Listening self-efficacy beliefs, L2 listening proficiency, and listening strategy training: An experimental study

Hamideh Hamdi Khosroshahi[1], Ali Merç[2]

[1,2]Anadolu University, Turkey

Article Info

Abstract

Self-efficacy plays an important role in language learners' performances in language learning. Studies report that explicit teaching of strategies, self-efficacy, and better learner performance are interdependent concepts. This entails the fact that language teachers should focus on the first two in order to increase the learners' performance. The aim of this study is to find out how teaching cognitive and metacognitive strategies affect EFL learners' performances and self-efficacy beliefs in listening comprehension tasks. Ninety students participated in this study, thirty of whom were part of the control group. Their listening self-efficacy and listening proficiency were measured before and after a four-week training. During the intervention sessions, instructors taught cognitive and metacognitive strategies in an explicit way, which included teacher modeling and teacher feedbacks. The results revealed that learners' listening proficiency scores increased while their self-efficacy scores did not change significantly after the training. These findings led to the conclusion that low self-efficacy does not necessarily lead to low listening proficiency. Another finding was that teaching only cognitive and metacognitive strategies does not help learners with their self-efficacy in a short time period. Implications and suggestions for L2 listening are provided considering the results of the study.

⊠ Correspondent Address:
Anadolu Universtiesi Egitim Fakutesi
26470 Tepebasi, Eskisehir, Turkey
E-mail: amerc@anadolu.edu.tr

INTRODUCTION

Language learners' individuality is gaining more importance in the ESL/EFL context in recent years, and researchers believe that there are many differences among individual learners, concerning their perceptions in the context of language learning (Dörnyei, 2005). One such difference emerges in language learners' self-perceptions or what scholars call their 'self-efficacy beliefs'. Bandura (1997) claims that learner's self-efficacy have a crucial role in their overall success. Hsieh and Schallert (2008) also argue that self-efficacy deals with learners' conscious or sub-conscious beliefs about how well they can complete a task. According to Mills, Pajares, and Herron (2006), self-efficacy plays a vital role in learning and students with high self-efficacy beliefs are more prepared to learning challenges. Savignon (1983) highlights the role of learners' feelings and claims that they are more important factors compared with others such as intelligence or teaching method. Self-efficacy beliefs can vary through different language skills and tasks.

Listening comprehension provides the aural input that learners receive during their communications or in classroom setting which makes proficiency in this skill fundamentally important for learners. Hasan (2000) claims that "listening comprehension provides the right conditions for language acquisition and development of other language skills" (p.138). The importance of both self-efficacy and listening tasks intrigues the implication that higher self-efficacy would result in better performance in listening comprehension tasks, and in return, better listening performance would lead students to have higher perceptions of themselves while confronting challenging listening tasks.

Furthermore, teaching learning strategies particularly metacognitive strategies has been reported to increase learners' performances in listening tasks. As Klingner, Vaughn and Boardman (2015) argue improving listening strategies help learners perform their listening activities more efficiently; moreover, language learners who utilize metacognitive strategies of planning, evaluating and monitoring, tend to achieve their goals with ease. This happens because learners do better at storing and processing new information, they apply better listening strategies to each task, (Riding & Rayner, 2013). It can be inferred that teaching strategies to learners will also improve their self-efficacy as they will start to perform better. As mentioned before, this higher self-efficacy will improve their performances even more since a successful listening comprehension skill directly "depends on learners' self-efficacy for listening, on their confidence in their ability to make sense of the input to which they are exposed" (Graham, 2011, p. 113). Al-Azzemi and Al-Jamal, (2019) claim that despite its valid importance to language learning, listening comprehension has been an undervalued skills in second language learning research.

Although a number of research studies have been conducted to find out the possible effect of listening self-efficacy, metacognitive strategy training, and listening comprehension, the possible relation among these variables is a genuine gap in the ESL/EFL literature. As a contribution to the literature to fill-in this gap, this study attempts to shed light onto the possible relationships among the aforementioned important concepts in ESL/EFL contexts. Considering the current gap and the interdependent roles of self-efficacy, listening comprehension performance, and listening strategies, the aim of this study is to investigate the correlation between these variables in a Turkish context. This study tries to find out how teaching listening comprehension strategies would affect learners' self-efficacy and listening comprehension. Within this purpose, the following research questions were formed: 1) Does teaching listening strategies have an effect on Turkish EFL learners' listening proficiency scores?; 2) Does it have an effect on their listening self-efficacy?; 3) Is there any correlation between listening proficiency scores and listening self-efficacy scores of Turkish EFL learners?

