PASAA Journal
Volume 64, July – December 2022, 194–215

PASAA

Narrow Listening as a Method to Improve EFL Learners' Listening Comprehension

Trần Thị Ngọc Yến[a]*, Rob Waring[b]

[a]Vinh University, Vinh, Vietnam

[b]Notre Dame Seishin University, Okayama City, Okayama Prefecture, Japan

* *Corresponding author*: yenttn.vinhuni@gmail.com

Article information	
Abstract	The practice of narrow listening was introduced almost 30 years ago (Krashen, 1996), but has not received enough attention from English language teachers and researchers. Past research has placed a focus on the combination of this method and narrow reading, or the use of this method in teaching languages other than English. This study explored narrow listening as an independent method to improve EFL learners' listening comprehension. The 38 participants in this study were intermediate EFL adult learners following a general English course. During the experiment, the treatment group were provided with narrow listening materials, while the control group were given listening exercises as homework. A pre-test and a post-test were used to measure the participants' listening comprehension. The results indicated that the treatment group outperformed the control group on the post-test. Compared to their control group counterparts, the narrow listening learners gained significantly greater comprehension of the oral texts, even those about the topics they had not practiced during the treatment. The findings have suggested that narrow listening has a positive impact on EFL learners' listening competence and

E-ISSN: 2287-0024

	that repetition in listening is advantageous to language acquisition.
Keywords	narrow listening, listening comprehension, input repetition, listening skills, EFL listening
APA citation:	Yến, T. T. N. & Waring, R. (2022). Narrow listening as a method to improve EFL learners' listening comprehension. *PASAA*, *64*, 194–215.

Introduction

All too often, listening has been considered a nerve-wracking part of the EFL learners' journey to mastery of the English language. It is, nevertheless, a vital skill for second language acquisition since it provides input for the learner (Nunan, 2002). Without listening, speaking is plainly insufficient for intelligible real-life communication. The listening skill, therefore, should be given greater attention and language instructors should be encouraged to experiment with methods that can facilitate their learners' listening competence development.

Quite a few EFL learners find themselves frustrated during listening sessions as they often have very little idea of what the oral texts are about. They may then panic, thinking that their listening skills are nowhere near the level they should be by the end of the program. Several issues could influence learners' success (or lack thereof) during these listening sessions. First, learners have to do the listening tasks at the pace that the instructor or audio machine sets, which might not be manageable or comfortable for every learner. Second, they cannot ask the instructor to repeatedly play the recording until they get a grasp of its content because the instructor must save time for other activities. Third, the topics change from one session to another; the learners have to listen to something new in every session, adding further stress. Last but not least, the fact that the learners have to do exercises as they listen increases the possibility of distraction. They are then listening to avoid losing face if being called on for a question, so it means they are not listening for interest.

All of the above-mentioned challenges may be mitigated, in part, by narrow listening. This method involves students listening to recordings about the same topic several times until their interest wanes. The method was coined by Krashen (1996) and then advocated by other linguists (Chang, 2019; Conti, 2015; Kimura & Ssali, 2009; Rodrigo, 2003, to name a few). However, many of the past studies on this topic only examined the benefits of narrow listening for learners of languages other than English, or attempted to combine narrow listening with narrow reading (Chang, 2019; Kimura & Ssali, 2009).

This study attempted to examine how narrow listening could remedy the undesirable situation that happened all too often in the listening class in EFL contexts. The participants in this study were all students within two intact English language classes at a language institute in Northern Vietnam. One of them was randomly assigned to be the treatment group, which received the narrow listening treatment while following the usual English program. The other class served as the control group for the experiment. A pre-test and post-test were used to measure the participants' listening competence. The study took a step further than previous research in that it attempted to determine whether the effects of narrow listening carried over to other topics than the ones included in the narrow listening materials.

