainty and these items can be useful talking points in discussion about listening processes’ (p. 271). In my study, responses are utterances produced following the listener’s, either conscious or unconscious, assessment of the immediate discursive context. They can
be verbal or nonverbal. Most of the participants in this study were aware of the responsibility to respond as part of the listening process.

My own interpretation of the findings revealed that listeners’ responses could serve the function of shaping the pattern of the interaction. The findings showed that as a result of listeners monitoring imbalanced discourse patterns due to differing verbal contributions, they might use questioning as a response in order to regulate future utterances. The use of questioning as a responding strategy regulated the discourse at a macro-level – it contributed to the development of a more balanced interaction, and also contributed to the flow of the interaction. This is in line with the findings in the study by Vandergrift (2003b) I reviewed in Chapter 2. In contrast to the conventional view on questioning where it was often associated with communication breakdown or feelings of confusion (Dipper et al., 2005; Swain & Deters, 2007), the present study found that certain responses, such as questioning, could in fact indicate that the listener has become the co-regulator of the discourse.

The findings demonstrated that as listeners respond, their understanding might be, in a cyclical manner, assumed, confirmed and revised. This parallels Farrell and Mallard’s (2006) study where they highlighted that listeners generally used three strategies when responding: backchannels, hypothesis testing and reprises. Their study concluded that listeners often used these strategies to signal understanding, check understanding and confirm understanding respectively. In my findings, some listeners utilised an array of metacognitive strategies such as monitoring, predicting and revising when they responded to utterances. This enabled them to form certain expectations, check their understandings and accommodate diverging thoughts if necessary.

This study also suggested that the listener’s verbal contributions could be imbalanced at times. Some listeners only offered minimal responses: occasional nods or minimal receipt tokens, for example. This pattern could be consistent almost throughout the entire interaction (see Kailee’s, Jane’s, Jamie’s, Lena’s interactions). Apart from providing minimal responses, their tendency to avoid explicit questioning in the listening process might contribute to this prevailing feature in the interaction. In addition, the strategy to avoid questioning could be closely linked to listeners’ expectations of the others’ willingness to contribute. Issues concerning L2 listeners’ management of expectations will be discussed further in the next section.
Rommetveit (1985) notes that ‘understanding (and misunderstanding) is in an ordinary verbal communication by definition a dyadic and directional affair’ (p.185). It is evident from this study’s findings that as a result of L2 listeners’ continuous monitoring and constant comparison of emergent goals in the interaction, they tended to make discourse adjustments. For example, the findings showed that listeners might develop an evolving understanding of the language that their partner used. This evolving understanding was often relational to the other, derived from the listeners’ understanding of the dialogical and reciprocal nature of communication. In other words, the monitoring in the listening process went beyond linguistic forms and functions: not only did the listener monitor the other’s linguistic choices, he or she also monitored the other’s understanding. It was the monitoring of the other’s understanding that led to the listener reformulating the subsequent responses.

Developing an awareness of the planning of the discourse is important in the discourse dimension of MDA. As was discussed in Section 2.2, through verbal planning, individuals are able to orchestrate their cognitive resources, which adds a layer of cognitive regulation to communication processes (Vygotsky, 1986). Planning is one of the metacognitive strategies/skills delineated by Brown (1987) who refers to cognitive planning as activities that learners are engaged in so as to organise the whole learning process (see Section 2.3). Planning is also the first stage in Pintrich’s self-regulated learning model (Pintrich, 2004). According to Pintrich, planning guides the regulation of cognition, motivation and behaviour. My study underlined that on the one hand, L2 listeners’ awareness of planning in the discourse dimension might be represented locally; on the other hand, their awareness of discourse planning might be represented globally. The awareness of discourse planning showed L2 listeners’ regulation of the discourse in relation to their utilisation of cognitive resources. The following section presents key patterns and trends concerning the thought dimension, and situates my findings within the existing literature.

### 6.3.2 The thought dimension

The listener’s awareness of the thought dimension involves his or her complex understanding of the ways in which thinking processes are organised and orchestrated so that effective communication can be achieved. Details regarding the specific components in this dimension and exemplifications of these components have been provided in Chapter 4. Some of these components in this dimension are central to the conventional view of metacognition, as was reviewed in Chapter 2. The thought dimension highlights the listener’s awareness of planning, predicting, shifting attention, and reflecting on prior knowledge, which can be the key to comprehending verbal and nonverbal messages as well.
as the interaction as a whole. However, there is also the possibility of misunderstanding and miscommunication. In this section, I focus on the trends and patterns emerged from the data.

It is widely recognised in L2 research that prior knowledge is important in the listening process, and this is often related to effective comprehension. As was reviewed in Chapter 2, the use of prior knowledge is key to the listener’s selection of different processing approaches (Vandergrift, 2007b). Prior knowledge provides L2 listeners with rich contexts which they can draw on (Tyler, 2001). The activation of prior knowledge is essential for listeners to develop a conceptual framework in order to parse the linguistic input (Macaro, Vanderplank, & Graham, 2005; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). In this study, prior knowledge was primarily concerned with the listener’s schemata and background knowledge which he or she already knew or developed throughout the course of the interaction. The findings suggested that listeners reflected on their prior knowledge while monitoring, planning, predicting and evaluating the ongoing message in order for the interaction to flow and for shared understanding to be created. Listeners’ regulation of cognitive resources, including the reflection on prior knowledge, was crucial to the contextualisation of emergent utterances. They not only needed to be aware of the situation (who is talking, where and when), the ‘co-text’ (the language that precedes and follows the current utterances) and visual information embedded in the physical context (Vandergrift, 2003b), they should also be able to establish a link between such contextual information and prior knowledge.

This is in line with Dipper, Black and Bryan’s (2005) study which concluded that listeners use prior knowledge to contextualise linguist input. The familiar scenarios from prior knowledge in the listeners’ long-term memory, along with the co-constructed information, help learners to develop a better understanding of new utterances. Their study is informed by Anderson’s (1995) Information Processing cognitive model which posits that during the utilisation phase, listeners form familiar ‘conceptual events’, and match ongoing utterances against them. The findings of this study indicated that by linking contextual information to prior knowledge, listeners developed an understanding that shaped the cognitive attunement between themselves and their counterparts. They may complete the other’s utterances in such a way that, apart from acknowledging the receipt of the information, also regulates discourse patterns (see Section 5.1). In addition, my findings confirmed previous studies, in that as listeners established the link between contextual information and prior knowledge, they formed certain mental images. The reflection on prior knowledge, which
required listeners to be actively engaged, contributed to the co-construction and negotiation of ongoing shared understanding (see Section 5.2).

Findings from this study also recognise that the monitoring and control of attentional resources are crucial to the co-regulation process in listening (see Section 4.1.3). The Literature Review chapter has discussed the importance of attention. Not only does it play a pivotal role in many listening models (Barker, 1971; Brownell, 2002; Steil, Barker, & Watson, 1983; Wolvin & Coakley, 1992, 1996), but it is closely related to the use of schemata or prior knowledge (Baddeley, 2003; Tyler, 2001). My findings indicated that as listeners listen, they may shift or direct their attention away for various reasons. They may decide to shift their attention away because the meaning of an utterance is irrelevant or redundant; alternatively, they may decide to focus on the task requirements rather than the meaning of the utterance. However, they may still pretend to listen out of politeness. This pattern of one person talking while the other person’s attention is shifting away may or may not be evident in the listener’s phatic responses at the local discourse level.

