The Role of Listening Strategy Instruction in Advancing Students' Listening Achievement and Strategy Use

Belilew Molla Gebre, Assistant Professor, Dilla University, Ethiopia
belilewmolla@yahoo.com
Girma Gezahegn Tadesse, Assistant Professor, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa
girmag@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present study was carried out to investigate the effects of listening strategy instruction on students' listening achievement and strategy use. The participants of the study were 50 English major freshman students of Dilla University. These Students were placed in experimental and control conditions for the purpose of comparing the mean difference between the two groups. The control group was taught listening skills by the conventional approach while experimental group was given explicit listening strategy instruction. The study followed pretest-posttest control group experimental design. The main instruments used to collect data were IELTS listening tests and Strategy Inventory for Language Learners (SILL) which was adapted to listening skills strategy inventory. The study employed statistical techniques to analyze the data obtained from listening tests and Listening Strategy Inventory for Listening. To this effect, independent-samples t test and repeated measures t test were used to examine whether the listening tests/inventory mean differences between and within groups were statistically significant. The findings revealed that listening strategy instruction was more effective and had a positive impact on students' academic achievement in listening than the conventional approach. Moreover, it was found that the instruction improved the participants' strategy use.

Key words: EFL, listening strategy instruction, listening achievement, strategy use

Introduction

The importance of listening comprehension in language teaching has been widely recognized since the comprehension approach (Asher, 1982) and the natural approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983) at the beginning of the 1980's. The underlying assumption of these approaches is that beginning-level second language learners internalize the target language gradually by absorbing comprehensible input through listening (Krashen, 1981; 1982). Since then the necessity of comprehensible input for second language acquisition has been widely accepted by researchers (Gass & Varonis, 1994; Long, 1987). Consequently, listening comprehension plays a critical role in second language acquisition in that it provides learners with opportunity to receive comprehensible input (Brown, 1988).

Listening is not only the first of the language skills developed, it is also the skill most frequently used in both the classroom and daily life. Research has demonstrared that adults spend 40-50% of communication time listening, 25-30% speaking, 11-16% reading, and about 9% writing (Feyten, 1991). Clearly, much of the educational process is based on skills in listening. Wolvin and Coakley (1996, p. 14) point out that up to about the sixth grade (12 years of age), listening is the most efficient learning mode, and fifty-eight percent of elementary students' (7-12 years of age) classroom time is spent in listening. From then on, students learn to make use of other modes, while continuing to use listening. By the time they enter college, the lecture system, presentations and group discussions draw heavily upon listening skills. Listening has always been

a primary activity of college-age students. As Brown (1987) states, listening abilities remain at the very heart of all growth, from birth through to the years of formal education.

Despite the importance of listening skills in language instruction, English language classes in many countries still emphasize only the skills of reading and writing. This is especially the case of English-as-a-foreign-language (EFL) situation in which the English language is taught as a subject at school and used only inside, but not outside, the classroom (Vandergrift, 1997). EFL students are studying English in their home countries where English is not the dominant native language. Students who are from environments where English is not the language of the country have very few opportunities to hear the real language; these students therefore are not accustomed to hearing the language as it is produced by native speakers for native speakers. Moreover, some students often panic when they hear the English language on television, radio, or in situations in which speech is fast and nothing is repeated (Feyten, 1991).

Ethiopia is one of the countries which use English as a foreign language. Since it is the language of international diplomacy, trade, science and technology, and communication, it has a tremendous influence on the political, economic, and socio-cultural developments of the country. Moreover, it is the medium of instruction at secondary and tertiary levels of education across the country. Hence, being a medium of instruction in high schools and tertiary levels of education, it demands competence in listening. Especially, tertiary or university students are expected to be competent in the listening skills so as to take notes from lectures, group discussions and presentations. Moreover, students' achievement in different fields of study depends on their ability to identifying main points from trivial ones, organizing ideas and being able to summarize what they listened to (Moges, 2003).