Literature Review

Self-efficacy

In 1970s, Albert Bandura defined self-efficacy as learners' beliefs in whether they have enough ability to perform a task. He claims that self-efficacy is the core cognitive feature that can affect a person's behavior and these beliefs "vary across activity domains and situational conditions rather than manifest uniformly across tasks and contexts in the likeness of a general trait (Bandura, 2012, p.13). Bandura (1995) identifies four factors in increasing self-efficacy: experiencing successes or mastery, observing peers' success or modelling, receiving verbal persuasion, and enhancing one's physiological states. The first and the most important source of self-efficacy, mastery, refers to the learner's previous experiences of failure or success. Mastering a task will increase the self-confidence of the learner in the related area whereas a failure will cause its decline. The next source of self-efficacy is the modeling source. According to Schunk (1987), when learners feel that they can be similar to their models and

gain success by following them, they get more motivated. Observing successes that are gained by sustained effort boost learners' beliefs in themselves. The third source of self-efficacy is available when learners are persuaded that they are capable and can complete a task successfully. In fact, teachers or parents can strengthen students' beliefs, which would lead them to put more effort on learning tasks. Graham (2007) claims that we need to make learners notice that their success or lack of success are due to their strategy uses, not their being talented or not. The last source of self-efficacy comes from affective and physical states. Depression, for instance, decreases an individual's confidence in their capabilities, and they may show poor performances.

Self-efficacy has been the focal point of numerous studies in the field of second language learning. A group of researchers have attempted to describe the relationship between self-efficacy and overall language learning (Gahunga, 2009; Magogwe, & Oliver, 2007; Mahyuddin, Elias, Muhamad, Noordin and Abdullah 2006; Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2007; Raoofi, Tan & Chan, 2012; Woodrow, 2011). These studies have revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and overall language learning success. For example, Raoofi et al. (2012) shows that learners' self-efficacy profiles can be a strong predictor for achieving language skills. Mills et al. (2007) investigated the L2 French students' academic performance in relation with their self-efficacy and found out that those who perceived themselves as proficient in using effective metacognitive strategies were more successful in French. On the contrary, Anyadubalu, (2010) studied the relationship among anxiety, self-efficacy, and students' performances in the English language and revealed that there was no significant relationship between self-efficacy and English language performance. Although this study shows no relationship, many studies that highlight the positive relationship between self-efficacy and using learning strategies can be an indicator of importance of self-efficacy and students' beliefs about themselves (Diseth, 2011; Kim et al., 2015; Pajares, 2002; Schunk, 1991; Anam & Stracke, 2016; Wilfong, 2006; Wong, 2005; Yang, 1992; Yang, 1999; Yang & Wang, 2015). The findings of these studies reveal a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and the using learning strategies by students. For instance, Anam & Stracke (2016) studied on Indonesian students' strategy use in learning English and its relationship with their self-efficacy beliefs and found out that students with high self-efficacy use different strategies compared with those who have low self-efficacy. In another study, Yang and Wang (2015) demonstrated how explicit strategy training increased students' self-efficacy and strategy use. Bonyadi, Nikou, and Shahbaz, (2012) explored the relationship between Iranian students' self-efficacy and strategy use; however, the results showed no significant relationship between them. Nosratnia et al. (2014) also found out that metacognitive awareness is a better predictor for successful strategy use than self-efficacy beliefs.

Another group of studies have attempted to explore the correlation between students' self-efficacy and their anxiety level (Çubukçu, 2008; Ghonsooly & Elahi, 2010; Huerta et al., 2017; Kirmizi & Kirmizi, 2015; Martinez, Kock & Cass, 2011; Mills, Pajares & Herron, 2006; Torres & Turner, 2016; Woodrow, 2011). Significant negative correlation has been found between students' anxiety and their level of self-efficacy in Torres and Turner (2016). Some studies explored the relationship between anxiety and self-efficacy regarded with students' writing skills and they all reported that writing self-efficacy is a strong predictor for writing anxiety (Huerta et al., 2017; Kirmizi & Kirmizi, 2015; Martinez et al., 2011; Woodrow, 2011). Mills et al. (2006) conducted a similar research on students reading and listening skills which had similar results. Çubukçu (2008) revealed that there was no significant correlation between self-efficacy and anxiety; she argues that students' anxiety could be due to educational settings, not their self-efficacy. Overall majority of these studies have found out that self-efficacy has positive effects on individuals as they claim that those with high levels of self-efficacy could deal better with different tasks, unfamiliar contexts, and interpersonal relationships; students with high self-efficacy tend to endure more in difficulties and challenges. They argue that self-efficacy causes higher level of motivation, since it makes students conscious of their progress in a skill. Most of the studies support the strong positive relationships between self-efficacy and learning strategies and academic achievement among students, as suggested by Zimmerman and Cleary (2006). Students with high self-efficacy are more active in the learning process, in other words, they try harder, persist longer, and have fewer negative emotional reactions in facing difficulties. Finally, it can be claimed that students with higher self-efficacy have more control over their cognitive processes in general.

Self-efficacy and Listening Comprehension

Listening skills are considered to be crucial for success in language learning. According to Dunkel (1986), the main path to reach proficient speaking is through listening mastery. Rubin (1994) lists a few factors contributing to listening comprehension one of which is the listener's emotions that the listener undergoes in the learning context. In a recent inquiry, Graham (2006) studied a group of intermediate learners of French in England and conducted a questionnaire to find out which language skill they had been more successful. The results revealed that very few students had seen listening as a fulfilled skill; following the interviews from the same group, it is noted that there were statements of demotivation regarding listening (Graham, 2006). Such findings have led a group of scholars to study the effect of self-efficacy and anxiety on learners' performance of listening comprehension. For example, Chen (2007) compared scores of listening self-efficacy of Taiwanese students with their L2 listening anxiety and found out that second language listening self-efficacy could predict the listening scores better than second language listening anxiety. Mills et al. (2006) found out that self-efficacy in listening was positively correlated with listening proficiency and negatively correlated with listening anxiety, accordingly, it can be expected that with higher level of self-efficacy, students will experience less anxiety.