Gardner (1998) argues that ‘there is a sense in which listeners’ vocalisations marking receipt of previous talk, but not contributing to topic, are neither purely listening nor purely speaking’ (p. 206). The findings of this study echo this contention. Some of the L2 listeners in the present study might maintain the flow of the interaction even when the attention has shifted. They used strategies to show that they were interested so that the interaction could flow, whereas in fact, they have already shifted their attention.

Previous research has established that as listeners communicate with their interlocutors, they form expectations. Listeners’ expectations may be related to the others’ understanding of their verbal and nonverbal responses (Schober & Brennan, 2003). Listeners’ expectations may be also linked to the affective aspect of their metacognitive experiences (Efklides, 2006). Efklides argues that the faster the listener’s rate of processing, the more positive expectation is experienced. Wolvin (2010) provides similar insights. As was noted in Chapter 2, Wolvin states that the listener’s background, past experience and other perceptual filters may shape his or her expectations. The study conducted by Tsui and Fullilove (1998) suggests that the mismatch between L2 listeners’ schemata and expectations distinguishes more-proficient listeners from less-proficient listeners. Section 5.4 specifically deals with L2 learners’ management of the unexpected in listening. My analysis of the interview and interaction data reveals that L2 listeners may utilise accommodation or directed attention as strategies...
to manage the unexpected in the interaction. These strategies contribute to the listeners’ implicit co-construction and negotiation of shared understandings.

Flowerdew and Miller (2010) indicate that ‘different cultures are likely to give rise to different schemata and consequently different expectations and interpretations of a given (spoken or written) text’ (p. 171). A notion related to this is ‘tolerance of ambiguity’ (TOA). Lynch (2009) defines it as ‘the willingness of members of a culture to accept uncertainty, vagueness, and fuzziness’ (p. 86). L2 learners from cultures with low TOA often utilise various strategies to avoid uncertainty; L2 learners with high TOA are, however, more willing to guess the meaning when listening to unfamiliar or ambiguous messages (Lynch, 2009; Oxford, 2002). While certain parts of my findings are in line with Lynch’s and Oxford’s suggestions mentioned earlier, the present study also notes that L2 learners with high TOA may develop sociocultural adaptations in their thinking processes when faced with uncertainty or confusion. Two of the participants, Yuzuki (Japanese) and Rachael (Chinese), are L2 learners with high-TOA according to Lynch and Oxford. Nevertheless, their discourse patterns and semi-structured interviews indicate that they tend to have low tolerance of ambiguity. They have developed a socioculturally adaptive awareness that enables them to apply the strategies to overlap, interrupt and ask questions, even when there is the slightest ambiguity. This is the result of them being aware of the sociocultural environment in which the listening process is situated as well as their understanding of the linguistic background of their interlocutors. The next section outlines my findings regarding the social-affective dimension of MDA.

6.3.3 The social-affective dimension

The social-affective dimension in the MDA framework focuses on how social and affective contextual information is embedded in the co-regulation process. This dimension recognises the situatedness of discourse and thought in communication by highlighting that the listener’s understanding of the other two dimensions does not exist in isolation. Chapter 4 has defined and exemplified the components within this dimension. The social aspect of this dimension is concerned with components such as relationship formation, shared responsibility, role negotiation and so on. The affective aspect of this dimension is concerned with components such as feelings of difficulty, comfort, level of interest and so on. This section will elucidate the trends and patterns emerging from the findings in this respect. As was argued in the preceding two Chapters, L2 listeners’ awareness of regulating the discourse dimension and the thought dimension is inextricably connected to their awareness of the social-affective dimension.
It is clear from this study’s findings that L2 listeners’ regulation of thought and discourse is situated in the social dimension of the listening process. One of the key constructs in the social-affective dimension is the sense of responsibility. Listeners’ awareness of responsibility is derived from Purdy’s view on listening as a community activity in which social responsibilities are constructed collectively (Purdy, 2000, 2003). In co-regulation research, responsibilities are considered to be a shared endeavour between oneself and the other in communication (Meyer & Turner, 2002). From a dialogical viewpoint, the notion of dialogical asymmetry, emphasising the asymmetrical participation, argues that interlocutors’ responsibilities to provide verbal contributions are distributed unevenly (Linell, 1998; Linell & Marková, 1993). The findings of the present study confirmed the existence of L2 listeners’ awareness of joint responsibilities in the discourse. Nonetheless, the way that they utilised strategies to regulate such responsibilities might vary. These shared responsibilities included the responsibility to produce verbal contributions, to initiate turn takings and to encourage the other to talk. For example, in order to make themselves understood, some L2 listeners in this study reported that it was their responsibility to use clarification strategies. This could be the result of them monitoring their partners’ level of understanding on an ongoing basis. Besides, guided by a sense of responsibility to create equal opportunities for participation, L2 listeners may shift their role in the conversation. They adjusted their discourse patterns and discourse planning at the local and global levels.

To a certain extent, the findings of this study are similar to what was reported by Foster and Ohta (2005) and Cutrone (2005). In the qualitative analysis section of their study, Foster and Ohta discovered that their participants actively supported each other in order to save face, even when there was misunderstanding or confusion in meaning. In the present study, the ‘okay, okay’ and ‘laugh’ could indicate that the dyad worked in a collaborative manner in order to create a polite and comfortable environment, despite temporary disagreement. This collaborative environment contributed to the formation of relationships, which was particularly vital given the nature of this study – all the participants were unknown to each other prior to the study. This might involve listeners neutralising their strong opinions so that divergent thought processes can be accommodated or reconciled. In other words, the listeners’ responses could be shaped by their evaluation of their evolving relationships with others at the affective level. This further demonstrates the inherent intertwinement between dimensions.
Previous research on language processing has concluded that the level of familiarity between interlocutors may have an impact on the discourse patterns (Clark & Marshall, 1981; Schober & Brennan, 2003). Schober and Brennan (2003) argue that ‘when strangers meet, they can make only generic assumptions about the communities to which each other belongs, based on appearance, and the situation they happen to be in’ (p. 135-136). It is noticeable within this study that some individuals positioned themselves as the listener because they were aware of unfamiliarity between themselves and their interlocutors. In particular, they monitored their own verbal contributions in relation to their partners’ contributions so that they did not seem dominant.

Relationship formation is another key strand that emerged from the data. It belongs to the social-affective dimension of MDA in the listening process. Purdy (1997) argues that listening ‘serves to build relationships. We build strong links with others by listening to why they are and what they mean’ (p. 10). Pecchioni and Halone (2000) echo this view and suggest that while relational listening is being constructed, social and personal relationships are also fostered. My findings are in agreement with these researchers in that the present study indicates that L2 listeners’ monitoring and control of the discourse are often based on the negotiation of dynamic relationships. Listeners may negotiate their relationships with the others as they regulate their thought processes. The inherent relatedness between the co-regulation of relationships and thoughts may facilitate L2 listeners’ interpretation of utterances.

