

The Impact of Strategy Instruction on Iraqi EFL Learners' Listening Comprehension and Metacognitive Strategy Use

Hussein Ghanim AL-Shammari^a, ^aPhD student at the Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures University of Tehran, Islamic Republic of Iran, Email: hussain.ganim@gmail.com

The present study examined the impact of process-based listening strategy instruction on Iraqi EFL learners' listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness of listening strategies. The study also investigated the differences in all of the five factors of the Metacognitive Awareness of Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) offered by Vandergrift et al. (2006). The study was a quasi-experimental with a pretest-posttest design using intact classes. The participants were 60 sophomore EFL learners in Iraq. They were divided into two groups: intervention (n=30) and control group (n=30). The intervention group received a process-based listening strategy instruction based on Siegel's (2015) model. The control group received the conventional teaching of listening without any strategy training. Both groups completed the listening section of the Preliminary English Test (PET) and the (MALQ) at the beginning and the end of the study. Results indicated that listening strategy instruction had generally a positive impact on learners' listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness of strategy use. More specifically, the intervention group outperformed the control group on the listening proficiency post-test and the MALQ. The examination of the MALQ factors showed significant increases in problem-solving, mental translation, and planning-evaluation strategies but decreases in directed attention and person knowledge of the intervention group. The findings imply the undeniable effect of explicit instruction of listening strategies on listening comprehension.

Key words: *EFL Iraqi learners, listening comprehension, listening strategies, metacognitive awareness, MALQ, process-based instruction.*

Introduction

Listening is of vital importance in English as a Foreign/Second Language (EFL/ESL) learning as it is a major source of input for language learners and as being more frequently used than other skills and grant access to other language skills (Siegel, 2014; Vandergrift, 2007). Despite its importance in L1 and L2 contexts, there is a general belief that listening is a challenging skill to teach (Siegel, 2015), the most difficult skill to master by learners (Renandya & Farrell, 2011), the less- attention received in teacher manuals and L2 instructional materials (Field, 2012; Vandergrift & Goh, 2012), and the less-researched among other skills (Graham & Santos, 2015). Thus, both researchers and teachers believe that listening is a significant skill but they do not know how to teach in the L2 context.

Teachers often do not teach listening but exploit it to teach other skills such as writing and speaking mainly to test the learners' accuracy of what they can get from an oral text in terms of writing and speaking outcomes (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). However, when they teach listening, they ask learners to write down the words they hear in conversational exchanges and complete listening activities in tests where only part of the text is comprehensible (Graham, 2017). This method of teaching listening is much like testing learners' current level of a text comprehension rather than teaching them how to listen. This approach of teaching listening is called 'Comprehension Approach' (Field, 2008) in which teachers rely heavily on the status quo of 'Listen, Answer, Check' sequence. This approach does not help learners improve listening comprehension and does not teach effective listening strategies use.

Contrary to the comprehensive approach, a process approach as a new approach to teaching listening emerged in the 1970s which aimed at describing the listening strategies and the processes (Bottom-up processing, Top-down processing or both) they used to comprehend the input data. Increased attention to language learners and the learning strategies used by successful language learners, which could be taught to the unsuccessful learners, has grown in the field of language learning . As a result of this increased attention, researchers have examined how listening strategy instruction influences foreign language learners' listening performance. However, there is no consensus among researchers on whether strategy instruction could lead to positive or negative results in different proficiency groups (Berne, 2004; Hassan et al., 2005). In a systematic review article on the effectiveness of strategy instruction, Hassan et.al (2005) found that only five out of 38 studies were directed towards listening. Only one of these studies by Thompson and Rubin (1996) pointed to the positive effect of strategy instruction on listening comprehension. In his meta-analysis review article, Plonsky (2011) stated that few studies on listening have explored the impact of listening strategy instruction on listening proficiency. He confirmed that listening strategy instruction grieved from methodological and theoretical flaws such as lack of a solid model of strategy instruction or come up with "negligible effects resulted from studies with listening,.....as

dependent variables” (2011, p.1010) among learners from various contexts. In addition, while much attention had been paid to the English language in the contexts of Canada, United States, Japan and China (Cross, 2009), the present study is conducted to examine the effect of listening strategy instruction on listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness of strategy use of Iraqi EFL learners, and on each factor of the metacognitive awareness of listening questionnaire (MALQ) in particular which used a quasi-experimental pre-test and post-test research design with standardised English tests to come up with factual results.