Regardless of the problems Ethiopian students face in understanding the materials they listen to in English, listening is not given due attention in Ethiopian learning institutions (Kebede, 2007). Students are not given appropraite exposure they need in order to cope up with the speed and pronounciation of the native speakers. In some well established and in almost all new universities, instructors teach only the theoretical part of the course and the practical part, which seems the most important to develop students listening ability, remains untouched. English language instructors the present researchers interviewed in Arbaminch University, Wolita Soddo University, and Hawassa University reported that there is lack of language laboratories and teaching materials like audio casette and books to give adequate opportunity for the students to listen to native speakers speech. Therefore, it seems that university English teaching practice is found to be that the teaching of listening skills is still the weak link in the language teaching process.

Another daunting problem in even well-established universities, which are equipped with language laboratories, is that teachers "test" listening rather than "teaching" it. Most of the time students are told to listen to the audio cassette and answer comprehension questions without being taught how to listen to the specific task to be accomplished. However, research findings indicate that students should be taught not only the content, i.e what to listen to, but also they should be taught how to listen to and learn the content, i.e the strategies (Cohen, 1990; Wenden, 1987). They further explain that students who experience the teaching of listening as more of testing develop negative attitudes towards language learning in general and listening skills in particular.

As a result of the weak link and lack of adequate exposure to the teaching of listening in Ethiopian high schools, students the researchers taught in Dilla University usually complained about the difficulty they faced during listening to the speech of native speakers on the audio tape in the language laboratory. They explained that when they were in the high schools, they did not

practice listening. According to the students, teachers in different states of the country overemphasized English grammar, reading, and vocabulary rather than speaking and listening. They often complained that listening is one of the most difficult skills to acquire.

Some local research findings also strengthen the complaints of the students. The findings indicate that students are not good at listening for the main ideas, listening for specific information, inferrencing, and summarizing the text being listened to (Abdi, 2005; Kebede, 2007; Seime, 1989). These studies also indicated that students face problems in understanding the pronunciations of the speakers, coping up with the speed of the speakers, understanding grammatical structures, etc. The researchers also indicated that the problems are attributed to the level of exposure students had and the inadequate attention given for the skill by language teachers.

Based on the important role listening plays in language education and the heavy demand it puts on the foreign language learners, it seems that strategy instruction in listening should get due attention. Research findings on strategy description and categorization have found their implications in language classrooms in helping teachers accelerate the language learning of their students. If learners are to be in a position to be made aware of different strategies that can assist them in the process of listening, they should be familiar with the strategies that are available. In other words, if students have to make their strategy selection, they have to know about the process of making this selection, because "informed selection of strategies presupposes knowledge of strategies and knowledge of strategies presupposes instruction" (Nunan, 1992, p. 179).

Moreover, the shift from the teacher centered classroom to the learner-centered classroom and from the interest in the product of language learning to the process have brought attention to learning strategies which an individual learner applies during the learning process to facilitate second language acquisition (Oxford, 1990; Wenden, 1991). In addition, as academic listening skills came to be recognized as an essential component of communicative competence in a university setting, distinguishable aspects of academic listening such as the discourse structure of academic lectures, the role of note-taking, and background knowledge effects have appeared to be valuable research topics with regard to pedagogical concerns (O'Malley, Chamot, & Kupper, 1989). However, research on L2 listening comprehension in academic contexts is not sufficient when compared to the amount of research on other areas. This could result in inadequate assumptions about many aspects of L2 academic listening (Rubin, 1994) and could thus impede the work of both applied linguists and classroom practitioners who interact with L2 learners (Mendelsohn, 1998). Thus, systematic research on the effects of listening strategy training in academic context especially in the foreign language learning context is necessary. As a result of the aforementioned facts, this research investigates the impact of listening strategy instruction on students' listening performance and strategy use.

