

# International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies

ISSN: 2308-5460



## Effect of Listening Proficiency on Types of Listening Strategies Used by Iranian EFL Learners

[PP: 30-41]

**Hossein Ali Manzouri**

English department, University of Zabol  
Zabol, Iran

**Amir Shahraki**

English department, University of Zabol  
Zabol, Iran

**Seyyed Ali Fatemi**

English department, University of Zabol  
Zabol, Iran

### ABSTRACT

This study aims at uncovering listening strategy use by Iranian EFL learners in general, and differences among proficient and less-proficient learners, in types of strategies used. To get to this, 40 EFL learners including 10 males and 30 females were selected and, based on listening proficiency test, were divided into two groups: proficient and less-proficient, each containing 20 learners. A listening comprehension test as well as a Likert-Scaled Listening Strategies Questionnaire were administered to the participants. Data collected from listening comprehension test was run through an independent sample t-test, while questionnaire data was analyzed through factor analysis, multiple regression analysis, and independent sample t-test using SPSS version 19. Results of factor analysis indicated that cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective strategies were responsible for 54.26% of Iranian EFL learners listening proficiency. Multiple regression analysis revealed that participants employed cognitive strategies more than other strategies ( $B = .612$ ,  $T = 306$ ,  $sig = .003$ ). However, independent sample t-test showed that proficient listeners used metacognitive strategies more frequently ( $T = 2.205$ ,  $sig = .00$ )

**Keywords:** Listening, Listening strategies, Strategy use, Metacognitive, cognitive, socio-affective

### ARTICLE INFO

The paper received on: **04/06/2016** Reviewed on: **25/07/2016** Accepted after revisions on: **06/08/2016**

### Suggested citation:

Manzouri, H., Shahraki, A. & Fatemi, S. (2016). Effect of Listening Proficiency on Types of Listening Strategies Used by Iranian EFL Learners. *International Journal of English Language & Translation Studies*. 4(3), 30-41. Retrieved from [www.eltjournal.org](http://www.eltjournal.org)

### 1. Introduction

Listening is a fundamental skill of language which develops faster than speaking and often has a considerable impact on the development and emergence of reading and writing skills in learning a

new language (Scarcella and Oxford, 1992; Oxford, 1990, 1993). The reason behind this lies in the fact that language learners, prior to responding orally or in writing, need to receive linguistic input through listening. To accentuate the significance of

listening skill, Brown (2001, p.248) depicts listening as “an important skill through which language learners internalize linguistic information without which they cannot produce language”. Listening comprehension, moreover, can be seen as an active and conscious process, through which listeners concentrate on extracting the important information from the spoken linguistic input, comprehend its meaning and understand its function, and produce linguistically appropriate output through combining them with the contextual clues and their background knowledge (O’Malley, Chamot & Küpper, 1989).

Listening is the most widely used language skill in our daily life (Morley 2001; Rost 2002). Therefore, one may logically presume that it is the most important skill for language learning. However, listening is, by no standards, an easy skill to be acquired because it demands that listeners infer meaning from the spoken linguistic input. Goss (1982) considers listening comprehension to be a complex mental process in which listeners try to reconstruct the meaning out of what they receive from the speakers. This sophisticated process is arrived at when listeners draw on their background knowledge of the language, and equally significant, of the world (Byrnes, 1984; Nagle & Sanders, 1986; Young, 1997) and reconstruct information in their long-term memory and finally interpret the spoken language (Murphy, 1985; Mendelsohn, 1994; Young, 1997).

Young (1997) believes that successful listeners need to be active processors of information. For carrying out such a complex process, language learners usually face with difficulties. Research on listening comprehension shows that these difficulties range from how fast a person is speaking (Conrad, 1989; Blau, 1990; Zhao,

1997), number of words used (Johns and Dudley-Evans, 1980), phonological features of the specified chunk of speech (Henrichsen, 1984; Matter, 1989) and finally to listeners background knowledge (Chiang and Dunkel, 1992). In addition, Brown (1995) contended that levels of cognitive demands made by the content of the texts may be another reason for listening difficulties.