Literature Review of Process-Based Listening Comprehension

Siegel’s perspective of listening comprehension (2015) focuses on a Top-Down Process (TDP) that can be activated at the beginning of listening input and help learners in reducing the possible meaning of an aural speech by focusing on the context of the text and activating their prior knowledge. TDP has brought the attention to the preconceptions about what learners will hear even before processing the listening input (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). These preconceptions are based on the knowledge the listeners bring to the text using their thinking of the topic of the text, prior knowledge of the text, context of the text, interlocutors, location, and situation. Utilization of the contextual aspect in the beginning can help narrowing the potential topical and lexical items (vocabulary) that listeners are expecting to hear. This could help listeners to start forming hypotheses, making predictions, expectations (without waiting for the comprehension of the incoming text) and narrow interpretation of the oral input making listening much easier to comprehend (Siegel, 2015).

Siegel proposed three sequential stages for listening comprehension: focus on context (TDP), focus on linguistic aspects Bottom-Up Process (BUP), and final comparison of linguistic input and context (TDP & BUP). Listening process in this model represents a balance between TDP and BUP to achieve listening comprehension. Focusing on TDP before listening can help learners form hypotheses and expectations about what they are likely to hear (unlike Anderson’s models which start with BUP focusing on linguistic knowledge). In the second stage, the cognitive processes that deal with input at the linguistic level are activated such as listening for gist, inferencing, elaboration, and note-taking . In the final stage, input reaches the stage of comparison between the information (the linguistic input) and experience (context knowledge) making connections between them and are stored in the long- term memory.

A process-based listening strategy instruction was developed by Siegel (2015) in which he proposed a possible enhancement to L2 listening pedagogy by explicitly teaching cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies. He focused on the development of two elements in teaching listening strategies: process-based task and listening strategy instruction. The process-based task element comes from the theories of top-down processes and bottom-up

processes, teacher modelling which is essentially based on teacher's knowledge of listening processes, and strategies that they can elicit from aural texts and introduce to learners to be emulated and practiced. The listening strategy instruction element includes the incorporation of cognitive and metacognitive strategic mental activities that teachers use to understand and teach to learners.

The goals of this model (process-based instruction) are to increase learners' listening confidence, advance their knowledge of the processes and strategies used in texts, and evolve their abilities to transfer these processes and strategies (transfer of strategies covered in one session) to novel listening events or tasks whether in or beyond the L2 listening classroom (Siegel, 2014). This strategic approach, attempting to empower learners, has capitalised on listening processes that can be transferred from L1 to L2, aspects of TDP and BUP, listening strategies instruction and teacher modelling of the processes and the strategies in an oral text.

Empirical Studies on Listening Strategy Instruction

There is a barely sufficient empirical literature on second or foreign language listening strategy instruction (Renandya & Farrell, 2011; Ngo, 2019; Plonsky, 2011). Little research has focused on strategy instruction to raise students' awareness of cognitive and metacognitive strategies (Chou, 2016). There is also a lack of consensus on whether or not strategy instruction could benefit learners in developing their listening comprehension and metacognitive strategy use. Researchers are not unanimous about the effects of strategy instruction; there are studies supporting the beneficial effects of listening strategy instruction on the listening ability of EFL/ESL learners (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012; Siegel, 2015). There are also researchers who have precautions about such claims including Renandya and Hu (2018) and Swan and Walter (2017) who argue that there is no need for listening instruction. They believe that listening can be practiced and learned by exposure to the listening tasks. Adding to this divergence of beliefs, the mixed results of studies regarding the effectiveness of listening strategy instruction on listening comprehension has complicated the picture (Plonsky, 2011; Berne, 2004; Hassan et al, 2005). Some of the recent studies on listening strategy instruction have led to negative results on the learners' listening comprehension such as (Cross, 2009; Milliner & Dimoski, 2019; Lopez, 2017; O'Malley et al., 1985; Sharaf et al., 2018; Taguchi, 2017; Tanewong, 2018; Zabler, 2010) which raise doubts about the effectiveness of listening strategy instruction.

Studies pointing to positive results of instruction on listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness of strategy use are summarized in Table1.

Table 1: Previous studies of positive results of instruction on listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness of strategy use

Researcher(s)	Participants	Effect of instruction on	
		LC	Metacognitive awareness
Thompson & Rubin (1996)	36 American High-intermediate learners of Russian	Improved	Not measured
Graham & Macaro (2008)	68 English Lower-Intermediate learners of French	Improved	Not measured
Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari (2010)	106 Canadian High-beginners and low-intermediate learners of French	Improved	Increased
Siegel (2012)	54 Japanese Advanced learners of English	Improved	Not measured
Lotfi, Maftoon & Birjandi (2012)	206 Iranian pre-intermediate & intermediate learners of English	Improved	Not measured
Siegel (2013)	54 Japanese upper-intermediate learners of English	Improved	Not measured
Goh & Hu (2014)	113 Chinese intermediate learners of English	Improved	Increased
Rahimirad & Shams (2014)	50 Iranian lower-intermediate & upper-intermediate learners of English	Improved	Increased
Movahed (2014)	55 Iranian beginners learners of English	Improved	Increased
Bozorgian (2014)	30 Iranian high-intermediate learners of English	Improved	No effect
Maftoon & Alamdari (2016)	60 Iranian intermediate learners of English	Improved	Increased
Mahdavi & Miri (2016)	60 Iranian high-beginner learners of English	Improved	Increased