The co-authorship role of the listener has been discussed in the Literature Review chapter. Hagtvet and Wold (2003) underline that the listener plays an indispensable role in the creation of shared understanding. The findings from my study indicate that L2 listeners’ role in the interaction can be assumed explicitly or negotiated explicitly. L2 listeners may assume the role of leading the conversation by initiating the interaction. They may also assume the role of being the passive recipient of the interaction. The listener’s awareness of the regulation of his or her role is embedded within the social-affective dimension of MDA.

Cutrone (2005) investigated the use of backchannels by Japanese learners of English when interacting with their British counterparts, and found that the use of backchannels could increase the level of confusion for their British counterparts. In other words, the more backchannels that L2 learners provided, the more uncertain their British counterparts felt about the understanding of the other. Cutrone concluded that responses not shared by the cultures of participants might contribute to the negative perceptions of the other. To a
certain extent, the findings of the present study resonate with the findings in Cutrone’s study. Due to the unique design of this study, each participant was paired with a counterpart from a different culture. The findings showed that some listeners had developed the awareness of regulating discourse patterns as a result of their preconceptions regarding the other’s cultural and linguistic backgrounds. In other words, not only were discourse features such as overlaps, interruptions and pauses potentially shaped by the ongoing monitoring at the discourse level, but they could also be underpinned by L2 listeners’ wider social and affective understandings of their counterpart. In the interaction between Savannah (German) and Yuzuki (Japanese), for example, Yuzuki’s preconceived notion of Savannah determines her regulation of the discourse patterns. Although Savannah is a native German speaker, she has spent three years in the US and developed a strong American English accent. Her partner Yuzuki, as the semi-structured interview revealed, was not familiar with an American English accent and thus felt nervous when listening to Savannah. Nervous feelings and unfamiliarity with the other’s cultural backgrounds influenced Yuzuki’s utterances - constant pauses and repetitions. Therefore, it could be argued that Yuzuki’s regulation of discourse was embedded within the social-affective dimension of MDA.

The role of affect in metacognition and communication has been highlighted by a number of researchers. Efklides (2008), for example, argues that metacognitive experiences can be affectively charged. As was discussed in the Chapter 2, Efklides and associates propose that two feedback loops link metacognitive experiences to affect – the processing fluency and the attainment of the goal (Efklides & Petkaki, 2005; Koriat, 2007). In a study on the importance of affect in L2 listening, Vandergrift (2007b) pointed out how affective factors might contribute to the listening process. This is in accord with Swain and Lapkin’s (1998) view that affective variables may have an important impact on the patterns and dynamics of the dialogue. The study conducted by Foster and Ohta (2005) found that L2 listeners’ strategy to provide certain responses could be linked to their way of expressing interest and giving encouragement in the interaction. These responses created a supportive environment which might be conducive to increased L2 production. In line with Foster and Ohta’s findings, my study foregrounded that L2 listeners not only monitored and modified their own utterance, but they also monitored and evaluated the other’s level of interest. Overlapping and questioning, defined as strategies in the local discourse dimension of MDA, for example, might also be utilised to signal or to infer the other’s level of interest. My study showed that with the development of the overall discourse pattern in mind, L2 listeners often evaluate
the extent to which their interlocutor is interested in the interaction during the listening process.

The preceding three sections have provided details regarding the three dimension of MDA: the discourse dimension, the thought dimension and the social-affective dimension. The discussion of each dimension and their interrelatedness have been situated in the existing literature. In conjunction with the findings presented in Chapter 4, this section has answered the first research question:

- What elements are L2 learners aware of that contribute to the monitoring and control of the listening process? What connections, if any, can be established between these elements?

In the next two sections, I outline the scope of the MDA framework. These two sections offer insights into the ways in which MDA is achieved in the listening process: a reciprocal understanding of self and the other and the co-construction and negotiation process.
6.4 A reciprocal understanding of self and the other

Having delineated the interwoven trends and patterns within, between and across the three dimensions of MDA, the following two sections (Sections 6.4 and 6.5) outline the scope of MDA. Section 6.4 discusses the listener’s reciprocal understanding of self and the other during the interaction.

Rost’s (1990) review of listening and language learning concluded that there was a lack of research traditions which regarded the listener as the co-author of utterances rather than as the passive recipient of the speaker’s utterances (see also Krauss, 1987). In recent years, however, there is still relatively little research on bi-directional listening, and even less literature which regards the listener as the co-author of the discourse (Lynch, 2011; Vandergrift, 2007b). There is therefore a need to develop a reciprocal understanding of listening in which meaning is to be communicated in a dialogical manner. In other words, the listener not only takes on an active role in understanding and interpreting the message, he or she also offers ‘competing frameworks’ to the speaker during listening process (Duranti, 1986; Goodwin, 1986). This view recognises the notion that the listener, rather than merely recreating the speaker’s understanding, actively constructs meaning.

The MDA framework proposed in this thesis connects the listener as self to the interlocutor as the other in the listening process. The scope of MDA therefore highlights the understanding that listening is fundamentally a dialogical process in which the listener monitors and predicts the other’s utterance while reflecting on his or her prior knowledge and seeking agreement. This reciprocal active listenership entails the monitoring and control of oneself as well as that of the other, which may contribute to the creation of shared understanding. The first part of this section links the notion of the listener regulating the reciprocal self to my study; the second part of this section focuses on the listener regulating the other.

6.4.1 The listener regulating the reciprocal self

The scope of the MDA conceptualisation highlights that the dialectic between the listener’s monitoring and control of him/herself and the listener’s monitoring and control of the other. This view extends Nelson et al.’s (1998) contention that one develops an understanding of oneself as well as the other guided by metacognitive knowledge. The listener’s awareness of the monitoring and control process is therefore not independent but reciprocal. As was discussed in Chapter 2, the majority of previous research tends to view metacognition and
listening as an individual psychological process in which the regulation of oneself is central. In the present study, some L2 listeners are primarily concerned with the local and individual regulation of discourse and thoughts. The findings show that their understanding of the MDA framework is thus confined by their perception of linguistic proficiency and its impact on communication. This study does not argue against the regulation of oneself in the conventional sense or deems it to be unimportant. In fact, self-regulation provides the foundation for an understanding of the MDA framework. The findings from my study suggest that L2 listeners and their counterparts are dependent on each other in that they often share the responsibility to structure the discourse and regulating each other’s thoughts reciprocally.

Focusing on the listener’s regulation of the reciprocal self draws our attention to the ways in which the listener develop certain expectations with regard to the other, the message and the dynamics of the interaction. The expectation element in the thought dimension of MDA has been discussed in Section 6.3.2. As the discourse develops with time, so does the listener’s formulation of expectations. For example, my findings showed that L2 listeners might adjust their expectations and level of comfort in relation to the other’s personalities and discourse patterns. The listener’s adjustment of expectations, especially the use of strategies to manage the unexpected in the listening process, foregrounded the notion of the listener regulating the reciprocal self (see Section 5.4).