To discover reasons for these difficulties, Underwood (1989, p.16) believes “the greatest difficulty with listening comprehension, as opposed to reading comprehension, is that listener cannot control how quickly a speaker speaks”. Moreover, when language learners listen to spoken language, they usually don’t have the opportunity to listen repeatedly as much as they wish. Small size of vocabulary knowledge of learners as well as lack of contextual clues in the spoken language may be considered as other reasons (Underwood, 1989). In line with what mentioned above, Vandergrift (1996, 1997, and 2003) admits that listening, even in our first language, is a complex process and it bears much more complexity for second language learners with limited memory capacity (Richards, 1983). For example, elements such as anxiety have been reported to negatively correlate with listening success (Ghapanchi & Golparvar 2012; Golchi 2012). All these reasons and complexities make language learners resort to some helping techniques that are technically called listening strategies.

## 2. Review of Literature

Oxford (1990) believes that language learning strategies are those techniques that learners employ to improve the use of the target (including second and foreign) language information. These strategies are steps taken to assist learners to acquire, store, retrieve, and utilize



information. O'Malley and Chamot's (1990) differentiated these strategies into three categories of cognitive, metacognitive and social-affective strategies and later on Vandergrift (1996; 1997) refined the classification. Up to date, this taxonomy has remained widely accepted among researchers.

In their taxonomy, O'Malley and Chamot (1990) explained each of the strategies. Meta-cognitive strategies are those utilized by students to improve retention and comprehension of second language, they help learners control their learning through planning, monitoring, evaluating and problem-solving. In line with this definition of metacognitive strategies, Rubin (1987) defines these strategies as management techniques used by language learners to control their learning process.

Cognitive strategies, on the other hand, are those which involve direct manipulation or transformation of the learning materials in performing a learning task (Brown and Palincsar, 1982; O'Malley and Chamot, 1990). They are strategies employed by learners to handle the material to be learned. Hinke (2006) defined the role of cognitive strategies as assisting learners in listening for gist, activating learners' background knowledge before listening, and making inferences about what they hear. Goh (1998) asserts that cognitive strategies, which include inferencing, repeating, deduction, imagery, elaboration, note taking, and translation, are utilized by language learners to help them process, store and recall new information.

Chamot and O'Malley (1987) define socio-affective strategies as the attempts to develop positive emotional reactions and attitudes towards language learning. Vandergrift (2003) explained socio-affective strategies as the techniques

language learners utilize to cooperate with others, to confirm their understanding, or to lower anxiety. These strategies are employed in the forms of asking the teacher for clarification, and applying specific techniques to lower anxiety (O'Malley, Chamot, & Küpper, 1989; Vandergrift, 1997).

Research carried out in learning strategies suggests they are effectively helpful in the process of language learning (Chamot, 2005). Vandergrift (1996) utilized a structured interview to uncover the strategies that high school students at different course levels reported using in different types of listening tasks. He found that all students had used strategies related to three broad categories: metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective strategies. Exploring strategy use, Bacon (1992a, 1992b) reported that the participants employed more cognitive than metacognitive strategies, and that females utilized metacognitive strategies more significantly than males.

Studies on the relation between proficiency level and strategy use are relatively rich and there is a positive correlation between strategy use and second language proficiency (Oxford *et al.*, 2004). In addition, others attempted to survey the effectiveness of strategy instruction in developing listening proficiency of language learners (Carrier, 2003; Vandergrift, 2003; Vandergrift, & Tafaghodtari, 2010; Cross, 2009; Chen, 2009; Coşkun, 2010; Bozorgian & Pillay, 2013; Rahimi & Katal, 2013; Rasouli, Mollakhan, & Karbalae, 2013; Dousti & Abolfathias, 2013). Researchers have found that there is a significant difference between proficient and less-proficient learners in their use of learning strategies (e.g., Bacon, 1992; Goh, 1998, 2000; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Vandergrift, 1998, 2003). In

addition, research has also indicated that the level of proficiency is one of the significant elements that determine the choice of a strategy (Conrad, 1985; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Rost & Ross, 1991). Therefore, it is logically concluded that skilled learners use more strategies than their less-skilled counterparts, and the types of strategies skilled and less-skilled learners use differed significantly.

Vandergrift (1993) reported that both proficient and less-proficient learners tended to utilize cognitive strategies. However, proficient learners, compared with less-proficient learners, used metacognitive strategies more frequently. Strategies they used included monitoring comprehension, identifying problems, use of their world knowledge, and overlooking irrelevant information. The same results were reported by Vandergrift (1997). Proficient learners reported using more metacognitive strategies than less-proficient listeners. In addition he found that, proficient listeners differed significantly in their use of cognitive strategies. While less-proficient listeners utilized more surface-processing strategies including translation and transfer, skilled listeners employed more deep-processing cognitive strategies such as comprehension monitoring and problem identification.