Bozorgian & Alamdari (2017)	180 Iranian advanced learners of English	Improved	Increased
Ngo (2019)	27 Vietnamese pre-intermediate learners of English	Not tested	Increased

A review of these studies indicates that a) Listening strategy instruction improved listening comprehension and metacognitive awareness of listening strategy use. b) the results of some of these studies are inconclusive as documented in the meta-analysis reports of Berne (2004), Hassan et. al (2005), Macro (2006), and Plonsky (2011). c) These studies suffer from certain inherent methodological shortcomings; for example, the low number of participants, the unreported validity and reliability of the listening tests; and the use of local tests to measure learners' level of listening proficiency. d) These studies have mostly adopted a quantitative approach to listening strategy instruction following different models of instruction (e.g., Thompson & Rubin, 1996; Graham & Macaro, 2008; Vandergrift & Goh, 2010). e) They have examined the effect of instruction of listening strategies on listening comprehension for few languages including English, French, Russian, and Spanish. In fact, while much attention had been paid to the English language used in Canada, China, Japan, and the United States, where students are at different proficiency levels in either high school or university (Cross, 2009), few studies examined other languages including French (Graham & Macaro, 2008; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010), Russian (Thompson & Rubin, 1996), and Spanish (Zobler, 2010). f), There is a dispute over whether teaching listening should focus on metacognitive strategies as in studies like Bozorgian and Alamdari (2017) and Vandergrift and Tafaghodtari (2010) or on both cognitive and metacognitive strategies as in Lotfi, Maftoon and Birjandi (2012), Graham and Macaro (2008), and Siegel (2013). Therefore, there is a need for more experimental or quasi-experimental studies to shed light on the actual difference strategy instruction may make in different language learning contexts, and avoid all methodological shortcomings in other previous studies. Hence, in this study, the effectiveness of a listening strategy instruction programs in which metacognitive and cognitive strategies at different levels of listening proficiency are tested by using a standardized test with a large group of Iraqi EFL learners for more generalizability (Cross & Vandergrift, 2014; Siegel, 2013; Yeldham & Gruba, 2014).

To the best of the researchers' knowledge, no study has examined the impact of listening strategy instruction in the context of Iraq. Therefore, further research is needed to examine the impact of a process-based listening strategy instruction course on Iraqi learners' listening comprehension and their metacognitive awareness of strategy use. In so doing, the following questions will be addressed:

- 1) Does listening strategy instruction have a significant impact on developing Iraqi learners' listening comprehension?
- 2) Does listening strategy instruction have a significant impact on the learners' metacognitive awareness of strategy use?
- 3) Does listening strategy instruction have a significant impact on each factor of the MALQ?

Methodology

Participants

The participants of the present study included a group of (n=60) sophomore male and female EFL Iraqi learners, between 19 and 20 years old, studying English in the College of Education at the University of Kufa, Iraq for the purpose of becoming high school teachers. They had learned English in previous school settings for at least nine years. Their listening proficiency level ranged from Basic User (Level A2) to a low-intermediate level (Level B1) according to the CEFR (Cambridge English, 2019). The participants were divided into two groups, the intervention (n=30) and the control (n=30) groups.

Instruments

The first instrument was the listening section of the Preliminary English Test (PET) which was used to measure the listening proficiency of participants at the beginning and at the end of the study. The listening section consisted of four parts. In the first part, there were 7 short informal monologues or dialogues accompanied by pictures with three-option multiple-choice items. In the second part, there was a long monologue or interview with 6 three-option multiple-choice items. In the third part, there was a longer monologue with 6 gaps to fill in with one word. In the fourth part, there was a longer informal dialogue in which examinees had to decide if the 6 statements were correct or incorrect. The total listening items were 25. Each item carried one mark. The reliability of Cronbach's alpha for the pretest and post-test was .76 and .80 respectively of the listening test for the interventional group and .77 and .75 for the control group.

The second instrument was the Metacognitive Awareness of Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) developed by Vandergrift et.al (2006) which measured learners' metacognitive awareness of listening and the listening strategies they reported to use. Since some of the words in the questionnaire were difficult to understand by the learners, alternative words with the same meaning were placed next to the difficult words. The questionnaire consisted of 21 items measuring five areas of strategy use: problem-solving, planning-evaluation, mental translation, direct attention, and personal knowledge. This questionnaire was a six-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly disagree (6), administrated once at the beginning of the term before the instruction and once after the intervention. The factors

comprising the MALQ are presented in Table 2. The Cronbach's alpha reliability reported for the intervention group at pretest and post-test was .78 and .80 respectively, and the control group was .77 and .75.