The process of internalisation as was reviewed in the Literature Review chapter accentuates that language serves both as a cultural tool through which members in the community create and share knowledge and as a psychological tool through which an individual regulates his or her own thought. Moreover, language as a cultural and psychological tool mediates learning and cognitive development from the interpersonal level to the intrapersonal level (also Section 2.2). My findings showed that L2 listeners might regulate discourse patterns by using a range of verbal and nonverbal responses as a result of them monitoring the other in order to achieve shared understandings. In other words, as listeners are engaged in the listening process, their regulation of themselves can be viewed as a relational and reciprocal endeavour.

6.4.2 The listener regulating the other
The listener’s regulation of the other is essential in this viewpoint. Adopting a dialogical perspective, the listener can be perceived as the co-regulator of the discourse (see also Section 5.2). When the listener takes on an active role in the listening process, he or she not
only listens in the conventional sense, he or she also participates in the construction of the discourse situated in the wider context.

The listener’s regulation of the other in the discourse is a gradual and often tacit process. Illustrating an aspect of this understanding from the findings of the study, the strategy to wait demonstrates an inhibiting control function for the listener. The utilisation of this strategy may be the result of the listener’s continuous monitoring and evaluation of the balance in verbal contributions. Waiting therefore indicates the listener’s implicit awareness of the reciprocal control of him/herself in relation to the other. As the listener waits for the other to finish a turn and listens attentively, he or she monitors the other’s understanding at the same time. Furthermore, the listener’s strategy to complete the other’s utterances, a result of active predicting, may also be an indication of the listener regulating the other and the discourse.

Floyd (2010) argues that ‘the overall nature and quality of one’s listening can be affected significantly by that person’s attitude/approach toward the other person or persons involved in any situation’ (p. 127). In the same vein, adopting the MDA framework, the co-regulation in the listening process entails an interpersonal endeavour in which the listener monitors and evaluates the other. My findings suggest that L2 listeners may regulate their role in the conversation in relation to the other throughout the course of the interaction and shift the role when necessary. Rather than being static, the listener’s awareness of the role of being a listener is constantly changing. The transition from being a dominant speaker to being an active listener for example, apart from showing that the listener listens in a way that is in relational to the other, also indicates that the listener is aware of the dynamic interpersonal relations in communication. In the present study, some participants deliberately opted to be ‘the listener’ at a certain point of the interaction, and offered only minimal verbal contributions. This was usually the result of their monitoring and evaluation of the imbalance in verbal contributions. Therefore, the listener’s awareness of actively adjusting the ways in which he or she listens in the interaction gives prominence to the notion of the listener regulating the other, i.e. the listener as the co-regulator of the discourse (see Section 5.2).

In the preceding section, I have explored the listener’s reciprocal understanding of self and the other. My findings contribute to the current debates regarding the listener as the co-author of the discourse. The MDA framework argues that the co-regulation in the listening process is a relational and reciprocal endeavour which involves the monitoring and control
of oneself, the other and the relationship between the two. This reciprocal understanding of self and the other contributes to the creation of shared understanding. In the next section, I present the co-construction and negotiation process in which the regulation of self and the other is situated.
6.5 The co-construction and negotiation process

The preceding sections have established that the MDA framework entails that the listener not only forms shared understanding on the thought level, he or she also forms shared understanding on the discourse and social-affective levels. Moreover, the preceding sections have discussed the importance of the listener’s reciprocal understanding of self and the others. This section will look at the process in which this understanding is co-constructed and negotiated.

As was reviewed in Chapter 2, a dialogical view of metacognition and listening extends beyond language forms and meanings; it is primarily concerned with how shared understanding is achieved. This particular lens on thought and communication is germane to my discussion of the scope of the MDA framework. From a sociocultural perspective Wertsch (1985) suggests that meaning is derived from the relationship between language and the context in which it is situated. The inherent connectedness between language and context is also highlighted by Vološinov (1973), who posits that ‘the sign and its social situation are inextricably fused’ and that ‘consciousness becomes consciousness only in the process of social interaction (p. 11).’ The dynamic approach to language and social interactions entails that it is through social interaction that individuals become more aware of their own cognitive state. Apart from belonging to the individuals, this awareness constitutes the collective communities in which it is jointly created and shared (Säljö, 2009). My findings reveal that the listener, as the co-regulator of the discourse, may take on the role of co-constructing cognitive attunement. The co-construction can be embedded in the discourse patterns such as overlaps, collaborative completions or repetitions. For example, the fact that L2 listeners often established a connection between the reflection on prior knowledge and the ongoing understanding could show that they were in the process of achieving cognitive attunement.

Rommetveit (1985) maintains that mutual commitment in dyadic communication control is rooted in the listener’s reciprocal understanding of perspective taking. In other words, the listener monitors his or her own understanding in conjunction with the monitoring of the other person’s thoughts and understanding. My findings indicate that the listener’s reciprocal understanding of perspective taking and setting is embedded in the co-construction and negotiation process. L2 listeners’ awareness of their evolving role, for example, is the result of their continuous monitoring of the interlocutor.
In addition, the MDA framework recognises the degree to which mutual sharedness is co-constructed and negotiated. Wittgenstein’s (1968) notion of ‘language game’ foregrounds the incompleteness and ambiguities of language which are derived from our fragmentary knowledge of the world. Hagtvet and Wold (2003) posit that shared understanding is often largely taken for granted. The co-construction and negotiation process therefore is likely to be implicit. Listeners may rely on the shared contexts which are being co-constructed and negotiated in the listening process. This tacit process is summarised by Rommetveit as ‘the attunement to the attunement of the other’ (Rommetveit, 1974, 1992). My findings show that the participants in a conversation often assume complementary roles in the interaction. The implicit co-construction and negotiation of the roles subsequently result in certain type of discourse patterns. For example, the L2 listeners in my study used questioning as a feedback and/or feedforward strategy to evaluate their partners’ approach to the task without negotiating the sequencing of the task explicitly. Additionally, the way that these listeners managed the unexpected in the discourse could be implicit; in particular, their strategy to accommodate the partners’ thoughts without changing the flow of the interaction may indicate the tacit nature of this process. In contrast to implicit co-construction and negotiation, there may also be explicit negotiation. When there is a discourse, thought or social-affective divergence between the interlocutors, for example, L2 listeners may utilise overt linguistic expressions to co-construct and negotiate meaning. However, as Chapter 5 has concluded, although the negotiation process may seem explicit, a certain degree of implicit sharedness may still exist. The co-ordination between explicit negotiation and implicit sharedness was crucial to both Harry and Mara as listeners.

Shared understanding in the listening process is temporary – it is contingent upon the listener’s reflection on prior knowledge and the continuous monitoring of the other. This temporary shareness triggers the listener’s ‘anticipatory comprehension’ (Rommetveit, 1974, p. 88). The preceding sections have discussed the listener’s management of the unexpected in the interaction, and it was argued that successful management of the unexpected involves the orchestration of a range of knowledge and strategies (see Section 5.4 and 6.3 for details). The formation of expectations and the management of the unexpected constitute an essential feature of the MDA framework. My findings suggest that misaligned expectations may lead to the listener noticing the unexpected. When misaligned expectations are not properly managed, the listener and his or her partner may not be able to achieve a certain degree of alignment of understanding. In my study, in order for L2 listeners’ to properly manage the unexpectedness of transitions and sequencing, they would often have to be actively engaged with their partners, attuning to the other at appropriate levels. Admittedly, different
listeners may form different expectations. These different expectations might include, for example, how explicit certain verbal and nonverbal responses should be. As L2 listeners co-regulate the discourse, thought and social-affective dimensions, they may attempt to attune their expectations to their partners’. My study observes that it is often the extent to which their expectations are co-ordinated that leads to the use of certain strategies. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that in some cases, the interaction may still flow despite misalignment of expectations between interlocutors.