In line with his previous research on listening strategies, Vandergrift (2003) found that listeners generally tended to use cognitive strategies more frequently, metacognitive strategies use came second, and there was little use of socio-affective strategies. Moreover, regarding the number of total strategies used, Vandergrift (2003) reported that proficient listeners used strategies twice as often as the less-skilled listeners. He also found that the more skilled listeners employed metacognitive strategies more frequently than the less-

skilled learners and less-skilled students utilized more translation which is a cognitive strategy. Other researchers (Baker & Brown, 1984; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Rubin, 1987) have also confirmed that proficient learners use more metacognitive strategies. Also, O'Malley, Chamot, and Kupper (1989) found that successful listeners utilized more repair strategies.

Other studies on listening strategy use have indicated that metacognitive strategies play a magnificent role in developing listening ability in second language learning, and have accentuated the positive outcomes of instructing students on strategy use in listening (O'Malley and Chamot, 1990; Vandergrift, 1997b). Research has also indicated that proficient learners use more top-down strategies while less-proficient learners utilized more bottom-up strategies (Clark, 1980; Conrad, 1985; Tsui & Fullilove, 1998; O'Malley, Chamot, & Kupper, 1989).

### 3. Statement of the Problem and Research Questions

Previous research on listening strategies covered all three strategies: cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective. However, there feels a lack of research on exploring all these strategies together in relation to listening proficiency. Some studies have concentrated on metacognitive strategies (i.e. Goh, 2006; Vandergrift, 2005), while others have focused on the listening strategies learners used while taking a listening test (Cohen, 2000, Taguchi, 2002). Besides, most of researchers who have studied listening comprehension strategies employed qualitative methods including using a think-aloud procedure, a recall protocol, and a structured interview to collect data. Thus, researchers in this study try to shed light on these research questions:



1. What are the strategies that Iranian EFL learners use while listening to an authentic text in English?

2. Is there a difference between proficient and less-proficient listeners in their use of cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective strategies?

#### 4. Methodology

##### 4.1. Research Design

The present study, unlike majority of research on strategy use by learners which used qualitative procedures to uncover strategy use by learners, aims at employing quantitative methods to reveal strategy use by Iranian EFL learners. A total of 40 EFL learners participated in this study. They were asked to listen to two lectures and answer 10 comprehension questions related to each of the lectures. Right after the listening test, students were required to complete a Likert-scaled questionnaire. The data gathered from the listening test and the Listening Comprehension Strategies Questionnaire was run in an independent-samples t-test, and factor analysis through SPSS version 19.

##### 4.2. Research Subjects and Procedures

The participants of this study were 40 Iranian EFL learners, 10 males and 30 females, majoring Teaching English as a Foreign Language (TEFL) in English Department at University of Zabol, Zabol, Iran. About half of them were studying in their 4<sup>th</sup> semester, while the next half were enrolled in their 2<sup>nd</sup> semester. In the present study, 20 students in 4<sup>th</sup> semester compose the Proficient Learners group, and 20 students in 2<sup>nd</sup> semester are considered as Less-proficient Learners group. (Although, to determine whether they are significantly different in proficiency, they underwent a listening test, see 5.1). Participants were all native speakers of Persian (Farsi). They were attending listening classes as part of

their educational curriculum two sessions a week, each lasting about 90 minutes.

To collect data, all students participated in a listening test session and listened to an English story. The story was played twice to all students and while listening, they could answer to 10 listening comprehension questions. Then, they were required to complete a Likert-Scaled Listening Strategies Questionnaire to uncover the strategies they used for listening (See appendix A). Table 1 shows groups statistics:

Table 1. Groups Statistics

	N	Mean	Std.	Std. Error Mean
Proficient	20	88.00	15.526	3.472
Less-Proficient	20	33.00	11.286	2.524

##### 4.3. Instruments

###### 4.3.1. Listening Test

Purpose of administering the listening test was to find whether there was a significant difference in proficient and less-proficient students' listening achievement. However students were in two different semesters and their listening proficiency was evidently different, the listening test was administered to make sure of their proficiency level. Moreover, students could use the listening test to reflect on their mental strategies while completing the questionnaire items. The listening was an English story called "a municipal report" by O. Henry, read by a native speaker of English, which lasted 09:05.