Literature Review

Although listening has been defined in a few different ways, there has been a consensus that it is an active, complex process of constructing meaning from oral input (Brown, 2006; Buck, 2001; Helgesen, 2003; Rost, 2011; Rubin, 1995). In other words, listening is not a passive process as it is often assumed to be (McErlain, 1999). It involves both reception and production. During this process, listeners receive and decode what they hear. In order to interpret the spoken message, they have to contribute knowledge from linguistic and non-linguistic sources. Buck (2001) identifies three types of knowledge people need to use in listening: applying knowledge of the language (linguistic source), using world

knowledge, and building mental presentations of meaning (non-linguistic sources). While listening, we utilize language knowledge, experiences, our current thoughts, feelings, and intentions to construct meaning from the spoken discourse. In this sense, listening is different from hearing. While hearing is passive and just involves sound perception, listening is active and involves the recreation of messages.

Quite a few researchers have emphasized the importance of good listening skills in academia (Asemota, 2015; Buck, 2001). The ability to listen to and comprehend spoken input may be a good indicator of success in language learning (Boyle, 1987). Put another way, listening can be seen as an integral part of language development (Nunan, 1998; Siegel, 2015). This is exemplified in a number of ways. Listening comprehension facilitates the development of speaking and writing skills (McErlain, 1999; Rost, 1994) since it provides learners with rich input and useful models. Previous studies have found that listening is beneficial for pronunciation (McErlain, 1999) and vocabulary learning (Asemota, 2015). Through listening to oral language input, learners are exposed to natural examples of pitch, tone, sounds, rhythm, grammar patterns, and word choice, which enhances their language acquisition.

Although the fundamental role of listening has been acknowledged, the practical complexities of preparing and selecting spoken materials have caused the teaching of listening to lag behind that of other language skills in many EFL settings (Buck, 2001). The listening session is also more likely to be cut than the others when there is a shortage of class time (Field, 2009). Fortunately enough, every so often, listening regains prominence among English language practitioners. There is a growing body of literature on English language teaching that is concerned with listening processing models (Anderson & Lynch, 1988; Brown, 2006), types of listening skills (Asemota, 2015), principles for teaching listening (Harmer, 2010), and approaches to listening instruction (Harris, 2007; Nation & Newton, 2009; Vandergrift, 1999).

A considerable amount of literature has been published on methods, strategies, or activities to develop listening skills. Researchers such as Walker

(2010), Mackenzie (2014), and McBride (2016) contend that the inclusion of non-native speaker accents in listening materials would be helpful for learners. Some linguists call for a balanced attention to top-down and bottom-up strategies (Nunan, 2002), while others report that bottom-up training activities for lower-level learners are more propitious (Goh, 2000). Researchers have also advocated the use of sub-skill and strategy taxonomies (Siegel, 2015), authentic materials (Miller, 2003), and pro-active and repair strategies (Field, 2009) for listening instruction. Along these lines, some previous studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of extensive listening, which is an aural version of extensive reading (Chang & Millet, 2014; Stephens, 2011; Waring, 2008). However, within this body of literature, there has existed another method to develop listening skills, namely narrow listening, which was put forward more than two decades ago but is still under-researched.

Narrow listening was developed by Krashen (1996), who experienced the then-unnamed method himself while learning Spanish as a foreign language. It involves learners listening to several recordings of native speakers talking about the same topic. Learners listen to the same listening samples several times until their interest diminishes in order to gain a deep understand of the topic, and build fluency and automaticity when listening. Krashen believes narrow listening is delightful and effective although he admits that in some EFL situations, native speakers are hard to find. Therefore, language teachers working in these settings may have to collect listening materials from YouTube, radio, television, and software applications, or even ask learners to contribute their own oral texts (Rodrigo, 2003) or make their own.

In order for narrow listening to work effectively, teachers should consider such factors as authenticity, topic familiarity, and repetition. Repeated exposures to authentic materials have been shown to lead to language development and cultural awareness (Rodrigo, 2003). Authentic materials provide more meaningful contexts, which promote language acquisition by increasing learner interest and giving the learners building blocks of language from which to develop their knowledge (Nation & Newton, 2009). The topics discussed in the listening samples

should also be familiar to learners so that they do not have to struggle to activate new background knowledge. A focus on information and general meaning would be more conducive to language acquisition (Day & Bamford, 1998; Krashen, 2003). Learners should also be provided with several different recordings about a single topic and listen to each of them as many times as they wish. This would allow them to have a sufficient quantity of content and language input to support language acquisition (Wodinsky & Nation, 1988). In this sense, narrow listening is different from listening repetition. With the latter, learners may get bored as they have to listen to the same listening text again and again. However, with the former, learners have opportunities to work with different listening texts, but they are still be exposed to the same topic. This allows them to come across many of the same vocabulary and language patterns while enjoying the new contents. In other words, narrow listening allows not only repetition, which is crucial for language acquisition (Nation & Newton, 2009), but also novelty, which listening repetition cannot offer.