Table 2: Factors of Metacognitive Awareness of listening Questionnaire

MALQ Factors	Number of Items	Items
Planning-evaluation	5	1,10,14,20,21
Mental translation	3	4,11,18
Problem-solving	6	5,7,9,13,17,19
Directed attention	4	2,6,12,16
Person knowledge	3	3, 8, 15

Procedure

Before the main study, a pilot study was conducted to determine the type of listening proficiency test that was appropriate to the level of participants. The researcher asked 20 learners to take either the listening section of First Cambridge English (FCE) or the listening section of the Preliminary English Test (PET) (10 learners for each test). All the participants who took the FCE listening section failed the test indicating that The FCE was difficult for these learners. Therefore, PET listening section was used to measure the listening proficiency level of the participants.

The MALQ was distributed among participants to see if they had any difficulty in comprehending the items of the questionnaire and determine the time needed for completion of the test. Since the participants had difficulty comprehending the meaning of certain words, a modified version of MALQ was developed in which the easy words was adjusted to difficult words. The time for completion of PET and MALQ was estimated 60 min.

First, participants (n= 60) took the listening part of the PET followed by the MALQ. They were divided into intervention and control groups. The intervention group was taught process-based listening strategy instruction (Siegel, 2015) whereas the control group was taught following the conventional teaching of listening regularly used by Iraqi teachers which is based on listen-answer-check method of teaching and did not receive any strategy instruction. Both groups received 10 sessions of instruction. The intervention group received explicit and integrated metacognitive and cognitive strategies training such as planning, monitoring, focusing attention, evaluation, prediction, interference, elaboration, listening for gist, listening for detailed phoneme discrimination and word segmentation. Explicit strategy instruction means that learners are provided directly with the strategies used in a listening text, for example; strategies are named, explained with examples to show their usefulness, and practiced overtly within a listening text. Integrated strategy instruction means that

strategies are taken from the existing course book and explained to the learners to help them see directly the application of the strategy use within the situation in which used. The course book *Real Listening and Speaking 3* by Graven (2008) assigned for teaching listening at the Department of English for sophomore level was used to introduce and practice strategies. The book included a wide range of authentic texts with monologues and dialogues representing native and non-native accents. The course book contained listening activities representing a variety of contexts, transcripts of the listening texts and answer keys for the exercises in each unit of the book. The researcher integrated the listening strategies into the listening texts (Kaivanpanah et al. 2020). In each lesson, the listening strategies were taught based on the following plan:

1. The teacher introduced the topic, and the type of text. The new words were presented. Learners' schemata was activated; their awareness of previous similar experiences were raised.
2. Learners were taught how to think-aloud after listening to the text. Top-down and bottom-up listening strategies were introduced.
3. Strategies were introduced and reviewed with useful examples taken from the texts and then combined with other strategies to be recycled in new listening texts and tasks.
4. Learners listened to another audio text and used the strategies that they just learned.
5. Learners kept a diary and wrote about their performance while listening to a text.
6. Learners were given short listening tasks as homework. They were provided with another course book they could do exercises called *North Star 3 Listening and Speaking* by Solorzano and Schmidt (2015).

The control group received the same audio texts and was taught by the same teacher. The teacher played the audio texts and asked the learners to listen carefully and answer the comprehension questions. After answering questions, the teacher played the audio text again to ensure that learners had comprehended the text. No direct instruction of strategies was provided by the researcher.

After the treatment, the researcher administrated another listening section of PET to compare the performance of both groups before and after the intervention and to measure the impact of the process-based listening strategy instruction on the listening comprehension on the intervention group. The modified Metacognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire (MALQ) was also administrated to all participants at the end of the study to examine the impact of listening strategy instruction on their overall metacognitive awareness of strategy use.

Results and Discussions

To examine the impact of listening strategy instruction on listening comprehension, the mean scores of the intervention and the control on the listening section of the PET post-test was compared. First, the mean scores on PET listening section for both groups at the pre-test were compared using Independent Samples t-test to ensure that they were similar at the outset of the study. The difference between the groups was not significant indicating that the two groups were similar in terms of listening comprehension.

The results of independent samples t-test comparing the differences between both groups at post-test revealed a significant difference indicating that listening strategy instruction had a positive impact on listening comprehension. This result is in line with other previous studies such as (Graham & Macaro, 2008; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010; Yeldham & Gruba, 2014, Bozorgian, 2014; Bozorgian & Alamdari, 2017; Maftoon & Alamdari, 2016; Rahimirad & Shams; 2014 among others) and at variance with the results of Cross (2009), Rahimi and Katal (2013), Sharaf et al.(2018), Tanewong (2018), Taguchi (2017) and Zobler (2010). The results of the present study also confirmed those of similar studies conducted in the Iranian EFL context (e.g., Bozorgian, 2014; Bozorgian & Alamdari, 2017; Maftoon & Alamdari, 2016; Rahimirad & Shams; 2014).