###### 4.3.2. Likert-Scale Questionnaire

The questionnaire used to unveil the listening strategies use by EFL learners was adapted from two previous studies: a: "Teaching L2 Learners How to Listen Does Make a Difference: An Empirical Study" by Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010), and Abdalhamid (2012). b: "L2 Learners' Strategic Mental Processes during a

Listening Test” by Taguchi (2001). Of course, some adjustments were made to the wording of some items to make them fit the purpose of questionnaire application. For instance, “French” was replaced with “English” in some of the questions. It is composed of 20 items related to listening comprehension. A four-point Likert-Scale ranging from (strongly disagree) to (strongly agree) was used to indicate students’ preferences. These 20 items measure the use of the strategies and processes underlying three factors related to the monitoring and regulating of L2 listening comprehension. These three factors include cognitive strategies (i.e. linguistic inferencing, and problem solving), metacognitive strategies (i.e. planning, and monitoring listening comprehension), and affective strategies (i.e. motivation, and anxiety). Questionnaire reliability, as shown in Table 2, was calculated 0.775.

Table: 2 Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.775	20

#### 4.4. Data Analysis

To determine whether there was a significant difference between proficient and less-proficient students’ proficiency level, an independent-samples t-test was conducted using SPSS software version 19. Then, the questionnaire data for all students (including both proficient and less-proficient) was run through a factor analysis using SPSS software to reduce questionnaire data into three main factors (cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective) and to uncover strategy use by Iranian EFL students in general. Next, data collected through questionnaire and proficiency data was analyzed by multiple regression analysis to see how much of the listening comprehension variance was accounted for by the three factors. Finally,

all data was categorized based on the proficiency level of students and was run through multiple regression analysis to give us a picture of strategy use by proficient and less-proficient students separately.

## 5. Results and Discussion

### 5.1. Results of Independent sample t-test

To see whether there was a significant difference in the listening proficiency of the two groups of the research, the scores of the listening test for both the proficient and less-proficient groups were run through a two-tailed independent- samples t-test. It needs to be mentioned that for all analyses reported in this research, the alpha level for significance was set at .05. As shown in table 3, the t-test results indicated that the proficient group had significantly outperformed the less proficient group on the listening comprehension test, with t value = 11.84, and p-value = .005. However, the t-test used to analyze this data was two-sided, so the p-value was divided by two to get a one-sided p-value (0.025). The results of the t-test prove that there is a statistically significant difference between of the proficient and less-proficient groups.

Table: 3 Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	2.070	.158	11.184	38	.000	48.000	4.292	39.311	56.689
Equal variances not assumed			11.184	34.696	.000	48.000	4.292	39.284	56.716

### 5.2. Results of Questionnaire data analysis

To uncover factors responsible for listening achievement of both groups and determine whether they use strategies or not, the Listening Comprehension Strategies Questionnaire data was run through a factor analysis with varimax



rotation using the principle component extraction method. Factor analysis yielded three factors: cognitive, metacognitive, and affective. The three factors accounted for 54.26% of the total variance. The first factor, cognitive strategies, accounted for 28.75% of the total variance. As shown in Table 4, questionnaire items (sub-components) related with cognitive strategy use were positively related with this component. Metacognitive component, which is the second factor, accounted for 13.66% of the total variance, while socio-affective factor accounted for 11.85% of the total variance.

Table: 4 Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings

	Total	% of variance	Cumulative %
Cognitive	5.817	28.75	28.75
Metacognitive	2.81	13.66	42.41
Socio-affective	2.543	11.85	54.26

Table 5, 6, and 7 indicate varimax rotated loadings for questionnaire items related to cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective strategies respectively.

Table: 5 Varimax Rotated Loadings for Factor Analysis of the Listening Comprehension Strategies Scale (Cognitive component)

Questionnaire Items
1. I focus on the meaning of every word to understand the whole text.
2. I try to picture the setting of the conversation to understand what the speakers are talking about.
4. I use the words I understand to help me guess the meaning of the words I don't understand.
5. I use the main idea of the text to help me guess the meaning of the words that I don't know.
6. I use my knowledge and personal experience to help me understand the topic.
7. As I listen, I compare what I understand with what I already know about the topic.
9. While listening, I translate in my head.
10. As I listen, I adjust my interpretation if I realize that it is not correct.