Methodology

The purpose of the study was to investigate whether listening strategies instruction enhanced students' performance in listening and listening strategy use. The study was mainly experimental since it tried to find out the effects of listening strategy instruction on students' listening performance and strategy use.

The research employed a quasi-experimental design. The data were obtained from pre- and posttests of the listening test and the pre- and post listening strategy inventory. The aim of the quantitative data was to test the hypotheses and to identify numerical mean differences in achievement and strategy use between the control and experimental groups.

Participants

Participants in this study were first year English major students at Dilla University. Students of one section who were fifty in number were taken as the subject of the study. This was because students who major in English are the only ones who take the listening skills course. Among these fifty students, twenty-five were placed in the control group and the remaining twenty-five were placed in the experimental group.

Materials and instruments

The IELTs listening comprehension test was administered before the intervention as pre-experiment test. The test required students to listen to a number of academic listening encounters i.e. dialogues, interviews, and lectures. To verify comprehension, they completed short blank spaces, summary notes, and answered true/false questions and multiple-choice questions. Based on the pretest results students were placed in experimental and control conditions by using the matching technique. After 16 weeks of explicit listening strategy instruction for experimental group and conventional approach of teaching listening for the control group, the posttest was given for both groups and the results were compared. The comparison was made to identify whether there was a statistically significant mean difference in achievement between the experimental and control groups.

The IELTs test was chosen for a number of important reasons. Firstly, the study required a standardized test, which could be confidently predicated to provide a sensible balance between reliability and validity. Another reason for using this particular test was that the level of difficulty among the tests was theoretically the same and would therefore be a controlled variable. The third reason for using the IELTs listening comprehension test was that a range of English accents and dialects appeared in the recordings that reflected the international usage. The task formats varied somewhat and include such question types as multiple choice, short answer questions, sentence completion, table completion and lablling a diagram which had numbered parts.

The second major instrument was Strategy Inventory for Language Learners (SILL). It was chosen for this study for the following reasons. Firstly, Oxford's classification is ''more systematic in linking individual strategies, as well as strategy groups'' (Oxford, 1990, p. 14). It is also more systematic because it links individual strategies, as well as strategy groups, with each of the four language skills: listening, reading, speaking and writing. Secondly, it is ''the most comprehensive one to date'' (Ellis, 1994, p. 539); thirdly, SILL is the most widely used strategy instrument around the world (Cohen & Macaro, 2007). Oxford and Burry-Stock (1995) estimated that 40-50 studies had used the SILL, involving approximately 9,000 language learners. It is the only language learning strategy instrument that has been extensively field-tested for reliability and validated in multiple ways. In adapting the original SILL items, changes were made at phrase, clause, and sentence levels so that they would meet the objectives of the study. For instance, the word 'English'; and a phrase 'English skills' used in the original SILL were consistently replaced by 'listening skills lessons' and 'listening skills' respectively. Then its internal consistency was checked by using Cronbach alpha and the overall consistency was found to be 0.89 which was in an acceptable range.

Procedures

In order to gather valid and reliable data, the following procedures were followed. First students took an IELTS test and they were placed in the experimental and control conditions

based on their pretest results using the matching technique. Among 50 students, 25 were placed in the EG and the rest 25 were placed in the CG. Students also immediately filled in the Strategy Inventory for Language Learners (SILL) which was adapted to listening strategies. The purpose of the inventory was to determine the frequency of strategy use before the treatment and to give due emphasis to the important strategies they needed to develop. The results of the pre-inventory were calculated and the mean scores were computed.

The second phase was meant for training the teacher/instructor who delivered listening lessons for both experimental and control groups. To do so, the researchers adapted the meta-cognitive training model and integrated the other strategies in the model. The teacher was given training for ten days basically on the problems identified at the pretest and pre-inventory. In the training, due attention was given to how to integrate the lessons with the intended strategies, how to demonstrate the use of different strategies, and how to reflect on the strategies used. At the end of the ten-day training, the teacher delivered two model lessons to the researchers and discussions were made to improve the quality of the training. Moreover, the teacher delivered three different lessons for the experimental group in the presence of the researchers. At the end, discussion was held and the teacher reflected on what happened, i.e. the challenges he and the students experienced. Accordingly, additional demonstrations and trainings were made and the teacher handled the training.