Understanding in discourse, as Shotter (1993) argues, involves ‘a complex back-and-forth process of negotiation both between speaker and hearer, and between what has already been said and what currently is being said’ (p. 27). Compared to studying the listening process when communication flows, studying a listener’s response when there is misunderstanding or when understanding is partially achieved can provide researchers with insights into the listener’s mental processes (G. Brown, 1995; Lynch, 2009). Taking this discussion further, my study shows that L2 listeners may develop misunderstandings in the course of the interaction. When mutual understanding or sharedness is limited, L2 listeners often resort to co-construction and negotiation in an explicit manner.

In the preceding four sections, I have explicated the definition, dimensions as well as the scope of the MDA framework. This re-conceptualisation argues for a broader understanding of learners’ metacognition in the listening process. In the next section, I will outline my contributions to knowledge.
6.6 Contributions to knowledge

This section summarises my theoretical and methodological contributions to knowledge. Specific contributions to knowledge discussed elsewhere in this thesis are brought together. Chapter 2 reviewed the relevant theoretical underpinnings of this study: a sociocultural and dialogical view on thought and communication, metacognition and listening. My review of the literature revealed that the majority of preceding research in relation to metacognition in L2 listening was still based upon the conventional cognitive approach (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). These studies paid little or no attention to the fact that listening is a dialogical endeavour in interpersonal contexts. My study therefore contributed to the existing body of literature by advancing a view that L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity can be conceptualised through a sociocultural and dialogical theoretical lens (Lantolf, 2006; Rommetveit, 1992; Wertsch, 1998). This wider understanding underlined the embeddedness of L2 listeners’ metacognition in the social world.

Chapter 3 set out a methodological contribution to knowledge. With regard to the issue of sampling, the participants in my study came from diverse first language backgrounds, and were paired in such a way that they spoke different first languages in their respective dyads. This sampling strategy differed from what was employed in previous empirical research in this area, which mainly adopted a survey method to elicit data from a monolingual group of L2 learners (e.g. Cross, 2011; Goh & Hu, 2014; Rahimirad & Shams, 2014; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010). My study, however, collected interview data and problem-solving interaction data from L2 learners from around the world (see Table 3:1). Not only did this strategy provide me with the opportunity to maintain the variation in terms of L2 learners’ understandings of metacognition and listening, but it allowed me to highlight aspects which would otherwise be tacit or implicit using survey methods. Furthermore, my methodological contribution, as was outlined in the Chapter 3, accentuated an ‘abductive’ approach to data analysis, which was informed by theory, whilst at the same time grounded in the empirical data. I developed an analytical framework drawing on the grounded theory and conversation analysis traditions. The framework allowed me to interpret the data from multiple perspectives, which increased the validity and reliability of the findings. It is worth noting that the development of this analytical framework was in line with my theoretical orientation, foregrounding the dialogical as well as the situated nature of thought and communication in listening.

Chapter 4 delineated my findings in relation to the complexity of the elements and dimensions in L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in the listening process.
Based on my analysis of the interview data, I presented the findings in a systematic and coherent way so that the interconnectedness within, between and across the three dimensions could be explicated. I identified a wide range of elements within each dimension, and explored their links. In addition, I explored the variability of the distributions of elements within each dyad.

Chapter 5 exemplified and captured the dialogical complexity of L2 listeners’ cognitive monitoring and control in action. The findings were drawn from my participants’ interaction data, complemented by their retrospective comments. I followed the methodological framework proposed in Chapter 3, and reported my interpretations of the interaction data from three levels: the linguistic level, the pragmatic level and the thought level. These findings provided exemplifications with respect to the process in which L2 listeners create shared understanding, co-construct and negotiate their understanding of themselves as well as their partners in the interaction. I also examined L2 listeners’ management of the unexpected and disagreement in the interaction, whereby they tended to attune to each other explicitly or implicitly by orchestrating a range of strategies across dimensions.

Building on Chapters 4 and 5, I defined the metacognitive discourse awareness (MDA) framework in Chapter 6. This re-conceptualisation of L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity gives prominence to the situated nature of the reciprocal monitoring and control within, between and across dimensions. Moreover, as Chapter 6 argued, the scope of my conceptual framework extends to the listener’s awareness of regulating him/herself in relation to his or her awareness of regulating the others. This relational awareness of co-regulation is situated in the co-construction and negotiation process.

In sum, whilst my investigation and re-conceptualisation as a whole may be informed by sociocultural theorising and the previous literature on metacognition and listening, the development of the MDA framework was, to a large extent, also the result of my fine-grained analysis of the empirical data. This study has made both theoretical and methodological contributions to the fields of metacognition and listening. The next section discusses the implications of my study, reflects on the design and outlines further research.
6.7 Implications, reflections and further research

Earlier sections have explicated the scope and complex interconnectedness within, between and across the dimensions in the MDA framework. This section will focus on the implications of this study, reflections on important theoretical and methodological matters and further research.

6.7.1 Implications

In recent years, there has been a growing number of studies exploring the pedagogical implications of teaching metacognitive awareness in L2 listening. They observe that L2 learners’ awareness of the listening process can be raised through strategy training and process-based reflections (Goh & Hu, 2014; Graham & Macaro, 2008; Liu & Goh, 2006; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010). Vandergrift and colleagues explored empirical evidence of the relationship between L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and listening development. They examined pedagogical practices, such as teacher modelling, learner reflections, and peer-peer dialogue, with a focus on teaching the metacognitive processes involved in listening (Cross, 2010, 2011; Goh & Hu, 2014; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). However, my review showed that these studies were primarily based on the cognitive approach which viewed L2 learners’ metacognition in listening as individual psychological processes. Therefore, although Vandergrift and Goh’s pedagogical approach was process-oriented, it was confined in scope (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). The MDA framework advanced in this thesis foregrounds the view that the regulation of thought (metacognition) in L2 listening involves a process of co-regulation in which the orchestration of cognitive resources is a reciprocal endeavour situated in the discourse, thought and social-affective dimensions.

The main purpose of this study was to get a stronger empirical and analytical sense of key matters relating to metacognition in L2 listening. The aim, however, was not to devise a model for teaching in a specific context. Thus, considerable caution needs to be exercised in straightforwardly transferring the findings from this study to classroom environments. Bearing that caution in mind and with appropriate adaptations, the MDA framework can contribute to L2 listening instruction. For example, learners can use a version of the framework as a checklist or discussion frame prior to, during or after their listening or talking tasks. Graham, Santos, and Francis-Brophy (2014) state that there is a lack of emphasis on post-listening discussion and in particular, the discussion of metacognitive awareness. Using the framework in this way therefore would prompt L2 listeners to reflect on a range of knowledge and strategies that they have or should have used during the
listening process. With appropriate guidance and feedback from the teacher, L2 learners will be able to develop knowledge and skills about listening independently, which may help them gain greater confidence in themselves as listeners and increase the awareness of the listening process.