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for the two groups in pre-and post-test of listening comprehension

Group	Pretest		Posttest	
	M	SD	M	SD
Intervention	6.70	2.42	10.40	2.82
Control	6.83	2.93	8.50	3.15

Table 4: Independent-Samples t-test comparing both Groups in the Pretest and Posttest

	T	Df	P
Pretest of PET	0.19	58	0.20
Posttest of PET	2.45	58	0.01

Regarding the impact of listening strategy instruction on learners' metacognitive awareness of strategy use, the scores obtained by both groups at pre-test and post-test on the MALQ were compared using an independent sample t-test (Table 5). There was no significant difference between the groups on the MALQ at pretest phase as indicated in Table 6. MALQ posttest scores of both groups were also compared to examine the effect of instruction on the metacognitive awareness of listening strategy use. The results of an independent samples t-test showed that the difference between the two groups did not reach significance; however, comparison of the mean scores of the intervention and control group indicated that the mean

scores of the intervention group increased more than the control group suggesting that the instruction had a positive effect on increasing learners' metacognitive awareness of strategy use. The findings indicated that learners can use facilitative listening strategies when dealing with listening tasks if they were instructed to do so. EFL learners were able to use their knowledge and experiences of the text before listening, guess the meanings of unfamiliar words, and adjust their understandings when they realize their interpretations of the text is not correct. EFL learners' awareness of directed attention strategies did not increase because they lost concentration and did not listen when they encountered difficulties in comprehending. The instruction succeeded in decreasing the effect of the personal knowledge factor. Based on the findings, it can be argued that after the intervention of process-based listening strategy instruction for Iraqi EFL learners listening is not anxiety-provoking (Kaivanpanah et al., 2020). These findings confirm the findings of other previous studies such as Goh and Hu (2014), Maftoon and Alamdari (2016), Mahdavi and Miri (2016) and Vandergrift, et al. (2006) among other studies, and in contradiction with other studies such as Bozorgian (2014), Tanewong (2018), and Zobler (2010).

Table 5: Descriptive statistics for the intervention and the control groups in the pretest and posttest of MALQ

Group	Pretest		Posttest	
	M	SD	M	SD
Intervention	80.21	16.65	82.04	15.72
Control	77.79	15.01	77.31	17.73

Table 6: Independent-samples t-tests of the two groups in the pretest and posttest of MALQ

	t	df	p
Pretest of MALQ	1.51	58	0.33
Posttest of MALQ	3.63	58	0.03

The examine the effect of listening strategy instruction on each factor of the MALQ, a paired samples t-test was used comparing the data obtained from the intervention group before and after the intervention course. Table 7 presented the mean score and the standard deviation with the p-value for each factor.

Table 7: Paired samples t-test of MALQ for the intervention group

MALQ Factors	Pre-test		Post-test		Mean difference	t	P-value (sig)
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD			
planning and evaluation	18.56	4.52	20.56	3.61	2.00	2.68	.012
mental translation	7.33	2.79	9.06	2.03	1.73	3.04	.005
problem-solving	27.50	3.64	29.06	3.16	1.56	3.13	.004
directed attention	15.96	3.07	15.03	3.48	-.933	1.13	.264
person Knowledge	9.66	2.74	7.33	2.94	-1.33	2.00	.040

The analysis of each factor was helpful in shedding more light on learners' metacognitive awareness for each strategy use. As seen in Table 6, there was a positive increase in learners' strategy use for planning-evaluation, mental translation, and problem-solving and person knowledge factors. A decrease is noted in the use of strategies related to directed attention. Among the five factors of the MALQ, the use of planning-evaluation strategies increased more than other strategies as a result of instruction. The first factor is the planning-evaluation which consists of items 1, 10, 14, 20, and 21. This factor includes two types of strategies: planning strategies and evaluation strategies. Planning strategies comprise items 1, 10, and 21 and intend to elicit strategies learners use to make a plan before listening to a text; it includes activating their prior knowledge of the topic (schemata activation), setting a goal in mind, and making a plan about how to listen (Goh & Hu, 2014; Vandergrift et al., 2006). The evaluation strategies represent the strategies used by the learners to monitor and evaluate their performance during listening by checking the accuracy of their comprehension and evaluating the effectiveness of strategies to determine their success in achieving a listening task (Goh & Hu, 2014; Maftoon & Alamdari, 2016; Vandergrift et al., 2006). The participants in the intervention group reported an increased use of planning and evaluation strategies after receiving the instruction. The mean differences between pre-test and post-test was significant at ($p = <0.05$) suggesting that listening strategy instruction enabled the learners to plan earlier for listening, and evaluate their efforts and satisfaction with the ongoing interpretation during listening.