Table: 6 Varimax Rotated Loadings for Factor Analysis of the Listening Comprehension Strategies Scale (Metacognitive component)

Questionnaire Items	Factor 2
3. Before listening, I think of similar texts that I may have listened to.	.816
8. Before I start to listen, I have a plan in my head for how I am going to listen.	.478
11. As I listen, I occasionally ask myself if I am satisfied with the level of my comprehension.	.589
14. As I listen, I have a goal in my head.	.642
16. When I guess the meaning of a word, I think back to everything else that I have heard, to see if my guess makes sense.	.682
18. After listening, I think back to how I listened and about what I might do differently next time.	.797
19. I focus harder on the text when I have trouble understanding.	.515
20. I feel that listening in English is a challenge.	.453

Table: 7 Varimax Rotated Loadings for Factor Analysis of the Listening Comprehension Strategies Scale (Socio-affective component)

Questionnaire Items	Factor 3
12. While listening, I try to relax.	.576
13. I try not to feel nervous as I listen to English.	.619
15. When I don't understand something, I try not to worry so much about it	.879
17. I always try to enjoy listening.	.638

The findings of factor analysis suggest that these three factors (cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective) are significant subcomponents of the listening comprehension strategies questionnaire. The results of factor analysis also revealed that majority of both proficient and less-proficient learners reported using three types of listening comprehension strategies.

### 5.3. Multiple Regression Analysis

To explain the relationship between the scores and the three factors (cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective), and to explore which of the factors is most responsible for the listening achievement of the proficient and less-proficient groups, the data was run through a multiple regression. Table 8 shows that among three variables, the cognitive was the most important predictor of the students achievement on the listening test ( $B = .612$ ,  $t = 3.06$ ,  $p = .003$ ). Metacognitive factor was the second effective factor ( $B = .423$ ,  $t = 2.56$ ,  $p = .004$ ), while socio-affective factor was the least ( $B = -.129$ ,  $t = -1.852$ ,  $p = .006$ ). It is noteworthy that these results

relate to all date, including both proficient and less-proficient.

Table: 8 Regression Coefficients and Significance

Factor	B	T	Sig
Cognitive	.612	3.06	.003
Metacognitive	.423	2.56	.004
Socio-affective	-.129	-1.852	.006

#### 5.4. Independent sample T-test for group comparison

To uncover the strategy use in relation to proficiency level, data was divided in two groups: the proficient group data, and the less-proficient group data. Then, three independent sample t-tests was run to prove any probable difference in using cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective strategies in the two mentioned groups. As indicated in Table 9 and 10, results of data analysis show that there is not a significant difference between the proficient and the less-proficient groups in their use of cognitive and socio-affective strategies. On the other hand, results of independent sample t-test indicated a significant difference in metacognitive strategies use between the two groups.

Table: 9 Independent Samples Test for cognitive strategy use

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
VAR00001	Equal variances assumed	2.684	.052	-.085	38	.933	-.01250	.14760	-.3112	.28629
	Equal variances not assumed			-.085	27.480	.933	-.01250	.14760	-.3150	.29009

Table: 10 Independent Samples Test for socio-affective strategy use

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
VAR00001	Equal variances assumed	.328	.570	-.417	38	.679	-.07500	.18000	-.4390	.28940
	Equal variances not assumed			-.417	37.50	.679	-.07500	.18000	-.4396	.28956

Table: 11 Independent Samples Test for metacognitive strategy use

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
VAR00001	Equal variances assumed	.075	.786	2.205	38	.00	1.069	.13429	.15936	.68436
	Equal variances not assumed			2.205	35.86	.00	1.069	.13429	.15989	.68489

Based on the results of all data analyses (factor analysis, multiple regression analysis, and independent sample t-test analysis), it is possible to answer the research questions. Concerning the first research question, the strategies Iranian EFL learners use while listening, results of factor analysis indicated that Iranian EFL learners utilize three listening strategies (cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective). However, multiple regression analysis proved that they tended to rely more on cognitive strategies. The same results were reported by Mohseny and Raeisi (2009) when they analyzed strategy use among Iranian EFL learners. In addition, Vandergrift (2003) found the same pattern of listening strategy use among students learning French. However, Bidabadi and Yamat (2011) reported a different pattern where metacognitive strategies were reported as the most frequently used strategies among Iranian EFL freshmen university students. Metacognitive strategies were the second important strategies used by the participants, and socio-affective strategies were the least employed strategies. These findings seem in line with what Bacon (1992a, 1992b), Vandergrift (1993), and Vandergrift (2003) reported. They found that listeners generally tended to use cognitive strategies more frequently, metacognitive strategies use came second, and there was little use of socio-affective strategies. Due to low frequency of socio-affective strategies, some researchers



(Serri, Boroujeni, & Hesabi, 2012) omitted them from factor analysis in their study on listening strategies. Some other researchers (e.g. Riazi, 2007) suggested that there may be some needs to teach socioaffective strategies to EFL students.