As the MDA framework highlights the interconnectedness across dimensions, teachers can help learners identify the links through teacher modelling. Learners’ reflections and peer discussions of these links are also important in raising their awareness. As was argued earlier, MDA foregrounds the dialogic nature of knowledge construction. It is therefore crucial for teachers to create an environment which is conducive to such collaborative endeavour. Appropriate usage of the framework may thus potentially guide learners to develop an understanding of the regulation of higher thinking skills in general social interactions, thereby helping them identify learning opportunities beyond the language classroom.

Integrating the MDA framework into teaching materials may give learners the language they need to talk about the implicit and complex processes in listening, which is especially useful in L2 context. Thus, MDA derived pedagogical activities will facilitate and encourage L2 learners to reflect more deeply on the elements and how best to orchestrate them in an effective way. In sum, the ‘translation’ of the MDA framework without losing sight of its context-saturated and interconnected nature has the potential to yield important pedagogical implications.

6.7.2 Reflections

This study has tapped into the listening process through interactional talk. Whilst it may be argued that these data are ‘proxy’ as listening can only be inferred through such data, it is important to note that rather than viewing the talk in interaction data and the listening process as separate entities, this thesis gives prominence to the interrelatedness between the two. Features in interactional talk, such as responses, are deemed important elements of the listening process (see Section 2.4.1). Moreover, the three-layered analytical framework developed in this thesis for the interaction data has not only allowed me to analyse the discourse on the linguistic and pragmatic levels, but also enabled me to link the findings of the interaction back to the interview data, thereby uncovering the listening process.
Setting out to explore metacognitive awareness and activities in L2 listening, this thesis has provided an account of a range of issues involved in L2 listening. It should be noted that some of the findings may also apply to listening in L1 or indeed other foreign language contexts. However, the primary concern was not to draw a distinction between L1 and L2 listeners but to explore metacognition in the listening process for L2 listeners. Thus, L2 speakers were recruited as participants in order to explore the phenomenon. Future studies are needed should researchers be interested in finding out the extent to which the findings of this study can be applied to the L1 community – this is beyond the scope of this study. Admittedly, participants’ language origins and proficiency levels may have an impact on my data and findings. Nevertheless, similar to the L1 and L2 distinction issues outlined above, the focus of this study was not to investigate the relationships between metacognition in listening and learners’ backgrounds and differing proficiency levels. As will be discussed later in this section, further research may consider widening the language backgrounds of participants or recruiting participants from a particular proficiency level.

The distinction between cognition and metacognition has been delineated in Section 2.3.1. While the debate on this matter is still ongoing, there seems to be a consensus that there is a blurred boundary between the two (e.g. Tarricone, 2011; Whitebread & Pino Pasternak, 2010). My analysis of the interview data has also shown that L2 listeners’ tended to switch between cognitive and metacognitive monitoring. This thesis considers metacognition to be the regulation of cognition at a higher level, i.e. the monitoring and control of a range of cognitive activities. Metacognitive discourse awareness, as was proposed earlier in this Chapter, can be perceived as learners being reflexive as they regulate their understanding of discourse and discourse strategies. Such a reflexive regulation is interconnected with the regulation of the thought and social-affective dimensions. To a great extent, this cross-dimensional regulation is the key to understanding metacognitive awareness and activities in listening.

6.7.3 Further research
This study has broadened our view of what L2 listening entails. I expanded the conventional cognitive and psychological view of listening, and highlighted the discourse, social and affective dimensions in which it is situated. Future research may consider developing this conceptual understanding by fine-tuning some of the theoretical matters that the framework is concerned with.
Further research may also adopt the framework and use the same sampling strategies I have outlined but with a larger and more varied population. Alternatively, researchers interested in comparing the difference between L1 and L2 listeners may conduct further studies with L1 listeners as the control group. In addition, there is a possibility that future research uses a different research design. Although it was argued earlier that the use of the MDA approach addressed the many limitations of merely administering the MALQ found in most of the recent studies in this area (Bozorgian, 2014; Rahimirad & Shams, 2014), the combination of these two research tools may yield new insights.

Finally, future studies may consider conducting research on the MDA framework in pedagogical settings in order to investigate some of the pedagogical implications discussed above. The discussion of the elements in MDA after L2 learners have completed different kinds of listening tasks involving different genres, for example, could lead to more relevant findings pertinent to classroom contexts. Such studies may also contribute to the empirical evidence that supports the development of the framework.

Finally, it is important that future research does not regard the framework as a prescriptive account of L2 listeners’ understanding of metacognition. Rather, research in different settings needs to view the framework critically with an aim that suits the purpose and context of their enquiry.
6.8 Limitations

This thesis has investigated L2 learners’ metacognitive awareness and activity in the listening process from a sociocultural and dialogical theoretical perspective. It is important, however, to acknowledge that there are some limitations. This section summarises the specific limitations discussed elsewhere in this thesis.

With regard to the issue of sampling, my deliberate decision to diversify participants’ profiles meant that the sampling procedure was not random sampling. Whilst it could be argued that this decision entailed that the participants were not representative of the general population, the sampling procedure suited the purpose of this study. My research design aimed to gain a deeper understanding of L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity; it was not to test a certain hypothesis. In effect, my sampling strategy could be construed as one of the key strengths of the study. For one thing, it distinguished this study from the majority of the studies on metacognition in L2 listening. Most, if not all, studies in this area recruited participants from one single cultural and language background or compared participants from two cultural and language backgrounds, resulting in relatively confined findings. For another, the fact that my study sampled L2 listeners across diverse social and linguistic backgrounds also allowed this exploratory study to survey a wider terrain, which can be seen to have led to the production of more interesting and nuanced data.

This study recruited twenty international students at a Scottish university. The relatively small-scale sample size may limit the generalisability of the findings. It is, however, important to note that throughout the thesis, I have paid special attention to producing a clear account of my data, analytical approach and findings, which contributes to the robustness of the study overall. Moreover, my view on the generalisability of the study was in line with Williams’ (2002) notion of ‘moderatum generalisation’ (p. 138). The more inductive reasoning that my study was concerned with recognised that there are considerable commonalities across social life; individual contexts are likely to share some of these commonalities which can be seen as instances of a broader pattern.

The retrospective approach is in accord with previous research on metacognition and listening (see Section 3.2). Limitations related to this approach include the time gap between the task interaction and subsequent interviews. The lapse of memory, i.e. veridicality, may affect the quality of the data (Bowles, 2010). As was argued in Chapter 3, providing the participants with video recordings of their interaction was a way to keep veridicality to the minimum. More important, however, rather than viewing participants’ retrospective
accounts as ‘distortion’ of the only ‘truth’, I attempted to underline the ways in which they produce narratives and interpreted their experience in the interview process and the analysis process that followed.