There was a significant impact of listening strategy instruction on the second factor of the MALQ, mental translation ($p = < 0.05$). Mental translation strategies (items 4, 11, and 18) represent the strategies listeners need to avoid in order to be more proficient listeners (Goh, 2018; Vandergrift et al., 2006). The mental translation strategies include three forms of translation including translating word-by-word, key words, and more general online translation (Vandergrift et al., 2006). The findings indicate that the participants in the intervention group used the mental translation strategies less frequently than they did before. Listening strategy instruction helped the learners to stop resorting to the mental translation strategies and decreased their use of mental translation which prevents learners from thinking about the translation of the words in Arabic while listening.

The mean difference between pre-test and post-test scores in problem-solving strategy were statistically significant ($p = < 05$), suggesting that learners were able to infer and monitor their inferences of unknown words and comprehension during listening. Problem-solving strategies includes inferencing strategies (items 5, 9, and 17) and monitoring strategies (items 7, 9, and 19). The inferencing strategies aimed at measuring participants' ability to use the words they understand, their own general idea or perception of the text, and their past experience and knowledge to infer the unknown words in the listening text. The monitoring strategies are used by participants to compare the meaning of the inferred words with their

general understanding of the topic, modify their inferencing strategies when they find it does not seem logical, and evaluate their understanding of the text. Listening strategy instruction had also a significant effect on person knowledge factor. Person knowledge factor includes items 3, 8, and 15 that relate to learners' perception of difficulty of listening, their self-efficacy while listening, and their listening anxiety level (Vandergrift, et al., 2006; Goh, 2018). The mean difference in person knowledge strategies before and after instruction indicated that participants less frequently used person knowledge strategies after instruction. Listening strategy instruction successfully help learners decrease the use of directed attention strategies which helped in decreasing participants' listening anxiety level, increasing their self-efficacy, and changing their belief about listening as a challenging skill.

The fifth factor of the MALQ is the directed attention strategies which describes how learners use strategies to focus on stay on the listening tasks (Vandergrift et al., 2006). This factor comprises items 2, 6, 12, and 16 which represent what listeners do when they face a comprehension problem (i.e. they may either focus more on the text or give up listening) or when losing concentration (i.e. they may either try to recover their concentration or get back on the listening task) (Goh & Hu, 2014). The participants of the intervention group were unable to use directed attention strategies during listening. These participants usually lost concentration and could not get back on task when facing a difficulty in understanding. The mean difference between pre-test and post-test was not statistically insignificant ($p = 0.26$) indicating that listening strategy instruction did not affect learners' use of directed attention strategies due to two reasons. First, these learners were at the early stages of English language learning; their limited knowledge of vocabulary makes them face difficulties in obtaining information from the text and this frustrates them. Second, learners might have heavily relied on the use of bottom-up strategies which were not always helpful in enabling them interpret the message of the text; this distracted them from getting their attention again on the task (Goh & Hu, 2014;Maftoon & Alamdari, 2016).

Conclusion

The present study investigated the impact of process-based listening strategy instruction on improving listening comprehension and the metacognitive awareness of strategy use of Iraqi EFL English learners. In process-based listening strategy instruction model adopted from Siegel (2015), explicit and integrated metacognitive and cognitive strategies were taught during the intervention course lasting for ten weeks. The results revealed that listening strategy instruction contributes significantly to the listening comprehension of the learners and had a strong impact on increasing their metacognitive awareness of strategy use. In particular, Listening strategy instruction increased learners metacognitive awareness of problem-solving, mental translation, and planning-evaluation and person knowledge strategies and decrease their directed attention strategies. The findings of the present study



indicated that process-based instruction can be integrated into regular lesson plans of Iraqi teachers. Listening strategy instruction capitalizes on listening as a process (teaching listening), not a product (testing listening) which suggests that the prior importance of instruction aimed at assisting the learners to implement strategies into the listening activities. Further research is needed to investigate whether Iraqi teachers are aware of teaching listening strategies or not, and how they might incorporate listening strategies in their classrooms. A qualitative analysis of the learners' perceptions about the usefulness of orchestrating strategies could be investigated to evaluate strategy instruction.



