

Examining the Effect of Listening Strategy Instruction on EFL Iraqi learners' Listening Anxiety

Shiva Kaivanpanah

Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures
University of Tehran Tehran, Iran

Sayyed Mohammad Alavi

Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures
University of Tehran Tehran, Iran

Hussein AL-Shammari

Department of English, Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures
University of Tehran Tehran, Iran

Abstract

The present study examined the effect of process-based listening strategy instruction on decreasing the learners' listening anxiety level, and the relationship between listening anxiety (LA) and listening comprehension (LC). The participants consisted of sixty sophomore Iraqi learners who were studying English as a Foreign Language (EFL) at the Department of English at the University of Kufa, Iraq. They were divided into experimental (n=30) and control(n=30) groups. The experimental group received explicit, and integrated listening strategies instruction based on Siegel's model of process-based listening strategy instruction (2015). The control group received the conventional teaching of listening without receiving any training in strategy process-based instruction over a semester (ten weeks). A modified version of the Foreign Language listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS) developed by Elkhafaifi (2005) was taken by the participants once before and once after the intervention to measure their LA. The listening section of the Preliminary English Test (PET) used to measure the learners' LC before and after the intervention. Findings showed that listening strategy instruction could decrease learners' LA. Furthermore, a negative relationship found between LA and LC. The paper concluded with some useful pedagogical implications, and suggestions for further research are discussed based on the findings for researchers, teachers, and educators within the constraints of the Iraqi context.

Keywords: Conventional teaching, EFL Iraqi learners, listening anxiety, listening comprehension, listening strategies, listening strategy instruction, process-based

Cite as: Kaivanpanah, S., Alavi, S. M.,& AL-Shammari, H. (2020). Examining the Effect of Listening Strategy Instruction on EFL Iraqi learners' Listening Anxiety. *Arab World English Journal: Special Issue on the English Language in Iraqi Context*. 62-75.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.24093/awej/elt2.4>

Introduction

Language acquisition happens when learners provide with comprehensible input. Input must be linguistically and cognitively appropriate to the learners' language proficiency level (Krashen, 1982; Vandergrift, 2003). For increasing the comprehensibility of the texts, direct and explicit instruction of the processes and strategies underlying the listening skill is beneficial (Vandergrift & Cross, 2018). Therefore, listening strategy instruction is of much importance as it increases learners' awareness of the strategies they can utilize to comprehend texts (Graham & Santos, 2015; Siegel, 2015).

With no optimal model to teach listening and no training course for teachers of language, listening is felt to be a difficult skill to teach and hard to learn by learners (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). Teachers have to make immediate decisions about their method of instruction of listening and modify it from one context to another (Graham & Santos, 2015). This view is supported by Siegel (2015), who notes that "This lack of understanding and attention likely applies to learners and teachers alike." (p. 236).

There have been few research studies in the literature of language learning strategies to date that have explored the effect of listening strategy instruction on LA (Zhang, 2013). The present study aims to fulfill this gap by considering the impact of a listening strategy instruction course on Iraqi learners' LA. Although few research studies examining the relationship between Listening Comprehension (LC) and LA in different learning contexts (Chow et al., 2017; Golchi, 2012), no study has examined this relationship in the Iraqi context. Therefore, more studies are needed to address the relationship between LA and LC. Thus, the present study addresses how process-based listening strategy instruction can decrease the LA level of Iraqi EFL sophomore at low-intermediate level English major learners. It also examines the relationship between LA and LC. Examining this relationship could provide language teachers with insights into what learners are doing when performing a listening task. Also, the results of the present study will add to the growing body of research on listening strategy instruction, particularly in the Iraqi context.

Listening Strategies Framework

Listening is an active skill in which a listener is actively engaged in the construction of meaning. Listening is vital since it is one of the primary sources of second language input for learners. Based on the premise that comprehensible input acts as a facilitator in the language acquisition (Krashen, 1985), listening instruction has become an essential component of language teaching methods such as Communicative Language Teaching and Strategy-based Approach (Graham & Santos, 2015). There are two pedagogical approaches to teaching listening: listening to learn (product-based pedagogy) and learning to listen (process-based pedagogy). In *listening to learn* pedagogy, learners listen to the listening text multiple times. Then they are asked to answer the follow-up (or during) questions to enable teachers to know how well learners have comprehended the oral text. This type of teaching focuses on testing learners' LC ability; its advocates argue that listening is a passive skill and consider it easy to pick-up due to similarities it shares with learners' native language (Flowerdew & Miller, 2010). The second approach, *learning to listen*, aims to help listeners obtain awareness of the strategies and processes involved in comprehending the oral texts. Teaching listening as a process rather than a product helps Foreign Language (FL) listeners regulate their learning and therefore increases their awareness of the strategies needed for

comprehension (Graham & Santos, 2015). Focusing on listening as a process rather than a product also reduces learners' anxiety because they can use different strategies to compensate for the gaps in their comprehension (Vandergrift & Cross, 2018).