Apart from lowering anxiety, Arnold (2000) believes that self-concept can affect overall listening comprehension, the change of which as MacIntyre and Gardner (1991) argue, can be challenging; however, it is worth it. Boosting self-efficacy and listening performance accordingly can be achieved through teaching listening strategies explicitly, which aims at boosting learners' sense of control and expectations of success (Chamot, 1987; Nunan, 1999; Yeldham, 2009). Researchers argue that low levels of self-efficacy regarding listening may be caused by the techniques used by teachers to teach listening in the classroom (Chambers, 2007; Field, 2008; Graham, 2006). They note that listening is considered as an activity to be 'delivered' while it should be considered as a skill that needs to be developed.

In most L2 teaching contexts, teachers emphasize more on quantity of practice than quality and they rely on repetition of the listening texts and never implement pedagogic principles (Graham & Santos, 2013). The importance of listening comprehension, learners' self-perception and necessity of teaching strategies have been the focus of several studies. Graham (2011) notes that both self-efficacy and performance of listening can be improved by explicit teaching of listening strategies which can happen through increasing learners' sense of control and making them aware of the relationship between strategies used and the outcome achieved. Graham and Macaro (2008) showed that learners who received listening strategy instruction scored better on a listening test, and their self-efficacy for listening also had improved. The same result was reported by Goh and Taib (2006) who claim that strategy instruction and discussing strategy uses with students improved their listening strategy knowledge and their confidence. Strategies like verbalization or modelling by a teacher are also believed to improve self-efficacy among the learners; Schunk and Rice (1983) reported that modelling listening strategies leads to higher self-efficacy and better listening performance.

In addition to cognitive strategies, metacognitive strategies are also believed to increase L2 learners' performance (Flavell, 1979; Schoenfeld, 1987). Metacognitive knowledge is about the self-regulation of language learning such as planning, monitoring, and evaluating the learning process (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Wenden, 1998). Since listening is a receptive language skill that does not push learners to produce language, researchers believe that the use of metacognitive strategies in listening comprehension can activate learners' language knowledge while listening (Goh & Taib, 2006; Graham & Macaro, 2008; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010). It is believed that proficient listeners use more metacognitive strategies, which lead to better listening performances. Students need to know what they need to achieve, and which strategies can be the most effective.

Mastery of listening comprehension as well as having high self-efficacy play key roles in overall language proficiency. There is also a codependency between high achievements in listening comprehension tasks and learners' high self-efficacy. While Çubukçu (2008) claims that the reason for anxiety among Turkish students is not due to their low self-efficacy but the overall educational setting in Turkey, it is assumed that explicit strategy training, modelling, and guiding students in self-regulating themselves will improve learners' listening comprehension performance, which will result in higher self-efficacy and lower anxiety levels. Therefore, this study aims to find out if teaching strategies and improving metacognitive abilities will alleviate learners' anxiety along with increasing their listening comprehension and self-efficacy or not.

METHODS

Reseach Design

This study is a quasi-experimental design with non-equivalent pre-test and post-test control groups. In quasi-experimental research design, as opposed to the true experimental designs, the subjects in the experiment are assigned to groups in a non-random fashion (Creswell, 2012). Therefore, a quasi-experimental design was utilized in the present study as there were two experimental groups and one control group, the participants of which were not chosen randomly; all three groups took pre-test and post-test, the experimental groups received treatment whereas the control group did not.

Participants

For the purpose of the current study, convenience sampling was used. Ninety students from elementary and pre-intermediate levels of a language school located in Eskisehir, Turkey participated in the experiment. These levels were preferred because higher-level students might have already been familiar with some metacognitive strategies. Before the implementation, a placement test (Macmillian Straightforward Placement Test) was held to check the homogeneity of the learners. Participants were between the ages of 14 and 16 and the gender of the learners were almost similar in number: 43 males and 47 females. Thirty students from B1 level were assigned as the control group and the remaining 60 were placed in two experimental groups. All of the participants in the control group were in B1 level, and the experimental group participants were in two levels of A2 and B1 according to CEFR that were in different classes.

Trainers

Three trainers applied the treatment sessions in the study: the trainer of the B1 experimental group was a native speaker teacher from the USA. There were an Iranian teacher for the A2 experimental group, and a Turkish teacher for the B1 control group. The trainers of the experimental groups were already assigned to the related groups by the school administration, which means they were not selected by the researcher. Fortunately, the trainers of the experimental groups were also IELTS instructors, therefore, they were already familiar with the listening strategies they were going to teach. Before the pre-test, a meeting was held with the trainers, and the aim and approach of the study was explained to them. Before each treatment session, the listening tasks were given to them, and the trainers of the experimental groups were given a list of the related strategies they were going to teach to the groups. They taught metacognitive strategies such as planning, and self-monitoring along with listening cognitive strategies like guessing, note taking, inferencing, catching the gist of the text as well as listening for details. The trainers modeled all of these strategies before asking students to do them on their own.