At the end of 16 weeks (4 months) of training, students both in the experimental and control groups were given the listening posttest. The purpose of the posttest was to determine whether listening strategy instruction brought about statistically significant mean difference in students' performance in experimental group and how significant it was. Students in both groups also filled in SILL questionnaire for the second time. This was also done to see whether the listening strategy instruction helped students in the experimental group to bring about statistically significant mean difference in listening strategy use. Data analysis   Since the study was experimental, quantitative data analysis techniques were employed. Data from IELTs pre and posttest and listening inventory pre and posttest were processed using *t* test and SPSS windows version 20.

Independent-samples *t* tests were used to determine whether there were statistically significant mean differences between control and experimental groups, and paired-samples *t* tests were used to determine whether there were statistically significance mean differences within the group between pre- and posttest results. Moreover, eta square was calculated to determine the magnitude of changes. In this particular research the significance level was determined to be .05.

Results

The aim of this study was to investigate the effects of listening strategy training on students' listening performance and strategy use. In this section the data obtained from IELTs listening tests, SIL (Strategy Inventory for Listening), and students' interviews were analyzed under quantitative and qualitative analyses. The quantitative data were analyzed followed by qualitative data. Eta square was also used to calculate the effect size.

The first specific objective of the research was to determine whether listening strategy training could bring about statistically significant achievement mean difference on students listening performance. To this end the IELTS pre- and post-listening tests were used as data gathering instruments.

To examine the difference between two groups and see the significance level, it is necessary to consult the results of independent-samples *t* test, which are presented below:

Table 1. Independent-Samples t Test of Control and Experimental Groups Pretest

Pretest	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Control	25	13.32	4.79	-2.72	48	.787
Experimental	25	13.68	4.57			

Sig. $p < 0.05*$

The table shows that the *t* value was ($t = -2.72$) and the degrees of freedom was ($df = 48$). From the table, it is also observed that significance of the two tailed *t* test was .787, which was greater than .05. According to this result, there was no statistically significant mean difference between the pretest mean scores of the students in the control and experimental groups at 0.05 level of significance since $p = .787$ ($p > 0.05$). This indicates that the experimental group and control group had a roughly similar proficiency in their listening comprehension levels before the treatment.

After listening strategy training for EG and conventional approach to the CG, the post listening test was administered and the following results were obtained.

Table 2. Independent-Samples t Test for Posttest

Posttest	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Experimental	25	19.80	4.79	-3.69	48	.001
Control	25	15.36	4.33			

Sig. $p < 0.05*$

The *t* value was ($t = -3.69$) and the degree of freedom was ($df = 48$). From the table above, it is also observed that significance was .001, which was less than .05. According to this result, there was a statistically significant achievement mean difference between the posttest mean scores of the students in the two groups at 0.05 level of significance since $p = 0.001$ ($p < 0.05$). This indicates that the experimental group made a significant improvement over the control group in listening achievement posttest. This finding implied that the experimental treatment had brought statistically significant positive change in listening achievement over the control group.

In order to determine the mean gain or difference of students in the experimental, and control groups, a repeated measures *t* test or paired-samples *t* test was computed as presented below.

Table 3. Paired-Samples t Test for the EG

	N	$\bar{x}$	sd	t	df	p
Pretest	25	13.69	4.79	-10.91	24	.000*
Posttest	25	19.80	4.18			

Sig. $p < 0.05*$

The achievement mean scores of the experimental group posttest and the pretest were 19.80 and 13.69, respectively. The achievement mean gain between experimental group pre and posttest mean scores was 6.11. This mean gain, as revealed by paired samples *t* test for mean difference, was found to be statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance ($df = 24$, $t = -10.91$) since $p = 0.000 < 0.05$ level of significance.