In response to the second research question, relation between listening proficiency and use of cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective strategies, results of independent sample t-tests (Tables 9, 10, and 11) are revealing. Independent sample t-tests that analyzed relation of listening proficiency level and strategy use indicated that there was no significant difference between proficient and less-proficient groups in their use of cognitive and socio-affective strategies. However, regarding metacognitive strategy use, results showed a significant difference between the two groups. These findings indicate a positive correlation between listening proficiency level and metacognitive strategy use. The same findings were reported by many researchers (Baker & Brown, 1984; Conrad, 1985; Rubin, 1987; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Rost & Ross, 1991; Bacon, 1992; Goh, 1998, 2000; Vandergrift, 1997, 1998, 2003; Oxford *et al.*, 2004). The findings is also goes in line with what other researchers have reported on the positive correlation between listening proficiency and using more top-down strategies (Clark, 1980; Conrad, 1985; Tsui & Fullilove, 1998; O'Malley, Chamot, & Kupper, 1989).

## 6. Conclusion

The aim of this research was to identify relationship between the listening strategy (cognitive, metacognitive, and socio-affective) use and listening proficiency among Iranian EFL learners. 40 EFL learners, including 10 males and 30 females, were selected and divided into proficient and less-proficient groups, each

containing 20 learners. Both groups were administered both a listening comprehension test as well as a Likert-Scaled Listening Strategies Questionnaire. Then, data was analyzed through some rounds of independent sample t-test, factor analysis, and multiple regression analysis using SPSS. Factor analysis revealed that listening strategies were responsible for 54.26% of Iranian EFL learners listening proficiency. Moreover, results of multiple regression analysis indicated that cognitive strategies, among others, were the most used listening strategies ( $B = .612$ ,  $T = 306$ ,  $sig = .003$ ). Finally, results of three independent sample t-tests proved the positive correlation between learners' proficiency level and metacognitive strategy use ( $T = 2.205$ ,  $sig = .00$ ).

## References

- Bacon, S. (1992 b). The relationship between gender, comprehension, processing strategies, and cognitive and affective response in second language listening. *Modern Language Journal*, 76, 160-178.
- Bacon, S. M. (1992 a). Phases of listening to authentic input in Spanish: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 25(4), 317-334.
- Baker, L., & Brown, A. L. (1984). Metacognitive skills and reading. In P. David (Ed.), *Handbook of reading research* (pp. 353-394). New York: Longman.
- Bidabadi, F., & Yamat, H. (2011). The relationship between listening strategies used by Iranian EFL freshman university students and their listening proficiency levels. *English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 26-32.
- Blau, E.K., (1990), "The effect of syntax, speed and pauses on listening comprehension", *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 746 - 753.
- Bozorgian, H., & Pillay, H. (2013). Enhancing Foreign Language Learning through Listening Strategies Delivered in L1: An Experimental Study. *International Journal of Instruction*, 6(1), 105-122.
- Brown, A. L., & A. S. Palinscar. (1982). Introducing strategic learning from texts by means of informed self-control training. *Topics in*