Previous studies have manifested the power of narrow listening in foreign language development. Dupuy (1999), for example, implemented the method with students of French as a foreign language and found that the participants' listening comprehension, fluency, and vocabulary range improved along with their confidence with French. Along similar lines, Rodrigo (2003) has confirmed that narrow listening is a stimulating and effective experience for learners of Spanish as a foreign language. The improvement of his participants' scores on a standardized listening test indicated that this method had a tremendous impact on their listening skills. Furthermore, the students' interest, motivation, and self-confidence were maintained. Many of the learners also asserted that they had learned about another culture and different points of view, improved their communicative skills in Spanish, and developed or reviewed their vocabulary through listening to the audio library material.

In EFL contexts, even though it has not been used as widely as its elder sibling narrow reading, narrow listening has caught the attention of several language practitioners. Kimura and Ssali (2009) combined narrow listening with

narrow reading in instructional contexts by having the participants intentionally recycle specialized and high frequency words appearing in the reading text during the listening activities. The results demonstrated that purposely enriched input can be advantageous for learners working on their reading and listening skills. Other researchers have also testified to the use of narrow listening libraries on the grounds that they would assist learners in improving their listening comprehension, pronunciation, and background knowledge (Bessette, 2007; Caspino, 2005; Chang, 2017). However, the literature on narrow listening is still in its infancy, despite the fact that it has existed for several decades. This study, therefore, set out to provide another opportunity to advance our understanding of the benefits that narrow listening brings to EFL learners and thus enrich the literature on this interesting yet under-researched topic.

Methodology

This section describes the research objectives and questions, participants, procedures, and materials used in the study.

Research objectives and questions

This study was carried out to examine the effects of narrow listening on intermediate EFL adult learners' listening competence. It also aimed to determine whether these effects could transfer from practiced topics to unpracticed topics. In other words, learners who used the narrow listening method may achieve better comprehension of spoken language about the topics that they had repeatedly listened to, but would they obtain better comprehension of spoken language about other topics too? The following research questions were posed:

a) What are the effects of narrow listening on the participants' listening comprehension?
b) To what extent does the improvement in listening comprehension of practiced topics carry over to unpracticed topics?

Participants and procedures

The participants in this study were EFL adult learners of two intact classes following an intermediate English course at a language institute. The control group consisted of 18 subjects aged from 21 to 37. The treatment group consisted of 20 learners aged from 20 to 39. The participants from both groups were admitted to the English course based on their scores on the placement test they were given at the beginning of the program. It was therefore ascertained that each participant had similar levels of English proficiency as the course commenced. They also shared similar backgrounds and were not attending any other English education programs during the experiment.

The English course at the language institute encompassed all four skills: reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Each group met three times a week for a 90-minute lesson. The curriculum contained 12 units, each of which was meant to be delivered in one week. At the beginning of the course, both groups sat the pre-test, which assessed the participants' entry level of listening competence. During the course, the treatment group was provided with narrow listening materials. The provision was done biweekly with five recordings on a single topic each time. The learners were encouraged to listen to the recordings as many times as they wished. No tasks or exercises on these listening samples were given. This was to make sure that they listened for pleasure, not for competition or grades. Meanwhile, the control group was asked to do listening exercises taken from the book *Tactics for Listening* (Richards, 2019). The answer keys would be provided to the learners the following week. This type of homework assignment would help to mitigate the possible factor of the treatment group making improvement just because they spent time studying while the other group did not. At the end of the English course, both groups sat the post-test.

Materials

For the English course, the book *Smart Choice 3* (Wilson & Healy, 2018) was used. This intermediate level coursebook was part of a four leveled skills-focused

series named *Smart Choice*. Throughout the course, the students' four skills were systematically developed. Each of the 12 topic-based units incorporated vocabulary and pronunciation along with grammar sections.