Instruments

Three instruments were used to collect data for this study:
• English Listening Self-efficacy Questionnaire
• Preliminary English Test (PET)
• Key English Test (KET)
• British Council Listening Comprehension Tasks

English Listening Self-efficacy Questionnaire

Learners' listening self-efficacy beliefs were measured by the Turkish version of an English listening self-efficacy questionnaire (See Appendix), which was developed by Rahimi & Abedini (2009). This questionnaire measures learners' confidence and self-perception during listening comprehension tasks and in communicating with native speakers and teachers. The original questionnaire was adapted for Turkish students in Turkish by using back-translation method. The questionnaire was first translated to Turkish and the translated version was retranslated into English to find out the flaws. The last version, which was in Turkish, was then edited and confirmed by an expert in the field. In order to prevent any misinterpretation of the questions, the questionnaire was piloted on seven learners who were not part of the study. The final questionnaire consisted of 18 Likert-scale items and the participants needed to read and decide if they: (1) strongly disagree (2) disagree (3) have no idea (4) agree (5) strongly agree.

Preliminary English Test (PET)

PET is developed by Cambridge ESOL called the Cambridge Main Suite, which measures the participants' proficiency in B1 level and is designed to be used for teenagers. Considering the age and level of the participants of this study, PET was used to measure the participants' listening comprehension in B1 level. This test has three main sections: reading/writing, listening, and speaking. The listening part consists of four parts ranging from short exchanges to longer dialogues and monologues. It measures learners' understanding dialogues and monologues on daily topics. The listening section has 25 items and takes 35 minutes for the test takers to complete.

Key English Test (KET)

KET is developed by Cambridge ESOL called the Cambridge Main Suite, which measures the participants' proficiency in A2 level and is designed to be used for teenagers. Considering the age and level of the participants of this study, KET was used to measure the participants' listening comprehension in A2 level. KET was used to measure the participants' listening comprehension in A2 level. KET has three main sections of reading/writing, listening, and speaking. The listening part consists of five parts ranging from short exchanges to longer dialogues and monologues. The listening section has 25 items and takes 30 minutes.

Listening Activities from British Council Website

Teachers who participated in this study used listening activities from British Council Website for the treatment sessions to teach and model metacognitive strategies used during listening activities. This website was chosen since the activities were designed for PET and KET exams, which could prepare the participants for the post-test exam.

Procedure

At the onset of the study, a placement test was held to confirm the homogeneity of the participants in both control and experimental groups. Later, the questionnaire of listening self-efficacy was given to the participants, which took 10-15 minutes. Having finished the survey, the listening comprehension tests were given to the participants. The participants in the control group and B1 learners of the experimental groups took PET and the rest of the experimental group took KET. Both of the listening tests had 25 questions, which took 35 minutes to complete. During the following weeks, the participants in the experimental group were trained for one month, by giving them listening activities, which were taken from British Council website. The activities were given in every session and the trainers were informed about how to train the learners. During the training sessions, the metacognitive strategies were taught in the classes. Some other strategies such as listening for gist and the details were also practiced. They were also given hints on how to answer different types of listening questions (e.g. true-false, fill-in-the-blanks, multiple choices). Other strategies were also used by the trainers to increase participants' self-efficacy. The strategies used for this purpose were adapted from Dörnyei (1994): giving affiliative motives, modelling the task first, and giving motivational feedback. Meanwhile, the control group was only receiving the activities and there were no instructions and no feedback given. To find out the efficacy of the treatments, after one month, the participants of both control and experimental groups were given a post-test. For the post-implementation session, students responded to the same questionnaire and took the listening test used for the pre-test.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data analyses were used to answer the three research questions posed for the purpose of the present experiment. To answer the first researh question, the learners' pre-test and post-test scores from PET and KET were compared via the paired samples t-tests. To answer the second research question, similar to research question 1, paired samples t-test analysis was used. To learn if there was any correlation between learners' post-test listening proficiency and listening self-efficacy scores of each group, as an answer to the third research question, Pearson's correlation analysis was calculated.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

To have an overview of each group's performance on pre- and post-tests, the mean scores are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Pre and Post-training Scores of the Control Group and Experimental Groups in Listening Proficiency Test and Self-efficacy Questionnaire

| | Listening Proficiency Test | | | | | | Self-efficacy Questionnaire | | | | | |
| | Pretest | | | Posttest | | | Pretest | | | Posttest | | |
	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD
Control Group	30	11	3	30	12	4	30	2.99	.78	30	3.31	.51
A2	30	17	3	30	20	2	30	3.26	.50	30	3.28	.50
B1	30	17	3	30	21	2	30	3.61	.34	30	3.58	.32

Table 1 demonstrates the number of the participants, minimum and maximum scores, mean scores, and standard deviations of the control group and the experimental groups of A2 and B1, both before and after the training period. Considering the control group, we can notice a slight improvement in their listening comprehension scores; there is also a noticeable amount of improvement in their self-efficacy scores. In the experimental groups, the participants of A2 level are seen to have improved their listening comprehension scores and their self-efficacy as well; however, their self-efficacy improvement is not considerable. The participants of the experimental B1 group seems to have a noticeable rise in their listening comprehension scores while their self-efficacy scores have slightly declined.