REFERENCES

- Berne, J. E., (2004). Listening comprehension strategies: A review of the literature. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(4), 521-531.
- Bozorgian, H. & Alamdari, E. F. (2017). Multimedia listening comprehension: Metacognitive instruction or metacognitive instruction through dialogic interaction. *ReCALL*, 30(1), 131–152
- Bozorgian, H. (2014). The role of metacognition in the development of EFL learners' Listening Skill. *The International Journal of Listening*, 28, 149–161.
- Cambridge English Language Assessment, (2019). *The cambridge english scale explained. a guide to converting practice test scores to Cambridge English scale scores*. Retrieved August 1, 2019, from <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/Images/210434-converting-practice-test-scores-to-cambridge-english-scale-scores.pdf>.
- Chou, M-H. (2016). A task-based language teaching approach to developing metacognitive strategies for listening comprehension. *International Journal of Listening*, 31(1), 51-70.
- Cross, J. D. (2009). Effects of listening strategy instruction on news videotext comprehension. *Language Teaching Research*, 13, 151–176.
- Cross, J. & Vandergrift, L. (2014). Guidelines for designing and conducting L2 listening studies. *ELT Journal*, 69, 86-89.
- Field, J. (2008). *Listening in the language classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Field, J. (2012). Listening instruction. In A. Burns, & J. Richard (Eds.), *Pedagogy and practice in second language teaching*, (pp. 207-217). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Goh, C. C. M. (2018). Metacognition in second language listening. *The Tesol Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, (1ST Edition). DOI: 10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0572.
- Goh, C. C. M. and Hu, G. (2014) Exploring the relationship between metacognitive awareness and listening performance with questionnaire data. *Language Awareness*, 23(3): 255–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2013.769558>.
- Graham, S. (2017). Research into practice: Listening strategies in an instructed classroom setting. *Language Teaching*, 50(1), 107–119. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444816000306>.



- Graham, S., & Macaro, E. (2008). Strategy instruction in listening for lower intermediate learners of French. *Language Learning*, 58, 747–783.
- Graham, S., & Santos, D. (2015). *Strategies for second language listening: Current scenarios and improved pedagogy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Graven, M., (2008). *Real Listening & Speaking 3 with answers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hassan, X., Macaro, E., Mason, D., Nye, G., Smith, P., & Vanderplank, R. (2005). *Strategy training in language learning: A systematic review of available research*. Retrieved January 22, 2018, from University of London, EPPI–Centre Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education Web site: [http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/EPPIWeb/home.aspx?page = /reel/ review_groups/mfl/review_one.htm](http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/EPPIWeb/home.aspx?page=/reel/review_groups/mfl/review_one.htm).
- Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M., & AL-Shammari, H. (2020). Examining the Effect of Listening Strategy Instruction on EFL Iraqi learners' Listening Anxiety. *Arab World English Journal: Special Issue on the English Language in Iraqi Context*. 62-75. DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/elt2.4>.
- López, M., N. (2017). Listening strategies instruction: effects on Hong Kong students' general strategic behaviour. *Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education*, (2)6, 17-29. .DOI 10.1186/s40862-017-0029-8.
- Macaro, E. (2006). Strategies for language learning and for language use: Revising the theoretical framework. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(3), 320–337.
- Maftoon, P., & Fakhri Alamdari, E. (2020). Exploring the effect of metacognitive strategy instruction on metacognitive awareness and listening performance through a process-based approach. *International Journal of Listening*, 34(1), 1-20. <https://doi:10.1080/10904018.2016.1250632>
- Mahdavi, N., & Miri, M. (2016). Co-Shaping metacognitive awareness and developing listening comprehension through process-based instruction. *International Journal of Listening*,(00),1-18, DOI:10.1080/10904018.2016.1260454.
- Milliner, B. & Dimoski, B. (2019). Explicit listening strategy training for ELF learners. *The Journal of Asia TEFL*, 16(3), 833-859.
- Movahed, R., (2014). The effect of metacognitive strategy instruction on listening performance, metacognitive awareness and listening anxiety of beginner Iranian EFL students. *English. International Journal of English Linguistics* (4)2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v4n2p88>.

- Ngo, N., (2019). Understanding the impact of listening strategy instruction on listening strategy use from a socio-cultural perspective. *System* 81, 63-77. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2019.01.002>.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Language learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., & Küpper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 10, 418–437.
- O'Malley, J.M., A.U. Chamot, G. Stewner-Manzanares, R.P. Russo and L. Kupper. (1985). Learning strategy application with students of English as a second language. *Tesol Quarterly*, (19) 3, 557–80.
- Plonsky, L. (2011). The effectiveness of second language strategy instruction: A meta-analysis. *Language Learning*, 61(4) .<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2011.00663.x>.
- Rahimi, M., & Katal, M. (2013). The impact of metacognitive instruction on EFL learners' listening comprehension and oral language proficiency. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, 5, 69–90.
- Rahimirad, M., & Shams, M. R. (2014). The effect of activating metacognitive strategies on the listening performance and metacognitive awareness of EFL students. *International Journal of Listening*, 28,162–176. <https://doi:10.1080/10904018.2014.902315>.
- Renandya, W. A. & Hu, G. (2018). L2 listening in China: An examination of current practice. In A. Burns & J. Siegel (Eds.), *International Perspectives on Teaching the Four Skills in ELT: Listening, speaking, reading, writing* (pp.37-50). Palgrave Macmillan, UK.
- Renandya, W. A., & Farrell, T. S. C. (2011). 'Teacher the tape is too fast!' Extensive listening in ELT. *ELT Journal*, 65, 52–59.
- Sharaf, F., G., Mobaraki, M., & Nia, M., R. (2018). The effect of listening strategy instruction on Iranian pre-intermediate EFL Learners' Listening Ability. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.7n.3p.188>.
- Siegel, J. (2012). Learner development through listening strategy training. In Irie, K. & Stewart, A. (Eds.), *Realizing Autonomy Practice and Reflection in Language Education Contexts* (pp.78-93). Macmillan Publishers Limited.