Six out of 12 topics covered in the course were selected for the narrow listening materials: hobbies, personality, technology, vacation, arts, and inventions. The selection was based on the results of a quick favourite-topic survey carried out in the first meeting. By doing this we could make sure that the topics were familiar to the students. They would not have to struggle activating new background knowledge, and thus would be able to focus on general meaning, which is believed to be conducive to language acquisition (Day & Bamford, 1998; Krashen, 2003). The narrow listening materials were then created with the help of five native English teachers working in the language institute. Each of them was asked to prepare six 2-to-3-minute spoken scripts, which were then checked and modified using a text inspector program (https://textinspector.com/) and a readability calculator (https://www.online-utility.org/english/readability_test_and_improve.jsp). The purpose of this was to make sure that the language used in the scripts were at the intermediate level. We used both websites to validate the reliability of the results. The websites showed such text analysis statistics as average sentence length, number of words, number of syllables, number of words with more than two syllables, average syllables per sentence, Flesch Reading Ease, and Flesch-Kincaid Grade. In this study, we observed four statistics: word number, average sentence length, average syllables per sentence, and Flesch Reading Ease. We put all the scripts onto the websites and made sure they contained similar numbers of words (around 280), similar average syllables per sentence (around 20), and similar average sentence length (around 13). We also based our scripts on the descriptive categories used in the Flesch Reading Ease Formula (See Table 1) and modified the scripts to make them score around 65.

Table 1

Descriptive Categories Used in the Flesch Reading Ease Formula

Reading Ease Score	Descriptive Categories	Reading Grade
90-100	Very easy	5th grade
80-90	Easy	6th grade
70-80	Fairly easy	7th grade
60-70	Standard/Plain	8th and 9th grade
50-60	Fairly difficult	10th to 12th grade
30-50	Difficult	College
0-30	Very difficult	College graduate

The text inspector program also categorized the vocabulary in terms of the Common European Framework levels. Based on these statistics, the scripts were modified to contain at least 90% words at B1 (intermediate) or lower levels. Finally, the speakers recorded themselves using the revised scripts. Altogether, 30 recordings were made.

The pre-test and post-test were administered to assess the participants' listening competence before and after the treatment. Each test consisted of eight sections, the items of which were extracted from the listening section of the Cambridge English standardized tests of English for the intermediate level. The first two sections required test takers to listen to short dialogues and choose the correct answer from three given pictures. The third and fourth sections required test takers to listen to short conversations and choose the correct answer from three written options. The next two sections required test takers to listen to a short talk and write one or two words to fill in a form. The last two sections required test takers to listen to a longer talk and choose the correct answer from three written options. There were 50 questions in each of the tests, each allocated one point. Only four out of the eight sections were related to the topics in the recordings that the treatment group practiced with. This was done to determine whether any measured improvement in comprehension of spoken language applied only to the

practiced topics or also carried over to other topics. Pilot testing was carried out to make sure the testing procedures would go smoothly.

Results

In this study, the participants' listening competence was assessed based on their level of comprehension, which was measured by counting the number of correct answers they had on the pre-test versus the post-test. The participants' improvement in listening comprehension was measured by subtracting their score on the pre-test from that on the post-test. Comparisons of scores on sections about practiced topics and scores on sections about unpracticed topics were also made.

Pre-test results

Regarding the participants' general performance on the pre-test, it was shown that the two groups started at the same level of listening comprehension ability, scoring around 17 out of 50 (See Table 2). The independent *t*-test results indicated that there was no significant difference in listening comprehension, $t(36) = -0.34$, $p<.05$, between the treatment group (M = 17.55; SD = 2.06) and the control group (M = 17.33; SD = 1.81). This result corroborated the participants' scores on the placement test administered as the admission procedure for the English course and reinforced the reliability of this study's findings.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Listening Comprehension on the Pre-test for Both Groups (max=50)

	N	Range	Min	Max	Sum	Mean	Variance	SD	Skewness
Control group	18	7	14	21	312	17.33	3.29	1.81	0.17
Treatment group	20	7	15	22	351	17.55	4.26	2.06	0.32