Strategy training and listening proficiency scores (RQ1)
The first research question was to find out if teaching Turkish EFL learners metacognitive and listening strategies improves their listening proficiency in a significant way. As Table 1 shows, the mean scores of the experimental and control groups all improved in the post-training listening proficiency test. Paired Sample t-tests were also conducted to find out whether these improvements were significant. As Table 2 shows, there is no significant difference between the pre and post-test of control group (t (29)= -1.992, p=.056). As the analysis indicated, the control group had no progress during the one-month time span.

Table 2. Paired Sample T-test Results of Listening Comprehension Pre-test and Post-test for Experimental and Control Groups

| | Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
| | | | | 95% Confidence interval of the Difference | | | | |
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std.Error Mean	Lower	Upper	t	df	Sig.(2-tailed)
Control Group pre and post-training self-efficacy	-1.267	3.483	.636	-2.567	.034	-1.992	29	.056
A2 pre and post-training listening scores	-3.067	2.449	.447	-3.981	-2.152	-6.860	29	.000
B1 pre and post-training listening scores	-3.967	2.512	.459	-4.905	-3.029	-8.650	29	.000

However, results show that there is a significant difference between pre- (M=17.30, SD= 3.109) and post-test (M=20.37, SD= 2.297) scores of A2 level experimental group (t (29) = -6.860, p< .001). There is also a significant difference between listening pre- (M= 17.30, SD=3.271) and post-test (M=21.27, SD= 2.212) of B1 level experimental group (t (29) = - 8.650, p<001). This means that teaching listening strategies helped Turkish EFL learners to make a significant progress in their listening proficiency tests. This finding confirms the statement that teaching cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies explicitly can improve the learners' listening comprehension performance (Flavell, 1979; Goh & Taib, 2006; Graham & Macaro, 2008; Graham, 2011; Macaro,

2008; Schoenfled, 1987; Schunk & Rice, 1983). It can also be understood that listening comprehension needs explicit training and development, and learners need to know that they can control their performance by implementing appropriate strategies (Graham, 2011). Among the various strategies used was modelling of the instructor, which can be notified as an effective way to guide students (Goh & Taib, 2006; Schunk & Rice, 1983). Metacognitive strategies, which were also included in the training sessions, had noticeable roles played in the post-tense results since their engage learners during the listening tasks and help them to process the task deeper (Goh & Taib, 2006; Graham & Macaro, 2008; Vandergrift & Tafaghodtari, 2010).

Strategy training and self-efficacy (RQ2)

The second research question was about finding out if teaching listening strategies to Turkish EFL learners improved their listening self-efficacy in a significant way. Considering the pre- and post-training mean scores of the three groups, a slight improvement was noticed (Table 3).

Table 3. Paired Samples T-test Table of Listening Self-efficacy Questionnaire Scores of Pre-training and Post-training for Experimental and Control Groups

		Paired Differences							
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std.Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Control Group pre and post-training self-efficacy	-.32281	.89327	.16309	-.65636	.01074	-1.979	29	.057
Pair 2	A2 pre and post-training self-efficacy	-.02807	.45249	.08261	-.19703	.14089	-.340	29	.736
Pair 3	B1 pre and post-training self-efficacy	.02982	.43018	.07854	-.13081	.19046	.380	29	.707

To find out if the self-efficacy improvements were significant or not, paired samples t-tests were conducted for the groups. As Table 3 shows, there is no significant difference between the pre and post-training scores of control group (t (29) = -1.979, p= .057). Considering the A2 level experimental group, there is no significant difference between their pre- and post-training scores either (t (29) = -.340, p=.736). The same result can be seen for the B1 level group, and there is no significant difference between their pre- and post-training scores (t (29) = .389, p=.707). These results reveal that teaching listening strategies had no effect on experimental groups' listening self-efficacy. According to Chambers (2007), Field (2008), and Graham (2006), teaching listening strategies can increase the learners' control over the listening tasks, which leads to higher self-efficacy in them. This claim has been approved by Graham (2011), Graham and Macaro (2008), Macaro (2008), and Schunk and Rice (1983); however, the finding of this study contradicts with these findings. Turkish EFL learners had no significant improvement over their self-efficacy scores. According to Bandura (1995), one of the most important sources of self-efficacy is mastery, or in other words, the amount of successful experiences that learners have had during their educational period. It can be inferred that learners need more success to be able to have higher self-efficacy. Another source of self-efficacy according to Bandura (1995) is learners' physiological status, which includes their affective filters. Sparks and Ganschow (1991) claim that affective filters consist various emotions like stress, anxiety and lack of self-confidence. Similarly, Çubukcu (2008) has recently reported general anxiety among Turkish learners, which she relates to the educational system of Turkey. It can be inferred that anxiety affects learners' overall self-efficacy beliefs.