Table 4. The CG Students' Achievement Mean Gain Between Pre and Posttest Mean Scores

	N	$\bar{x}$	sd	t	df	P
Pretest	25	13.32	4.57	-12.86	24	.009
Posttest	25	15.36	4.33			

Sig. p < 0.05*

The mean scores of the control group posttest and the pretest were 15.36 and 13.32, respectively. A paired-samples *t* test for mean difference showed that the mean gain between the post and pretest mean scores was 2.04 (*t* = -12.86, *df* = 24). This mean gain between the pre and posttests mean scores of the control group was statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance as *p* = 0.009 < 0.05. This implies that the achievement mean gain was significant, but by far less than the achievement mean gain of the experimental group.

However, it appears inappropriate to draw the conclusion that this mean gain was solely due to the treatment effect as the mean gain is crude. Therefore, the experimental group achievement mean gain, its overall achievement mean gain over the control group, and the conclusion drawn were presented below.

Table 5. The EG Students' Overall Achievement Mean Gain over the CG

Group	Number	Measurements		Achievement Gains	P
		Posttest	Pretest	Posttest - pretest	
Control ($\bar{x}$)	25	15.36	13.32	2.04	0.009*
Experimental($\bar{x}$)	25	19.80	13.68	6.12	0.000*
Mean Difference($\bar{x}$)		4.44	0.36	4.08	0.000*

Sig. p < 0.05*

Table 5 above is a summary of achievement mean gain. The data were based on an independent-samples *t* test for the equality of means and a paired-samples *t* test. As indicated therein, the achievement mean gain of the experimental group from pretest to posttest was 6.12 at 0.05 level of significance, (*p* = 0.000 < 0.05, *df* = 24, *t* = -10.91) while the achievement mean gain of the control group from pretest to posttest was 2.04 at 0.05 level of significance (*df* = 24, *t* = -12.86). The *t* tests show that the mean gains for the experimental group was statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance since *p* = 0.000 and the *t* tests for the control group was also statistically significant at 0.05 level since *p* = 0.009, which is less than 0.05. However, the experimental group made a considerably higher progress as compared to the control group. The experimental group overall achievement mean gain over the control group was found to be 4.08 and this much mean gain of the experimental group over the control group was statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance, *p* = 0.000, *p* < 0.05 (*df* = 24).

The effect size of the intervention was also calculated. Effect size $r2 = t2/ (t2+df) 2 = -3.683 / (-3.683 + 48) 2 = 0.22$ (22% of variances in the post test results is accounted for listening strategy training.

Typically, effect-size estimates are interpreted in different ways. One way is to rely on commonly accepted benchmarks that differentiate small, medium, and large effects. Perhaps most well-known are those benchmarks presented by Cohen (1988) for interpreting Cohen's *d*, whereby 0.2 equates to a small effect, 0.5 equates to a medium effect, and effects larger than 0.8 equate to large effects. Thus, according to the independent-samples *t* test and the calculation of

the effect size, the difference represents a large effect. Moreover, as indicated above, 84% of the overall achievement mean gain was due to the impact of listening strategy training, and this much effect size, according to Cohen (1988), was taken as high difference effect.

According to the result of inferential statistics, this study rejected the null hypothesis Ho$_1$. This seems to indicate that the overall experimental group achievement mean gain over the control group was attributed to the effect of listening strategy training over the conventional teaching method of listening. This result supports the hypothesis that listening strategy training has a positive effect on listening comprehension.

The second specific objective of this study was to see whether listening strategy training could bring about a statistically significant difference in students' listening strategy use. To this end, data were gathered through adapted SILL, and semi-structured interview. To this effect students filled in the listening strategy inventory questionnaire before and after listening strategy training. Moreover, to gather qualitative data, nine students from the experimental group were interviewed before and after the listening strategy training.