General improvement in listening comprehension

Regarding the participants' general performance on the post-test, the data indicated that the narrow listening learners outperformed their control counterparts. On average, the treatment group and the control group scored 36.25 and 24.78, respectively (See Table 3). Most participants of the treatment group scored at least 35, whereas most participants of the control group scored under 27. The best-performing participant in the treatment group scored 40, while the best-performing participant in the control group scored only 28. The independent *t*-test results indicated that the 20 participants who did narrow listening (M = 36.25; SD = 2.24), compared to the 18 participants in the control group (M = 24.78; SD = 2.60), demonstrated significantly better listening comprehension, $t(19) = -14.59$, $p < .05$.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics of Listening Comprehension on the Post-test for Both Groups

	N	Range	Min	Max	Sum	Mean	Variance	SD	Skewness
Control group	18	8	20	28	446	24.78	6.77	2.60	-0.29
Treatment group	20	7	33	40	725	36.25	5.04	2.24	0.21

Table 4 presents the data for the listening comprehension improvement for both groups. As can be seen, the treatment group and the control group achieved average score increases of 18.70 and 7.44, respectively. The best-performing participants in the treatment group attained an increase of 24, which was almost double the gain by the best participant in the control group. While all of the treatment group participants achieved increases of over 18, most of the control group participants achieved increases of less than 10. The independent *t*-test results indicated that the treatment group's average increase (M = 18.70, SD = 2.75), compared to the control group's average increase (M = 7.44, SD=2.43), was significantly higher, $t(19) = 13.29$, $p < .05$.

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics of Listening Comprehension Improvement for Both Groups

	N	Range	Min	Max	Sum	Mean	Variance	SD	Skewness
Control group	18	10	3	13	134	7.44	5.91	2.43	-0.29
Treatment group	20	11	13	24	374	18.70	7.59	2.75	0.00

Practiced topics versus unpracticed topics

In the experiment, the participants in the treatment group listened to each of the recordings several times so they were repeatedly exposed to similar types of language on the same topics. It can therefore be hypothesized that the repetition promoted their comprehension of spoken language about those topics. However, if there was evidence that this impact carried over to other topics, the values of narrow listening would be highlighted.

In this study, the scores the learners obtained on the two types of test questions (those about topics included in the narrow listening materials and those about other topics) were calculated and compared within the treatment group and between the two groups.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of Increases in Listening Comprehension of Practiced Topics and Unpracticed Topics for Both Groups

		Range	Min	Max	Sum	Mean	Variance	SD	Skewness
Treatment group	Practiced	5	8	13	211	10.55	1.94	1.39	-0.11
	Unpracticed	9	4	13	163	8.15	6.03	2.46	0.23
Control group	Practiced	6	1	7	69	3.83	2.74	1.65	0.03
	Unpracticed	6	1	7	65	3.61	3.43	1.85	0.33

The study found that although the treatment group made increases in comprehension of materials on both practiced and unpracticed topics, the improvement for the practiced topics was slightly larger than that for unpracticed topics (See Table 5). Note that at the start of the course, both groups achieved

similar scores on the two types of questions. An independent-samples *t*-test was conducted to compare comprehension increases the two groups made on the test sections for the practiced topics. There was a significant difference in the scores for the treatment group (M = 10.55; SD = 1.39) and the control group (M = 3.83; SD = 1.65); t(36) = 13.58, p < .05. The results of the independent-samples *t*-test conducted to compare comprehension increases the two groups made on the sections about unpracticed topics also showed that there was a significant difference in the scores for the treatment group (M = 8.15; SD = 2.46) and the control group (M = 3.61; SD = 1.85); t(36) = 6.38, p < .05. These results eliminated the possibility that the treatment group's overall improvement was entirely due to their being familiar with the topics they had listened to repeatedly. The fact that they achieved an increase of at least 8 points from the pre-test to the post-test for both types of sections suggested that the effect of narrow listening not only stayed within the practiced topics but also transferred to unpracticed topics.