- Siegel, J. (2013). Second language learners' perceptions of listening strategy instruction. *Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching*, (7)1, 1-18, DOI:10.1080/17501229.2011.653110.
- Siegel, J. (2014). Problematising L2 listening pedagogy: The potential of process-based listening strategy instruction in the L2 classroom.(Unpublished doctoral thesis), Aston University, UK.
- Siegel, J. (2015). *Exploring listening strategy instruction through action research*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan, UK.
- Solórzano, H. S., & Schmidt, J. P. L. (2009). *Northstar 3. listening and speaking (Third Edition)*. White Plains, New York: Pearson Education.
- Swan, M., & Walter, C., (2017). Misunderstanding comprehension. *ELT Journal*. <https://doi:10.1093/elt/ccw094>.
- Tanewong, S., (2018). Metacognitive pedagogical sequence for less-proficient thai EFL listeners: A Comparative Investigation. *RELC Journal*, 1-18, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033688218754942>.
- Thompson, I. and Rubin, J. (1996). Can strategy instruction improve listening comprehension? *Foreign Language Annals* (29) 3,331–42.
- Vandergrift, L. (1997). The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30, 387-409.
- Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Vandergrift, L., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2010). Teaching learners how to listen does make a difference: An empirical study. *Language Learning*, 65, 470–497.
- Vandergrift, L., Goh, C., Mareschal, C., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2006). The metacognitive awareness listening questionnaire (MALQ): Development and validation. *Language Learning*, 56(3), 431–462.
- Yeldham, M. & Gruba, P. (2014). Towards an instructional approach to developing interactive second language listening. *Language Teaching Research*, 18(1), 33-53.
- Zobler, Ana C. (2010). Effects of listening strategies instruction on listening comprehension, oral proficiency, and metacognition on second language learners. Western Connecticut



International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change. www.ijicc.net
Volume 14, Issue 7, 2020

State University, Western Connecticut, USA. Education Dissertations.16.
<http://repository.wcsu.edu/educationdis/16>

Appendix A

A modified version of the Metacognitive Awareness of Listening Questionnaire (MALQ)
The statements on the following page describe some strategies for listening comprehension and how you feel about listening in the language you are learning. Do you agree with them? This is not a test, so there are no “right” or “wrong” answers. By responding to these statements, you can help yourself and your teacher understand your progress in learning to listen. Please indicate your opinion after each statement. Circle the number which best shows your level of agreement with the statement.

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Partly agree	Agree	Strongly agree
For example:						
I like learning another language	1	2	3	4	5	6

1. Before I start to listen, I have a plan in my head for how I am going to listen.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I focus harder on the text when I have trouble understanding.	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I find that listening is more difficult than reading, speaking, or writing in English	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I translate in my head as I listen.	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I use the words I understand to guess (assume) the meaning of the words I don't understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. When my mind wanders, I recover my concentration (attention) right away.	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. As I listen, I compare what I understand with what I know about the topic.	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I feel that listening comprehension in English is a challenge (difficult) for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I use my experience and knowledge to help me understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Before listening, I think of similar texts that I may have listened to.	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I translate key words as I listen.	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. I try to get back on track (course) when I lose concentration (attention).	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. As I listen, I quickly adjust (correct) my interpretation (understanding) if I realize that it is not correct.	1	2	3	4	5	6



14. After listening, I think back to how I listened, and about what I might do differently next time.	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. I don't feel nervous when I listen to English.	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. When I have difficulty understanding what I hear, I give up and stop listening.	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. I use the general idea of the text to help me guess (assume) the meaning of the words that I don't understand.	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. I translate word by word, as I listen.	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. When I guess (assume) 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	5	6
20. As I listen, I periodically (frequently) ask myself if I am satisfied (pleased) with my level of comprehension.	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. I have a goal in mind as I listen.	1	2	3	4	5	6