Table 6. Independent-Samples t Test for the Pre-Experiment Inventory

Strategies	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Cognitive	-.302	48	.764
Memory	-.088	48	.931
Compensation	-.381	48	.705
Meta-cognitive	-.999	48	.323
Social	-.107	48	.915
Affective	-.655	48	.516

As depicted in the above table, the *t* value was (*t* = -.302) and the degrees of freedom (*df* = 48) and level of significance was .764 for cognitive strategy, and level of significance for the memory category was 0.931. The significance values for the compensation strategy and for meta-cognitive strategies were 0.705 and 0.323, respectively. Regarding social and affective strategies, the significance levels were 0.915 and 0.516, respectively. According to this result, there was no statistically significant mean difference in the six constructs. Therefore, it can be concluded that the frequency of strategy use for students in both groups were more or less the same before the experiment began.

Therefore, to determine whether listening strategy training improved the learners' strategy use or not, students were asked to fill in the inventory questionnaire as a posttest after listening strategy training for the EG.

In order to show whether there was a statistically significant difference between the two groups or not, an independent-samples *t* test was conducted.

Table 7. Independent-Samples t Test for the Post-Experiment Inventory

Strategies	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Cognitive	3.00	48	.004*
Memory	3.49	48	.001*
Compensation	.522	48	.604
Meta-cognitive	3.00	48	.004*
Social	.836	48	.407
Affective	3.83	48	.000*

As depicted in Table 7, for the cognitive strategy, the *t* value was (*t* = 3.00), the degrees of freedom was (*df* = 48), the level of significance was .004, and the effect size was 0.11 (which is large effect). In the memory category, the *t* value was (*t* = 3.49) and the degrees of freedom was (*df* = 48). The significance in this category was 0.001, and the effect size was 0.17 (which is large effect). Regarding the meta-cognitive strategy category, the *t* value was (*t* = 3.00), and the degrees of freedom was (*df* = 48). As observed in the table, the significance was .004, and the effect size was 0.06 (which is a moderate effect). For the affective category, the *t* value was (*t* = 3.83), the degrees of freedom was (*df* = 48), the *p* value was .000, and the effect size was 0.31 (which is a small effect). Therefore, the result revealed that there was a statistically significant mean difference for the experimental group in the posttests for cognitive, memory, meta-cognitive, and affective strategies since the levels of significance were less than 0.05. This indicates that the experimental group made a significant improvement over the control group in strategy use as a result of the listening strategy training or intervention.

With regard to compensation strategy, the *t* value was 5.22 and the degrees of freedom was 48 (*df* = 48). From the information in the table, it is also observed that significance was 0.604, which was greater than 0.05. According to this result, there was no statistically significant mean difference between the posttest inventory mean scores of the students in the experimental and control groups for the compensation category at 0.05 level of significance since *p* = 0.604 (*p* > 0.05). The *t* value in the social strategy category was .836, the degree of freedom was 48 (*df* = 48), and the *p* value was 0.407, which was greater than 0.05. The results of post-experiment inventory for compensation and social strategies revealed that the experimental group did not make a significant improvement over the control group after the intervention.

However, it is also important to see whether students in the CG and EG improved their frequency of strategy use from pretest to posttest. To this end, paired-samples *t* test was employed to determine the significance level.

Table 8. Paired-Sample t Test for the Experimental Group

Strategies	Mean		*SD*	*df*	*t*	*p*
Cognitive	Pre-inv	3.13	.57	24	-3.07	.005*
	Post-inv	3.51	.43			
Memory	Pre-inv	3.02	.66	24	-3.05	.005*
	Post-inv	3.40	.55			
Compensation	Pre-inv	3.01	.60	24	-.613	.546
	Post-inv	3.11	.72			
M-cognitive	Pre-inv	3.16	.74	24	-3.22	.004*
	Post-inv	3.65	.59			
Social	Pre-inv	3.34	.55	24	1.30	.206
	Post-inv	3.115	.62			
Affective	Pre-inv	2.82	.52	24	-3.57	.002*
	Post-inv	2.92	.46			