Listening proficiency scores and self-efficacy (RQ3)

The third research question was to find out if there was any significant correlation between listening proficiency scores and listening self-efficacy scores. Table 4 presents the results of the correlation analysis.

Table 4. Correlation between Groups' Post-training Listening Proficiency Scores and Their Post-training Listening Self-efficacy Scores

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Control Group Listening Post-test and Post-training self-efficacy	30	.588	.001
A2 Listening Post-test and Post-training self-efficacy	30	.085	.654
B1 Listening Post-test and Post-training self-efficacy	30	-.041	.831

Table 4 indicates that there is no statistical correlation between A2 level group's listening proficiency post-test and their post-training listening self-efficacy scores (r=.085); the same result can be seen for the B1 group (r= -.041). Considering the control group, though, we can see a significant moderate positive relationship between their listening proficiency post-test and their post-training listening self-efficacy scores (r= .588, p<05). This finding contradicts with the studies reporting a significant positive relationship between self-efficacy and language performance (Gahunga, 2009; Magogwe, & Oliver, 2007; Mahyuddin, et al. 2006; Mills, et al., 2007; Raoofi, Tan, & Chan, 2012; Woodrow, 2011). Nevertheless, it is in parallel with Anyadubalu (2010) and Bonyadi et al. (2012) who had found no significant correlation between performance and self-efficacy. Anyadubalu (2010), found out that the learners who had lower self-efficacy did not necessarily have a poor performance in learning English; however self-efficacy was negatively correlated with anxiety. In other words, self-efficacy does not affect language performance on its own; but higher self-efficacy can lower the anxiety, which leads to a better performance.

CONCLUSION

This study attempted to find out if explicit teaching of listening strategies would increase learners' listening comprehesion scores. The results revealed that the experimental groups had a significant improvement in their scores. This implies that the outcome of the listening comprehension tasks would be noticeably better if teachers train their learners explicitly in what strategies can be more efficient for a particular task and how to implement those strategies. Learners should also be able to monitor their actions and evaluate themselves to find out whether they are on the right path or not. As students might be confused at the onset of the lessons and considering the fact that metacognitive strategies might be intangible for the learners, teachers' modelling the strategies can be essential during the training sessions. Teachers also need to observe their learners carefully to provide efficient feedback to them while they are implementing the strategies. To sum up, language teachers need to raise their students' consciousness on the nature of the listening skills and the needed strategies to perform the tasks. They should model those strategies, introduce and practice new strategies frequently, and remind students to plan and set goals and conduct self-evaluation (Rubin, Chamot, Harris, & Anderson, 2007). Another finding of the study was that explicit teaching of strategies had no significant effect on learners' self-efficacy, which led to the finding that there was no correlation between listening scores and self-efficacy scores of the experimental groups. Referring to Çubukçu (2008), general anxiety that is present in Tukish educational setting might lower learners' self-efficacy, which calls for further research on the elements that cause the anxiety and the ways that the system can be revised to lower it. The anxiety factor is one of the factors that this study should have considered and controlled. A limitation of the study was the duration of intervention sessions: the training period of the experimental groups took only one month, in a longer time span for training, the participants might increase their sense of mastery and accordingly their their self-efficacy scores.

REFERENCES

Al-Azzemy, A. F., & Al-Jamal, D. A. (2019). Evaluating cognitive, metacognitive and social listening comprehension teaching strategies in Kuwaiti classrooms. *Heliyon, 5*(2), e01264. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e01264

Anam, S., & Stracke, E. (2016). Language learning strategies of Indonesian primary school students: In relation to self-efficacy beliefs. *System, (60)*, 1-10. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2016.05.001

Anyadubalu, C. C. (2010). Self-efficacy, anxiety, and performance in the English language among middle-school students in English language program in Satri Si Suriyothai School, Bangkok.

International Journal of Human and Social Sciences, 5(3), 193-198. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.309.5940&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Arnold, J. (2000). Seeing through listening comprehension exam anxiety. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*, 777–786. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/3587791

Bandura, A. (1995). *Self-efficacy in Changing Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https:// https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511527692

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W. H.Freeman.

Bandura, A. (2012). On the functional properties of perceived self-efficacy revisited. *Journal of Management 38*(1), 9–44. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0149206311410606

Bidabadi, F. S., & 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. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1080439.pdf

Bonyadi, A., Nikou, F. R., & Shahbaz, S. (2012). The relationship between EFL learners' self-efficacy beliefs and their language learning strategy use. *English Language Teaching, 5*(8), 113-121. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1079780.pdf

Carrell, P. L, Gajdusek, L., and Wise, T. (1998). Metacognition and EFL/ESL reading. *Instructional Science. 26*(1), 87-112. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1023/A:1003092114195.pdf

Chambers, G. (2006). Developing listening skills in the modern foreign language. In N. Pachler, A. Redondo (Eds.), *A practical guide to teaching modern foreign languages in the secondary school (pp. 62-69)*. Routledge. Retrieved from http://golshanlc.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/A-Practical-Guide-to-Teaching-of-Modern-Foreign-Languages.pdf#page=63

Chamot, A. (1987). The Learning Strategies of ESL Students. In A. Wenden, & J. Rubin (Eds.), *Learner Strategy in Language Learning (pp. 71-83)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Chen, H. Y. (2007). Relationship between EFL Learners' Self-Efficacy Beliefs and English Performance. Unpublished PhD thesis, The Florida State University. Retrieved from http://purl.flvc.org/fsu/fd/FSU_migr_etd-3846

Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.