During the semi-structured interviews, the self-initiated replay in which participants chose segments allowed them to take control. Besides voluntarily pausing the video and articulating their thoughts, the participants also answered questions based on the extracts selected by me. The selection of the extracts highlighted instances where the regulation between the participants was more salient. This was in accord with my general approach to interviewing outlined in Chapter 3. The challenges and limitations, however, were mainly concerned with the consistency of the segments chosen for participants to comment on. In other words, some might argue that the selection of segments might be inconsistent and rather subjective. However, as I argued in Chapter 3, these video segments only served as part of the retrospective approach the purpose of which was to encourage L2 learners to reflect on their knowledge and strategies regarding metacognitive awareness and activity during the listening process. The purpose was not to set a uniform criterion for choosing segments, if that were indeed possible at all.

As a way of triangulating the findings, the analytical approach devised for this study foregrounds both the analysis of individuals’ reflections and the analysis of the talk. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) argue that triangulation is ‘a strategy that adds rigour, breadth, complexity, richness and depth to any enquiry’ (p. 5). The findings from the interview data set out to obtain L2 learners’ understanding of metacognition in the listening process whereas the talk in the interaction data explored their discourse and action. In terms of the analysis of interviews, there may be concerns with regard to the potential limitation of drawing inferences from quantitative data. The counting of (co-)occurrences provided clear indications to the reader as to what was happening in the data. Any inferences from the quantitative data have been dealt with caution. My discussion on counting in Section 3.6.1 highlighted that the frequency of occurrences was not necessarily indicative of weight of importance. The main purpose of including numerical data was to analyse the data and present the findings in a more systematic manner by mapping trends and patterns - part of my in-depth analysis of the interview data. All the quantitative findings were interpreted and understood in conjunction with qualitative illustrations. The extracts contextualised the numerical data and strengthened the quantitative findings.
The preceding sections have shown the main contribution of this thesis central to the investigation of L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity. The MDA framework advanced in this study is an attempt to capture the re-conceptualisation. Any potential for applying the framework to pedagogical settings should be exercised with caution. Practitioners should avoid adopting a reductionist and static view of the re-conceptualisation by focusing on merely teaching specific listening strategies or techniques in the classroom; they should recognise the fluidity and dynamics of the diverse regulation that the listening process entails. This study underlined the understanding of developing MDA through discourse. MDA informed pedagogical activities should always be complemented by the teacher’s and learners’ endeavour to create a dialogical environment in which the development of thinking is situated in the development of discourse and social-affect.
6.9 Conclusion

The thesis has also provided an in-depth review of some of the key issues concerning metacognition and listening. The theoretical origin of this study lies in sociocultural theorising which regards language as a cultural and psychological tool mediating the individual’s development between the intrapersonal level and the interpersonal level. Thus, the assumption that guided this study was that metacognition in L2 listening is inherently dialogical, involving the reciprocal regulation of the listener and his or her partner in the interaction.

In my presentation of the findings, it was argued that metacognition in L2 listening could be construed as a joint endeavour in which learners’ awareness and activity of reciprocal monitoring and control are situated in three interconnected dimensions: the discourse dimension, the thought dimension and the social-affective dimension. In addition, through a fine-grained analysis of L2 learners’ discourse, this study highlighted variability in the ways in which the listeners developed an understanding of themselves and the others.

The MDA conceptual framework advanced in this thesis has provided new insights into L2 learners’ understanding of metacognition in the listening process, addressing a gap in the literature. Whilst my study did support the existing literature by confirming the importance of regulating thought processes in listening (Field, 2008; Goh & Hu, 2014; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012), but it also moved beyond the narrow focus on cognition. It has underlined the fact that the regulation process is dialogical and reciprocal, embedded in the interconnected dimensions not only of thought, but also of discourse and social-affect.

Finally, since the MDA framework is grounded in the complexities of how L2 learners listen in a cross-cultural and face-to-face settings, it can be argued that this conceptualisation can be of distinct value for language teaching practitioners in diverse local and global contexts. The challenge when applying this framework to practice, however, may be to find ways of integrating such an understanding into real world learning, teaching and assessment environment.

It is hoped that the investigation into and re-conceptualisation of L2 listeners’ metacognitive awareness and activity discussed in this thesis will serve as an important precursor to further research into learners’ awareness of higher thinking skills in everyday settings. This study may also potentially contribute, beyond the domain of language learning, to our
evolving understanding of listening as the foundation of communication and as the means by which we acquire and exchange knowledge.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1 Flyer and e-mail templates

Flyer

Research Volunteers Needed!
My name is Alan. I am a second year PhD student at Moray House School of Education. I am looking for international students from diverse cultural and language backgrounds to help me with my research.

Current research
This PhD project is looking at the ways in which international students communicate using English as a second/foreign language, and the thinking processes behind.

Who can participate?
International students who are not native speakers of English.

What’s involved?
You will have the opportunity to work on a problem-solving task with another non-native English speaker, and do a follow-up interview with the researcher talking about the social factors behind your thought processes during the interaction. Each session will last about an hour. Refreshments will be provided.

If you are interested, please do not hesitate to contact me at:
Alan Huang
Email: Ning.Huang@ed.ac.uk
2.11 Simon Laurie House, Moray House School of Education, Holyrood, University of Edinburgh, EH8 8AQ

E-mail Template

Hi xxx,

My name is Alan. I am a second year PhD student at Moray House School of Education. I am looking for international students from diverse cultural and language backgrounds to help me with my research. I wonder if you could circulate this email among the students in your school. Here is a brief description of my study.

This PhD project is looking at the ways in which international students communicate using English as a second/foreign language. You will have the opportunity to work on a problem-solving task with another non-native English speaker, and do a follow-up interview with the researcher talking about the social factors behind your thought processes during the interaction. The session will last about an hour. Refreshments will be provided.

Please contact me at Ning.Huang@ed.ac.uk for more details if you are interested.

Thank you and best regards,
Appendix 2 Demographic Form

You will be assigned a code, and all information will be linked only to your code, not to your name. This will help to ensure confidentiality. Your code will not be able to be matched to your name. Your code appears at the top of this page.

Please complete the information below. It will assist me in gaining a mixed sample of participants for this study.

Age: __________ Gender: □ Female □ Male
IELTS Score: _________________ TOEFL Score: _________________

Please indicate your level of English

□ Pre-intermediate
□ Intermediate
□ Upper-intermediate
□ Advanced

English is your □ first language / □ second language / □ third/foreign language

I was born in the country of _________________.

I have been in the UK for ____________ months / years. (Delete as appropriate.)

My degree area is _________________.

CODE

________________________
Appendix 3 Informed Consent Form

Project/Title

Investigating metacognitive discourse awareness in second language listening

Statement of Age of Participant

I state that I am 18 years of age or older, in good physical health, and wish to participate in a programme of research being conducted by Alan Huang in the Moray House School of Education at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, EH8 8AQ

Purpose

The purpose of the research is to investigate metacognition and language learning. This is not a test of any kind.

Procedures

The procedures involve completing a problem-solving task which will be video recorded, stimulated-recall semi-structured interview which will be audio recorded. I understand that my participation will require approximately 1 hour.