Discussion

This study set out to explore the impacts of narrow listening on intermediate EFL adult learners' listening comprehension and to determine whether these impacts carried over to other settings in which students dealt with new listening materials. The most obvious finding to emerge from the analysis was that the participants' listening comprehension was significantly improved after three months of continuous narrow listening. It was found that the treatment group achieved an increase of 18 points from the pre-test to the post-test, outperforming the control group whose average increase was only 7 points. This finding further supported those reached by Bessette (2007), Caspino (2005), and Chang (2017).

There are several explanations for the substantial gains by the treatment group. First, with narrow listening, the learners were exposed to repeated lexical and grammatical loads, through which they also familiarized themselves with the English sounds, intonation, stress, and other discourse features of spoken language. This corroborated the comprehensible input theory of Wodinsky &

Nation (1988) and Krashen (2004). Since the participants could repeatedly replay a single recording or several recordings of a familiar topic, they were provided with enough comprehensible input for language acquisition to take place. In this case, varied topics, genres, and styles may not offer as valuable benefits to EFL learners as they were usually assumed to. Often in the language classroom, the topics change from one to another after every session making it hard to retain information and reinforce previous learning. If there are more opportunities for learners to practice the same topic until their confidence has been boosted, language acquisition would be more likely to take place. Narrow listening fills this gap by offering learners repetitive exposures to the same genres, vocabulary, grammatical structures, and discourse features. The study's finding has therefore highlighted the essential role of repetition in language learning.

The participants' improvement in listening comprehension may also be explained by the language anxiety hypothesis and the affective filter hypothesis (Krashen, 1982). Advocates of the language anxiety theory have shown that anxiety impairs the language learning process and negatively affects the learners' course grades (Horwitz et al., 1986), vocabulary recall, and short-term memory capacity (MacIntyre & Gardner, 1991). Along similar lines, Krashen (1982) proposes that when learners are tense, anxious, or bored, they mentally filter out input, which makes it unavailable for language acquisition to take place. In this study, the learners in the treatment group carried out narrow listening outside the classroom; therefore, they could listen at their own pace in the comfort of their home. Furthermore, unlike their control group counterparts, they did not have to worry about listening exercises. This might have allowed them to alleviate such burdens as having to keep up with peers or respond to the teacher's requirements and questions. The fear of losing face or self-identity was also minimized. These anxiety reducing factors could have possibly contributed to the notable improvement made by the treatment group.

Another possible explanation for the treatment group's remarkable achievement in listening comprehension is that narrow listening might have

provided them with opportunities to focus on the ideas and messages conveyed by the language (meaning-focused) while allowing learners to pay attention to language items and language features (form-focused). In the experiment, the participants in the control group probably had to focus on answering the listening comprehension questions, whereas the treatment group could either listen for pleasure or deliberately learn and practice language features and language use strategies. To put it another way, the treatment group were more likely to benefit from the presence of both the language-focused learning and meaning-focused input strands (Nation, 2007). Researchers have recommended an appropriate balance of these two strands in language courses (Nation & Newton, 2009; Nation & Yamamoto, 2012). It could therefore be hypothesized that narrow listening offered this balance and the participants in the treatment group were able to take advantage of that.

The second aim of this study was to see if the effects of narrow listening carried over to other topics that learners did not deliberately practice during their narrow listening time. It was found that compared to the control group, the treatment group gained significantly larger score increases on both types of topics (practiced and unpracticed). This result suggested that narrow listening generated profound effects on learners' comprehension. The observed increase in comprehension of practiced topics could be attributed to background knowledge activation, apart from language repetition. In a more precise way, the participants receiving treatment had become familiar with the topics through narrow listening; therefore, they had additional advantages over the control group on the post-test. The treatment group's substantial attainments in comprehension of unpracticed topics are more difficult to explain in this paper, but the reason may be related to automaticity. Automaticity can be understood as the effortless, accurate, and fast recognition of words (Adams, 1994; Schwanenflugel et al., 2006). If EFL learners possess listening automaticity, they can recognize the sounds with very little effort, leaving cognitive resources for more complicated tasks such as comprehension, inference, analysis, and other higher-order skills. It might be that through narrow

listening, the treatment group obtained higher automaticity skill leaving more attentional resources for comprehension. By contrast, the control group may have had to save more attentional resources for lower order processes such as sound decoding, which negatively influenced their comprehension.