Çubukçu, F. (2008). A Study on the correlation between self efficacy and foreign language learning anxiety. *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, 4*(1), 148-158. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED502016.pdf

Dornyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. New Jersey: Mahwah.

Dunkel, P. A. (1986). Developing listening fluency in L2: Theoretical principles and pedagogical considerations. *The Modern Language Journal, 70*(2), 99-106. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/327314.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Af09f2b94b408424f88ddc4f08e05fd2a

Flavell, J. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive development inquiry. *American Psychologist, 34*(10), 906–911. Retrieved from https://psycnet.apa.org/doi/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906

Gahunga, O. (2009). Are self-efficacy, language learning strategies, and foreign language ability interrelated? *The Buckingham Journal of Language and Linguistics, 2*, 47-60. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.5750/bjll.v2i0.14

Ghonsooly, B., & Elahi, M. (2011). Learners' self-efficacy in reading and its relation to foreign language reading anxiety and reading achievement. *Journal of English Language Teaching and Learning, 53*(217), 45-67. Retrieved from https://www.sid.ir/FileServer/JE/1323201021703.pdf

Goh, C.C.M. & Taib, Y. (2006). Metacognitive instruction in listening for young learners. *ELT Journal, 60*, 222-232. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/ccl002

Graham, S. (2006). Listening comprehension: the learners' perspective. *System, 34*, 165–182.

Graham, S. (2007). Learner strategies and self-efficacy: Making the connection. *Language Learning Journal, 35*(1), 81-93. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/09571730701315832

Graham, S. (2011). Self-efficacy and academic listening. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 10*(2), 113-117. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/09658416.2011.652634

Graham, S., & Macaro, E. (2008). Strategy instruction in listening for lower-intermediate learners of French. *Language Learning (58)*, 747–783. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2008.00478.x

Graham, S., & Santos, D. (2013). Selective listening in L2 learners of French. *Language Awareness, 22*(1), 56-75.

Hasan, A.S. (2000). Learners' perceptions of listening comprehension problems. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 13*, 137–153. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/07908310008666595

Huerta, M., Goodson, P., Beigi, M., & Chlup, D. (2017). Graduate students as academic writers: writing anxiety, self-efficacy and emotional intelligence. *Higher Education Research & Development, 36*(4), 716-729. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/07294360.2016.1238881

Kim, D. H., Wang, C., Ahn, H. S., & Bong, M. (2015). English language learners' self-efficacy profiles and relationship with self-regulated learning strategies. *Learning and Individual Differences, 38*, 136-142. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2015.01.016

Kirmizi, Ö., & Kirmizi, G. D. (2015). An investigation of L2 learners' writing self-efficacy, writing anxiety and its causes at higher education in Turkey. *International Journal of Higher Education, 4*(2), 57-66. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1060569.pdf

Klingner, J.K., Vaughn, S., Boardman, A. (2015). *Teaching Reading Comprehension to Students with Learning Difficulties*. (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford Publications.

MacIntyre, P. D., & Gardner, R. C. (1991). Investigating language class anxiety using the focused essay technique. *The Modern Language Journal, 75*(3), 296-304. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/328723.pdf?refreqid=excelsior%3Ada280cd34fd5e32d1542abe58fc6c7c5

Mahyuddin, R., Elias, H., Cheong, L. S., Muhamad, M. F., Noordin, N., & Abdullah, M. C. (2006). The relationship between students' self efficacy and their English language achievement. *Malaysian Journal of Educators and Education, 21*, 61-71. Retrieved from http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.485.2420&rep=rep1&type=pdf

Magogwe, J.M. & Oliver, R. 2007. The relationship between language learning strategies, proficiency, age and self-efficacy beliefs: A study of language learners in Botswana. *System, 35*, 338–352. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2007.01.003

Martinez, C. T., Kock, N., & Cass, J. (2011). Pain and pleasure in short essay writing: Factors predicting university students' writing anxiety and writing self-efficacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy, 54*(5), 351-360. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1598/JAAL.54.5.5

Mills, N., Pajares, F. & Herron, C. (2006). A reevaluation of the role of anxiety: self-efficacy, anxiety, and their relation to reading and listening proficiency. *Foreign Language Annals, 39*, 276-295. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1944-9720.2006.tb02266.x

Mills, N., Pajares, F., & Herron, C. (2007). Self-efficacy of college intermediate French students: Relation to achievement and motivation. *Language Learning, 57*(3), 417-442. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2007.00421.x

Nosratinia, M., Saveiy, M., & Zaker, A. (2014). EFL learners' self-efficacy, metacognitive awareness, and use of language learning strategies: How are they associated. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 4*(5), 1080-1092. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/download/47373588/EFL_Learners_Self efficacy_Metacognitiv20160720-10430-i8kyqk.pdf

Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

O'Malley, J. M. and Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning Strategies in Second Language Acquisition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.tr

Pajares, F. (2002). *Self-efficacy beliefs in academic contexts: An outline.* Retrieved from http://www.uky.edu/~eushe2/Pajares/efftalk.html

Rahimi, A., & Abedini, A. (2009). The interface between EFL learners'self-efficacy concerning listening comprehension and listening proficiency. *Novitas-Royal, 3*(1), 14-28.