Confidentiality

All information collected in the study is confidential, and my name will not be identified at any time. The data I provide will be grouped with data others provide for reporting and presentation. Since the study will involve both audio and video recording, I understand that I may be recognised by the researcher(s) when they review the data; however, they will always refer to my responses by my assigned code instead of my name. Records and data will be securely stored to protect my identity. Records and data will be kept for a minimum of 5 years after today and/or 5 years after any publication using this data, whichever is longer.

Risks

I understand that there are no foreseeable personal risks associated with my participation. I understand that portions of the study may be video or audio recorded, and I give my permission to be audio and/or video recorded. At the end of the study, I will be made aware of exactly what was recorded, and I will be given the choice to approve or disapprove the use of these materials. Since my image and voice might be recognisable by the researchers when they are reviewing the data, I understand that anonymity is not guaranteed. Further, I understand and give my consent to have these recordings used for subsequent studies conducted only by the primary researcher, and I understand that my responses and identity will remain confidential.

Freedom to Withdraw, and Ability to Ask Questions

I understand that I am free to ask questions and/or to withdraw from participation at any time without penalty and/or decline to answer certain questions and/or decline to release my audio or videotape for use in this study.

Principle Investigator

Alan Huang, 2.11 Simon Laurie House, Moray House School of Education, University of Edinburgh, Scotland, EH8 8AQ. Email address: Ning.Huang@ed.ac.uk
Obtaining Research Results

I understand that I may obtain a copy of the results of this research after August 2015 by contacting Alan Huang at the above listed address.

I have read and agree with the statement above.

Printed name of participant _______________________
Signature of participant _______________________
Date ___________________
Appendix 4 Main Study Task

Flat sharing is a must-have experience for most international students here in Scotland. Being able to communicate well with your flatmates is extremely important, especially if you are from different cultures. However, issues such as washing up, noise, or personal hygiene may cause dispute even for flatmates from the same culture.

Now discuss the following flat-sharing issues with your partner, and find suitable solutions together.

1. Some flatmates like to invite friends and organise parties at night without asking others first.
   Possible solution: ________________________________.

2. Yesterday you found the butter you left in the fridge was gone, but you remember clearly that you had only used half of it.
   Possible solution: ________________________________.

3. One of the flatmates never pays the rent/bills on time. In fact, the landlord might come to talk to you about this.
   Possible solution: ________________________________.

4. Some flatmates never clean anything. Although you clean the kitchen and bathroom whenever you can, it still looks very messy most of the time.
   Possible solution: ________________________________.

5. One of your flatmates likes to play loud music with the volume turned up. Sometimes you can hear the music in your room especially after midnight.
   Possible solution: ________________________________.

You will have 8-10 minutes to work on these issues collaboratively with your partner. However, if there are other flat-sharing issues that you would like to raise, feel free to do so!
Appendix 5 Interview Questions

Warm-up questions

- What did you think of the task in general?
- How did you find working with your partner?

Now let’s watch video recording together. Please feel free to pause the video and describe or explain your thought processes when you see examples of you and your partner working together.

Main questions

What was going through your mind while listening to his/her speech?

- What did you have to do to be able to understand the other person, or to be able to speak and make yourself understood?
- When/how do you know when you understand a message, when/how do you know you don’t?

What does his/her reaction tell you? How did you come to this conclusion?

- What did you finish his/her sentence?
- Why did you/s/he give specific examples?
- Do you think he got your idea?
- Why did he get confused?
- Why do you think saying ‘okay’ and nodding your head is important?

How did you think about your own experience while listening to him/her?

- * How did you manage listening to your partner, but at the same time thinking about your own experience and preparing for an answer?
- Influence on interest? Why important?
- * You mentioned ‘the situation’. What is it? Why is it important?

Strategy use

- Why did you decide not to pay attention to the wording?
- What made you decide to ask for repetition/paraphrasing here?
- * Why did you change from ‘probably’ to ‘surely’ here? What made you change from one word to the other?
- Why did you hesitate so much here?
- When would you normally use prediction? How do you predict?
- Is checking to see if you understand someone important?

Silence

Who took the initiative in the conversation? Why?

What were your general expectations from your conversation partner? How would this influence your performance?

Is there any final thought you would like to share? For example, how you and your partner worked together to achieve the common goal?
Appendix 6 Transcription Conventions

[ simultaneous speech
, brief and natural pause
? rising intonation
. end of an utterance
<laugh> laughter
... ellipsis/unable to transcribe
<2> two-second pause
<gesture> hand gestures
- latching
:: elongation of a syllable
, one’s thought during the interaction or
repetition of the other person’s utterance
## Appendix 7 Coding Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>The listener accommodates the other’s thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment</td>
<td>The listener adjusts the discourse patterns in the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>The listener monitors the agreement or disagreement during the interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>The listener’s focus on the various aspects of the interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backchannel</td>
<td>Minimal response tokens such as ‘yeah’, ‘uhm’, ‘uhuh’, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification</td>
<td>The listener clarifies the meaning of the preceding utterance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-construction</td>
<td>The participants’ joint creation of shared understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence</td>
<td>The coherence or sense-making of utterances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>The participants’ feelings of comfort with the interlocutor, the interaction or the atmosphere in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication breakdown</td>
<td>Misunderstanding affects the flow of the communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion</td>
<td>The participants construct the same utterance in a collaborative manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confusion</td>
<td>The listener’s feeling of confusion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>The listener monitors verbal contributions in the interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>The listener’s awareness of the culture-specific aspects of the interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>The listener monitors the task requirements during the ongoing interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty</td>
<td>Feelings of difficulty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>The listener’s awareness of him/herself or the other being dominant in the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaboration</td>
<td>The listener’s awareness of forming a mental image based on the situation that the other is describing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouragement</td>
<td>Feelings of being encouraged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation</td>
<td>The listener’s expectation with regard to a range of aspects in the listening process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye contact</td>
<td>The participants either make or avoid eye contact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flow</td>
<td>The listener monitors or maintains the flow of the communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td>The listener’s awareness of context formality in the conversation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand gestures</td>
<td>The participants use hand gestures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesitation</td>
<td>Segments of an utterance with unnatural pauses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiation</td>
<td>The initiation of the interaction or new topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>The listener can be interested in the other’s opinions or the listening process in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language use</td>
<td>The listener’s awareness of the language-related aspects of the discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervousness</td>
<td>Feelings of nervousness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nodding</td>
<td>The participants nod.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overlap</td>
<td>The listener starts to talk while the ongoing utterance has not ended – simultaneous speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patience</td>
<td>Feelings of patience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>The listener’s awareness of his/her own as well as the other’s personalities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politeness</td>
<td>The listener’s awareness of politeness issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior knowledge</td>
<td>The listener reflects on his/her prior knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>The listener asks questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>The listener monitors and controls the relationship formation during the interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repetition</td>
<td>The listener repeats all or part of what one or the others have said in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>The listener’s obligation to balance verbal contributions or the initiations of a new topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>The participant’s perceived role in the interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequencing</td>
<td>The order of the topics to be discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>Significant pauses in the interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>The listener monitors and evaluates the current or overall pace of the interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiting</td>
<td>The listener waits for the other to finish the last turn, or to self-repair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worry</td>
<td>Feelings of worry or anxiety.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>