Limitations and Recommendations

This study has identified the potential benefits of narrow listening as a method to develop listening skills. The results of the experiment showed that the learners who undertook narrow listening attained significantly better comprehension. It was also found that narrow listening facilitated the learners' comprehension of not only practiced topics but also unpracticed topics. These findings have highlighted the immense impacts of narrow listening and reinforced the idea that repetition nurtures language acquisition.

However, there are some limitations to the generalizability of these findings. In the experiment, the amount of time the participants spent on narrow listening was not recorded. In other words, we did not know how much time in total the participants had spent on listening to the provided materials. If these data had been available, more insights into how narrow listening works could be forthcoming. Further research may therefore explore the relationship between the amount of time spent on narrow listening and the gains in comprehension. Furthermore, the participants were not asked to note down the number of times each recording was replayed. Therefore, we did not know how many times each participant had replayed each recording. For this reason, future research is needed to see if the number of times the recordings of the same topic are replayed correlates with comprehension of talks about that topic.

To conclude, notwithstanding its limitations, this research confirms previous findings and extends our knowledge of the effects of narrow listening in English language learning. The results yielded from the research may be encouraging to EFL teachers, learners, and researchers, especially those who are sceptical about the extent to which learners can benefit from this method. English language

practitioners will possibly be more inspired to apply narrow listening knowing that this method enhances learners' comprehension, no matter what topics are included in the recordings.

About the authors

Tran Thi Ngoc Yen is an Associate Professor at Vinh University, Vietnam. She received her Ph.D in Applied Linguistics from Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand. She is an Executive Board member of the Extensive Reading Foundation. Her research interests are teaching EFL reading and listening and language memory span.

Rob Waring is an acknowledged expert in Extensive Reading and vocabulary acquisition. He has published over 80 articles and has given hundreds of lectures, plenaries, and featured speaker presentations in 32 countries. He is an Executive Board member of the Extensive Reading Foundation responsible for the promotion of Extensive Reading globally.

References

Adams, M. J. (1994). Modeling the connections between word recognition and reading. In R. B. Ruddell, M. R. Ruddell & H. Singer (Eds.), *Theoretical models and processes of reading* (4th ed., pp. 838–863). International Reading Association.

Anderson, A., & Lynch, T. (1988). *Listening*. Oxford University Press.

Asemota, H. E. (2015). Nature, importance and practice of listening skill. *British Journal of Education, 3*(7), 27–33.

Bessette, A. (2007). Creating online narrow listening libraries. *Memoirs of the Osaka Institute of Technology, 52*(1), 15–24.

Boyle, J. P. (1987). Sex differences in listening vocabulary. *Language learning, 37*(2), 273–284. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1987.tb00568.x

Brown, S. (2006). *Teaching listening*. Cambridge University Press.

Buck, G. (2001). *Assessing listening*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511732959

Caspino, B. K. (2005). Support for narrow listening libraries. *The international journal of foreign language teaching, 1*(4), 2–9.

Chang, A. C-S. (2017). Narrow listening: A subset of extensive listening. *Journal of Teaching & Learning English in Multicultural Contexts, 1*(1), 1–9.

Chang, A. C-S. (2019). Effects of narrow reading and listening on L2 vocabulary learning: Multiple dimensions. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 41*(4), 769–794. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263119000032

Chang, A. C-S., & Millett, S. (2014). The effect of extensive listening on developing L2 listening fluency: Some hard evidence. *ELT Journal, 68*(1), 31–40. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/cct052

Conti, G. (2015, June 21). *Narrow reading and narrow listening - enhancing receptive skills through focused and purposeful recycling*. https://gianfrancoconti.com/2015/06/21/narrow-reading-and-narrow-listening-enhancing-receptive-skills-through-focused-and-purposeful-recycling/

Day, R. R., & Bamford, J. (1998). *Extensive reading in the second language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.

Dupuy, B. C. (1999). Narrow listening: An alternative way to develop and enhance listening comprehension in students of French as a foreign language. *System, 27*(3), 351–361. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00030-5

Field, J. (2009). *Listening in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511575945

Goh, C. C.M. (2000). A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problems. *System, 28*(1), 55–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00060-3

Harmer, J. (2010). *How to teach English* (6th ed.). Person Education Limited.