Table 8 revealed that the *t* value for the cognitive strategy was (*t* = -3.07), the degree of freedom was (*df* = 24), and significance was .005, which was less than .05. Paired-samples *t* test also indicated that the *t* value for memory strategy was (.-3.05), the degree of freedom was (*df* = 24), and the *p* value was 0.005, which was less than 0.05. The table also shows that for compensation category, the *t* value was -.613, the degree of freedom was 24 (*df* = 24), and the significance was 0.546, which was greater than 0.05. The result of the above paired-samples *t* test

for the meta-cognitive category revealed that the *t* value was (-3.22), the degree of freedom was 24 (*df* = 24), and the *p* value was 0.004, which was less than 0.05. The result for the affective category indicated that the *t* value was .1.30, the degree of freedom was 24 (*df* = 24), and the significance was 0.206, which was greater than 0.05. According to this result, there was a statistically significant mean difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores of the students in the experimental group for cognitive, memory, meta-cognitive and affective strategies. This clearly indicates that the listening strategy instruction helped the students to improve the frequency of strategy use in the above-mentioned domains. It was in the compensation and social strategies that students' use of strategy was not statistically significant since *p* = 0.0546 for compensation strategy and *p* = .206 for social strategy, which were greater than 0.05.

Discussion

The first objective of this study was to investigate whether listening strategy instruction improved students' listening achievement. To this end, IELTS listening pre and posttests were administered for control and experimental groups to determine the mean difference between and within the groups. The finding indicated that students in experimental group, who attended explicit listening strategy training, outperformed students in the control group.

This finding is in accord with some of the previous studies on listening strategy instruction. For example, Goh (2000) indicated that strategy training helped learners to improve their listening comprehension. Moreover, Ross and Rost (1991) found that after listening strategy training, listeners at elementary as well as intermediate levels showed improvement in listening comprehension tasks and were able to ask hypothesis-testing questions. Thompson and Rubin (1996) confirmed that an experimental group who received systematic instruction in listening improved significantly over those who had received no instruction. Vandergrift (1999) has also proposed that teachers can nurture the development of listening strategies for L2 learners. The findings of Fujware (1990) also revealed a positive effect for listening strategy training on the listening comprehension of subjects who reported that they became aware of effective listening strategies. Thus, the present study confirmed that listening strategy training significantly improved students' listening performance/comprehension**.**

The second objective of the study was to see whether listening strategy instruction helped students improve their frequency of listening strategy use. The findings of the current study indicated that there was a statistically significant mean difference in the experimental group subjects' use of listening strategies. That is, subjects employed significantly more strategies after they received instruction in listening strategies. The results support those of some previous studies on strategy instruction. For example, Ridgway (2000) found out that the use of listening strategies increased by the experimental group. O'Malley et al. (1985) indicated that strategy training can be effective on integrative language tasks for ESL students. Moreover, Thompson and Rubin (1996) found that American students learning Russian who received listening strategy instruction improved significantly over those who had received no instruction. Thus, the present study confirmed the facilitating effect of strategy instruction on the use of EFL listening strategies.

However, this finding contradicts Teng's (1998) findings in that she found compensation strategy to be the most commonly used and affective strategy the least commonly used strategies. On the other hand, the finding was in harmony with Teng's finding in cognitive, memory and meta-cognitive strategies.

Conclusions

The major objective of the present study was to determine the effects of listening strategy training on students' listening performance and listening strategy use. Based on the results of the study, the following conclusions and implications were drawn:

Listening strategy instruction is more effective than the conventional approach of teaching the listening skills. Students in the experimental group achieved statistically significant mean difference after the training over students in the control condition. Moreover, listening strategy training brought about statistically significant mean difference in students' listening strategy use. The mean difference from pre to posttest indicated that students in the experimental group progressed significantly. For instance, the mean strategy use of students before the intervention was in the range of medium strategy usage. However, after the intervention, majority of the students' frequency of strategy use fell in the range of high strategy use.