Raoofi, S., Tan, B. H., & Chan, S. H. (2012). Self-efficacy in second/foreign language learning Contexts. *English Language Teaching, 5*(11), 60-73. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1080058.pdf

Riding, R., Rayner, S., 2013. *Cognitive Styles and Learning Strategies: Understanding Style Differences in Learning and Behavior.* Routledge. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.tr/books

Rubin, J. (1994). A review of second language listening comprehension research. *The Modern Language Journal, 78*(2), 199-221. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/329010

Rubin, J., Chamot, A. U., Harris, V., & Anderson, N. J. (2007). Intervening in the use of strategies. *Language Learner Strategies, 30*, 29-45. Retrieved from

https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Vee_Harris/publication/27225122_Intervening_in_the_
Use_of_Strategies/links/0a85e5352dff5b429f000000/Intervening-in-the-Use-of-Strategies.pdf

Schoenfeld, A. H. (1987). What's all the fuss about metacognition. *Cognitive science and mathematics Education*, 189-215. Retrieved from https://books.google.com.tr/books.

Schunk, D. H., & Rice, J. M. (1983). Strategy Verbalization Effects on Self-Efficacy and Listening Comprehension. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED233816.pdf

Schunk, D. H. (1987). Peer models and children's behavioral change. *Review of Educational Research, 57*, 149-174. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.3102%2F00346543057002149

Schunk, D. H. (1991). 'Self-efficacy and academic motivation'. *Educational Psychologist 26*(3-4): 207–31. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.1991.9653133

Sparks, R. L., & Ganschow, L. (1991). Foreign language learning differences: Affective or native language aptitude differences? *The Modern Language Journal, 75*(1), 3-16.

Torres, K. M., & Turner, J. E. (2016). Students' foreign language anxiety and self-efficacy beliefs across different levels of university foreign language coursework. *Journal of Spanish Language Teaching, 3*(1), 57-73. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/23247797.2016.1163101

Wenden, A. L. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 19*(4), 515-537. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/19.4.515

Wong, M. S. L. (2005). Language learning strategies and language self-efficacy: Investigating the relationship in Malaysia. *RELC Journal, 36*(3), 245-269. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0033688205060050

Woodrow, L. 2011. College English writing affect: Self efficacy and anxiety. *System, 39*, 510- 522. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2011.10.017

Yang, N. D. (1992). *Second language learners' beliefs about language learning and their use of learning strategies: A study of college students of English in Taiwan.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, ation, University of Texas at Austin. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.26153/tsw/2033

Yang, N.D. 1999. The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System, 27*, 515-535. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/S0346-251X(99)00048-2

Yang, P. L., & Wang, A. L. (2015). Investigation the relationship among language learning strategies, English self-efficacy, and explicit strategy instructions. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL, 12*(1), 35-62. Retrieved from http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1078937.pdf

Yeldham, M. A. (2009). *Approaches to second language listening instruction: Investigating the'top-down/bottom-up debate.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Melbourne, Australia.

Zimmerman, B. J., & Cleary, T. J. (2006). Adolescents' development of personal agency: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and self-regulatory skill. In F. Pajares, T. Urdan (Eds.), *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 45–69). Greenwich, CT: Information Age. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2006.05.002

APPENDIX

A Questionnaire on EFL Learners' Self-efficacy about Listening Skill

Name: Age:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1) I have a special ability for improving listening skill.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2) In a listening practice, although I understand almost every word, the big problem is that I do not have the ability to keep all of them in my mind.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3) I have the ability to concentrate on the content to which I listen.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4) I believe that my proficiency in listening skill will mprove very soon.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5) I am sure that if I practice listening more, I will get better grades in the course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6) I can understand the tape in listening classes better than other students.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7) I cannot understand an English film without English subtitles.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8) No one cares if I do well in listening course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9) My classmates usually get better grades than I do.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10) Even if the listening practice in the class is difficult and I cannot understand it completely, I can find a strategy to answer most of the related questions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11) I am very stressful during the listening class.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12) I enjoy doing listening practice, when the speaker speaks fast.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Strongly Agree	Agree	No idea	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13) I enjoy doing listening practice with a proficient partner.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14) I am one of the best students in listening course.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15) When I am doing a listening practice with a tape at home, it is not important that how difficult it is because I repeat it so much that I can understand it.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16) I enjoy meeting tourists because I can understand them well.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17) The more difficult the listening practice it is, the more challenging and enjoyable it is.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18) In the listening class, when the teacher asks a question I raise my hand to answer it even if I am not sure about it.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