- Learning and Learning Disabilities*, 2, 1-17. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED220820.pdf>
- Brown, G. (1995). Dimensions of difficulty in listening comprehension. In: Mendelsohn, D. and Rubin, J. Editors, 1995. *A Guide for the Teaching of Second Language Listening*, Dominie Press, San Diego, CA, 59-73.
- Brown, H. D (2001). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy* (2nd. Ed.). White Plain, NY: Pearson Education.
- Byrnes, H. (1984). The role of listening comprehension: A theoretical base. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17(4), 317-329.
- Carrier, K. (2003). Improving High School English language learners' second language listening through strategy instruction. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 27, 383-408.
- Chamot, A. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: Current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 25, 112-130.
- Chamot, A. U., & O'Malley, J. M. (1987). The cognitive academic language learning approach: A bridge to the mainstream. *TESOL Quarterly*, 21, 227-249. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3586733>
- Chen, A. (2009). Listening Strategy Instruction: Exploring Taiwanese College Students' Strategy Development. *The Asian EFL Journal Quarterly*, 11(2), 54-85.
- Chiang, C.S. & Dunkel, P. (1992). The effect of speech modification, prior knowledge, and listening proficiency on EFL lecture learning. *TESOL Quarterly* 26, 345-374.
- Clark, M. (1980). The short circuit hypothesis of ESL reading. *The Modern Language Journal*, 64, 203-209. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4781.1980.tb05186.x
- Cohen, A.D. & Allison, K.C. (2000) Bilingual processing strategies in the social context of an undergraduate immersion program in Cooper, Shohamy, Walters (Eds.), *New perspectives and issues in educational language policy*, John Benjamins.
- Conrad, L. (1985). Semantic versus syntactic cues in listening comprehension. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 1, 59-72. doi: 10.1017/S0272263100005155
- Conrad, L. (1989). The effects of time-compressed speech on native and EFL listening comprehension. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 1-16.
- Coşkun, A. (2010). The effect of metacognitive strategy training on the listening performance of beginner students. *Novitas-ROYAL*, 4(1), 35-50.
- Cross, J. (2009). Effects of listening strategy instruction on news videotext comprehension. *Language Teaching*
- Dousti, H., & Abolfathias, H. (2013). The Effect of Metacognitive Listening Strategy Training on EFL Learners' Listening Sub-skills Performance. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, 2(4), 50-55.
- Ghapanchi, Z., & Golparvar, S. (2012). Foreign language listening anxiety in Iranian EFL context. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1, 16-22.
- Goh, C. (2000). A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension problem. *System*, 28, 55-75.
- Goh, C. (2006). Metacognitive instruction in listening for young learners. *ELT Journal*, 60, 222-232. doi: 10.1093/elt/ccl002
- Goh, C. C. (1998). How ESL learners with different listening abilities use comprehension strategies and tactics. *Language Teaching Research* 2 (2), 124-147.
- Golchi, M. (2012). Listening anxiety and its relationship with listening strategy use and listening comprehension among Iranian IELTS learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2(4), 115-128.
- Goss, B. (1982). Listening as information processing. *Communication Quarterly*, 30, 304-307. Retrieved from <http://0-www.tandf.co.uk.catalog.library.colostate.edu/journals/titles/01463373.asp>
- Henrichsen, L. (1984). Sandhi-variation: a filter of input for learners of ESL. *Language Learning*, 34, 103-126.
- Hinkel, E. (2006). Current perspectives on teaching the four skills. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40, 109-131. doi: 10.2307/40264513
- Johns, T., & Dudley-Evans, A. (1980). An experiment in team-teaching of overseas postgraduate students of transportation and plant biology. *ELT Documents No.106*, 6-23. London: British Council.
- Matter, J. (1989). Some fundamental problems in understanding French as a foreign language. In: Dechert, H.W. and Raupach,



- M. (eds.) *Interlingual Processes*. Gunter Narr, Tübingen, 105-119.
- Mendelsohn, D. (1994). *Learning to listen: A strategy-based approach for the second-language learner*. San Diego, CA: Dominic Press.
- Mendelsohn, D. (1998). Teaching listening. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 81-101.
- Mohseny, A., & Raeisi, N. (2009). The Relationship between Language Proficiency of EFL Students and Their Strategy Use in Listening Comprehension. *TEFLL*, 1(4), 111-132
- Morley, J. (2001). Aural comprehension instruction: Principles and practices. In Marianne Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 69- 85) Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Murphy, J. M. (1985). An investigation into the listening strategies of ESL college students. *ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 278275*.
- Nagle, S. J., & Sanders, S. L. (1986). Comprehension theory and second language pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 20(1), 9-26.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., A. U. Chamot and L. Küpper. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 10, pp. 418-437.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House Harper Collins.
- Oxford, R. L. (1993). Research update on teaching L2 listening. *System*, 21(2), 205-211.
- Oxford, R., Cho, Y., Leung, S. and Kim, H. (2004). Effect of the presence and difficulty of task on strategy use: An exploratory study. *IRAL (International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching)*, 42, 1-47.
- Rahimi, M., & Katal, M. (2013). The Impact of Metacognitive Instruction on EFL Learners' Listening Comprehension and Oral Language Proficiency. *The Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS)*, 5(2), 69-90.
- Rasouli, M., Mollakhan, K., & Karbalaee, A. (2013). The effect of metacognitive listening strategy training on listening comprehension in Iranian EFL context. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 115-128
- Riazi, A. (2007). Language learning strategy use: Perceptions of female Arab English majors. *Foreign Language Annals*, 40(3), 433-440.
- Richard, J. C. (1983). Listening comprehension: Approach, design, procedure. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17 (2), 219-240.
- Rost, M. (2002). *Teaching and researching listening*. London: Longman.
- Rost, M. and Ross, S. (1991). Learner use of strategies in interaction: Typology and teachability. *Language Learning*, 41(2), 235-273.
- Rubin, J. (1987). A review of second language listening comprehension research. *Modern Language Journal*, 78(2), 213-215.
- Scarcella, R. C., and Oxford. R. I. (1992). *The tapestry of language learning: The individual I the communicative classroom*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Serri, F., Boroujeni, A., & Hesabi, A. (2012). Cognitive, Metacognitive, and Social/Affective Strategies in Listening Comprehension and Their Relationships with Individual Differences. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(4), 843-849.
- Taguchi, N. (2001). L2 learners' strategic mental processes during a listening test. *Japan Association of Language Teachers*, 23, 176-201.
- Taguchi, N. (2002). L2 learners' strategic mental processes during a listening test. *JALT Journal*, (23), 26- 31. Retrieved from <http://jalt-publications.org/archive/jj/2001b/art1.pdf>
- Tsui, A., & Fullilove, J. (1998). Bottom-up or top-down processing as a discriminator of L2 listening performance. *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 432-451. doi: 10.1093/applin/19.4. 432
- Underwood, M. (1989). *Teaching listening*. London: Longman.
- Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010). Teaching L2 Learners How to Listen Does Make a Difference: An Empirical Study. *Language Learning*, 60 (2) 470-497.
- Vandergrift, L. (1996). Listening strategies of Core French high school students. *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 52 (2), 200-223.
- Vandergrift, L. (1997a). The comprehension strategies of second language (French)

- listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30, 387-409.
- Vandergrift, L. (1997b). The strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30(3), 387-409.
- Vandergrift, L. (1998). Successful and less successful listeners in French: What are the strategy differences? *The French Review*, 71(3), 370-395.
- Vandergrift, L. (2003). Orchestrating strategy use: Toward a model of the skilled second language listener. *Language Learning*, 53 (3), 463-496.
- Vandergrift, L. (2005a). Relationships among motivation orientations, metacognitive awareness and proficiency in L2 listening. *Applied linguistics*, 26, 70-89. doi:10.1093/applin/amh 039
- Young, M. Y. C. (1997). A serial ordering of listening comprehension strategies used by advanced ESL learners in Hong Kong. *Asian Journal of English Language Teaching*, 1, 35-53.
- Zhao, Y., (1997) "The effects of listeners' control of speech rate on second language comprehension", *Applied Linguistics*, 18, 49 – 68.

### Appendix:

#### Listening Strategies Questionnaire

The statements below describe some strategies for listening comprehension and how you feel about listening in the language you are learning. This is not a test, so there are no "right" or "wrong" answers.

Please circle only **ONE** number for each statement.

Strongly disagree 1 Disagree 2 Agree 3 Strongly Agree 4

1. I focus on the meaning of every word to understand the whole text.  
1            2            3            4
2. I try to picture the setting of the conversation to understand what the speakers are talking about.  
1            2            3            4
3. Before listening, I think of similar texts that I may have listened to.  
1            2            3            4
4. I use the words I understand to help me guess the meaning of the words I don't understand.  
1            2            3            4
5. I use the main idea of the text to help me guess the meaning of the words that I don't know.  
1            2            3            4
6. I use my knowledge and personal experience to help me understand the topic.  
1            2            3            4
7. As I listen, I compare what I understand with what I already know about the topic.  
1            2            3            4
8. Before I start to listen, I have a plan in my head for how I am going to listen.  
1            2            3            4
9. While listening, I translate in my head.  
1            2            3            4
10. As I listen, I adjust my interpretation if I realize that it is not correct.  
1            2            3            4
11. As I listen, I occasionally ask myself if I am satisfied with my level of comprehension.  
1            2            3            4
12. While listening, I try to relax.  
1            2            3            4
13. I try not to feel nervous as I listen to English.  
1            2            3            4
14. As I listen, I have a goal in my head.  
1            2            3            4
15. When I don't understand something, I try not to worry so much about it.  
1            2            3            4
16. When I guess the meaning of a word, I think back to everything else that I have heard, to see if my guess makes sense.  
1            2            3            4
17. I always try to enjoy listening.  
1            2            3            4
18. After listening, I think back to how I listened, and about what I might do differently next time.  
1            2            3            4
19. I focus harder on the text when I have trouble understanding.  
1            2            3            4
20. I feel that listening in English is a challenge for me.  
1            2            3            4