Harris, V. (2007). Exploring progression: Reading and listening strategy instruction with near-beginner learners of French. *Language Learning Journal, 35*(2), 189–204. https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730701599229

Helgesen, M. (2003). Teaching listening. In D. Nunan (Ed.), *Practical English Language Teaching* (pp. 23–46). McGraw-Hill.

Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M. B., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern language journal, 70*, 125–132. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.1986.tb05256.x

Kimura, H., & Ssali, V. (2009). The case for combining narrow reading and listening. *The language teacher, 33*(6), 9–13.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Pergamon.

Krashen, S. D. (1996). The case for narrow listening. *System, 24*(1), 97–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/0346-251X(95)00054-N

Krashen, S. D. (2003). *Explorations in language acquisition and use*. Heinemann.

Krashen, S. D. (2004). *The power of reading: Insights from the research* (2nd ed.). Heinemann.

Mackenzie, I. (2014). *English as a lingua franca: Theorizing and teaching English*. Routledge.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Language anxiety: Its relationship to other anxieties and to processing in native and second languages. *Language learning*, *41*(4), 513–534.

McBride, P. (2016). An overview perspective on teaching ELF: Principles and practices. *Waseda Working Papers in ELF, 5*, 186–197.

McErlain, T. (1999). The nature of listening: The need for listening in English for academic purposes. *Ibérica, 1*, 77–81.

Miller, L. (2003). Developing listening skills with authentic materials. ELC680: *English as a Foreign Language (EFL) Assessment*. Continuing and Professional Studies, UMBC.

Nation, P. (2007). The four strands. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching, 1*(1), 2–13. https://doi.org/10.2167/illt039.0

Nation, I. S. P., & Newton, J. (2009). *Teaching ESL/EFL Speaking and Listening*. Routledge.

Nation, P., & Yamamoto, A. (2012). Applying the four strands to language learning. *International Journal of Innovation in English Language Teaching, 1*(2), 167–181.

Nunan, D. (1998). Approaches to teaching listening in the language classroom. In Proceedings of the 1997 Korea TESOL Conference (pp. 1-10). Taejon, Korea: Korea TESOL.

Nunan, D. (2002). Listening in language learning. In J.C. Richards & W.A. Renandya (Eds.), *Methodology in language teaching* (pp. 238–241). Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J. C. (2019). *Developing tactics for listening - Student book*. (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Rodrigo, V. (2003). Narrow listening and audio-library: The transitional stage in the process of developing listening comprehension in a foreign language. *MEXTESOL Journal*, *27*(1), 9–25.

Rost, M. (1994). *Introducing listening*. Penguin.

Rost, M. (2001). Listening. In R. Carter & D. Nunan (Eds.), *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages* (pp.7-13). Cambridge University Press.

Rost, M. (2011). *Teaching and researching: Listening* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education Limited.

Rubin, J. (1995). The contribution of video to the development of competence in listening. In D. Mendelsohn & J. Rubin (Eds.), *A guide for the teaching of second language listening* (pp. 151–165). Dominie Press.

Schwanenflugel, P. J., Meisinger, E. B., Wisenbaker, J. M., Kuhn, M. R., Strauss, G. P., & Morris, R. D. (2006). Becoming a fluent and automatic reader in the

early elementary school years. *Reading Research Quarterly, 41*(4), 496–522. https://doi.org/10.1598%2FRRQ.41.4.4

Siegel, J. (2015). *Exploring listening strategy instruction through action research*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Stephens, M. (2011). The primacy of extensive listening. *ELT Journal, 65*(3), 311–313. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccq042

Walker, R. (2010). *Teaching the pronunciation of English as a Lingua Franca*. Oxford University Press.

Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring successful strategies. *ELT Journal*, *53*(3), 168–176. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/53.3.168

Waring, R. (2008). Starting an extensive listening program. *Extensive Reading in Japan, 1*(1), 7–10.

Wilson, K., & Healy, T. (2018). *Smart choice 3*. Oxford University Press.

Wodinsky, M., & Nation, P. (1988). Learning from graded readers. *Reading in a Foreign Language, 5*(1), 155–161.