Based on the findings, the current study proposes that systematic strategy instruction result in the improvement of achievement and strategy use for EFL listeners. The present research can provide the following contributions: to empirically investigate the effect of strategy instruction on FL listening comprehension, to provide process-oriented descriptions for the research literature of listening strategy training, and with instructional implication to teach students how to employ effective EFL listening strategies. Moreover, teachers in the high schools as well as in universities should identify learners strategy use and make remedial works on those listening strategies students do not use or wrongly use. Students' level of readiness should also be considered in the part of teachers so as to maintain equity education. Slow learners or learners with elementary level of proficiency need more assistance from teachers about how and when to use listening strategies.

References

Abdi, H. (2005). *An investigation of learning strategies employed by high school teachers and students to develop effective listening skills*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Addis Ababa, AAU.

Asher, J. J. (1982). Learning another language through actions. *Teaching Techniques.* Retrieved from http://www.oneonta.edu/faculty/thomasrl/YaTeachTech.pdf.

Best, J.W., & J.V. Kahn (1993). *Research in education*. (7th ed.) New Delhi: Prentice-Hall Indian Private Ltd.

Brown, J.D. (1988). *Understanding research in second language learning*.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brown, J. I. (1987). Listening: Ubiquitous yet obscure. *Journal of the International Listening Association,* 1, 3-14.

Coakley, C., & Wolvin, A. (1997). Listening in the educational environment. In M. Purdy & D. Borisoff (Eds.), *Listening in everyday life: A personal and professional approach* (2nd ed.) (pp. 179-212). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Cohen, A. D. (1990). *Language learning: Insights for learners, teachers, and researchers*. NewYork: Newbury House/Harper & Row.

Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Feyten, C. M. (1991). The power of listening ability: An overlooked dimension in language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 173-180.

Fujiware, B. (1990). Learner training in listening strategies. *JALT Journal 12(2),* 203-17.

Goh, C. (2000) A cognitive perspective on language learners' listening comprehension

problems. *System*, *28*(1), 55-75

Kebede, B. (2007). *An investigation of Learners difficulties in learning listening skills through the plasma education: Grade 9 in focus*." Unpublished M.A thesis. Addis Ababa, AAU.

Krashen, S. D. (1981). *Second language aquisition and second language learning*. Oxford: Pergamon.

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

Krashen, S. D. & Terrell T. D. (1983). *The natural approach: Language acquisition in the classroom.* California: The Alemany Press.

Long, D. R. (1987). Second language listening comprehension: A schema-theoretic perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 32-40.

O'Malley, J. M., Chamot, A. U., Stewner-Manzanares, G., Russo, R., & Kupper, L. (1985). Learning strategy applications with students of English as a second language. *TESOL Quarterly, 19*, 285-296.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Ridgway, T. (2000) Listening Strategies – I beg your pardon? *ELT Journal, 54*(2), 179-185.

Rost, M., & Ross, S. (1991). Learner strategies in interaction: Typology and teachability. *Language Learning, 41*, 235-273.

Seime, K. (1989). *An investigation of the listening abilities of Bahir Dar college students*. Unpublished M.A thesis. Addis Ababa, AAU.

Teng, H. (1998). An investigation of EFL listening strategies by Taiwan college students. *Paper from the proceedings of the sixth international symposium on English teaching* (pp.509-519). Taipei: Crane.

Vandergrift, L. (1997). The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, *30*(3), 387-409.

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

Wenden, A. (1987). Metacognition: An expanded view of the cognitive abilities of L2 learners. *Language Learning*, *37*(4), 573-94.

Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy: Planning and implementing learner training for language learners*. New York: Prentice Hall.

Wolvin, A.D., & Coakley, C. G. (1996). *Listening*. London: Brown & Benchmark.