A shift from a product-based approach to a process-based approach necessitates explicit or implicit instruction of listening strategies. Researchers (e.g., Rubin, 1975; Stern, 1975) argue that good language learners use a more extensive, more comprehensive, more full range of Language Learning Strategies (LLS) compared to the less successful learners. It suggests the possibility of utilizing these strategies to raise learners' awareness of their thinking and learning process. Stern (1975) listed ten LLS, which describe the characteristics of good language learners. Descriptive and correlational inquiry of strategies and factors affecting the choice of strategies (e.g., age, gender, learning style, personality trait, motivation, learning context, and language proficiency) form the foundation of the theoretical background of LLS.

Different classifications of LLS proposed by Rubin (1975, 1981), O'Malley and Chamot (1990), Oxford (1990) and Vandergrift (1997) reflect the disagreement among researchers on the definition and classification of strategies. This disagreement is echoed by Stern (1992) when he refers to "a certain arbitrariness in the classification of learning strategies" (p. 264). Oxford (1990) also argues that "there is no complete agreement on exactly what strategies are, how many strategies exist, how they should be defined, demarcated and categorized" (p. 17). Models of LLS also differ due to the nature of research in terms of the following three aspects. First, the design of the strategy instruction can be either explicit or implicit (Chamot, 2004). In explicit instruction called 'strategy-based instruction' (Cohen & Weaver, 2006), the teacher informs the students about the aims of teaching strategies. The teacher presents the strategy in groups and models them so that the students become aware of their thinking and learning process. In implicit instruction, which is called 'Self-regulated strategy instruction' by Oxford (1990), the teacher embeds strategies in lesson activities without explaining them (Chamot, 2004).

Second, they differ regarding the language of instruction. Whether the guidance should conduct in learners' first language (L1) or an FL is a matter of controversy (Graham & Santos, 2015). Since the aim is to discuss the strategies and evaluate them, learners may use their first language. The low proficiency level and commonality of L1 use among learners are two reasons for learners' L1 in listening strategy instruction.

The third difference concerns whether instruction should be integrated into the listening activities or offered separately (Graham & Santos, 2015). Incorporating strategies into the lesson plan of listening course is more beneficial because it can help learners raise their metacognitive awareness about the procedures, directly evaluate the strategies used in activities, and eventually facilitate LC (Rubin et al., 2007). If listening instruction is not being part of teaching, listening activities will primarily use for providing vocabulary or background knowledge for subsequent tasks such as writing or speaking (Vandergrift & Goh, 2012). In this case, listening activities use to serve other skills rather than themselves. Therefore, integrated instruction is a more preferable to help the listening lesson than offered separately in programs to teach strategies. Strategies explained within the lesson plan of the existing textbook can make students more aware of the strategies and could be transferred to similar tasks or situations (Siegel, 2015).

Theoretical Perspective of Listening Anxiety

Psychologically, anxiety is as a personal feeling of unease or fear towards certain situations (MacIntyre & Gregersen, 2012), which may impede or interfere negatively with learners' input, processes, or performance in academic circumstances (Krashen, 1982). FL learners have reported many sources of comprehension anxiety problems such as listening input that can hinder comprehension (Vogely, 1998). Most of the LA problems stem from the characteristics of oral input data. Horwitz, Horwitz, and Cope (1986) defined anxiety as "the subjective feeling of tension, apprehension, nervousness, and worry associated with an arousal of the automatic nervous system" (p. 125). They developed the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS) to identify learners with debilitating anxiety in the FL classroom. The scale consists of 33 items that reflect communicative apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation in the FL classroom (Horwitz et al., 1986). Drawing on these three conceptual anxiety dimensions, Horwitz et al. (1986) defined FL anxiety as a "distinct complex of self-perceptions, beliefs, feelings, and behaviors related to classroom language learning arising from the uniqueness of the language learning process" (p. 128).

More definite shreds of evidence of language skill-specific anxiety reported concerning LC. Vogely (1998) identified the sources of LC anxiety and the solutions for them in a university-level Spanish course. She stated that LC anxiety could influence speech production directly since anxious listeners find it difficult to comprehend what said in the FL. The sources of LC anxiety put into four general categories, namely: a) characteristics of the LC input, processing-related factors to aspects of FL, b) anxiety associated with FL instructional factors, c) FL anxiety associated with learners, and d) teachers' characteristics. Vogely asserted that 81% of LC anxiety sources are related to two factors. The first factor is the nature of language input (i.e., lack of clarity, lack of visual supports, and repetition of input data). The second factor is the processes associated with LC (e.g., inappropriate use of strategies, lack of time to process, lack of rules to study LC., and the lack of ability to check answers).

The first study differentiated general FL learning anxiety from FLLA, and examined the effect of general FL learning anxiety on learners' achievement in Arabic course and their LC conducted by Elkhafaifi (2005). The participants were (n=233) Arabic learners from 10 US universities who completed an adapted version of (FLCAS) and *Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale* (FLCAS) adopted from the Foreign Language Reading Anxiety Scale (FLRAS) developed by Saito, Garza, Horwitz. (1999). The results found that FL learning anxiety and LA were separate, but related measures; both correlated negatively with learners' achievements. Learners with higher LA or classroom anxiety levels had lower LC levels (Elkhafaifi, 2005). In a similar study, the relationship between self-efficacy and anxiety and their relation to reading and listening proficiency investigated by Mills, Pajares, and Herron (2006). They used a modified version of Betz's (1978) Mathematics Anxiety Scale (MAS) to measure reading and LA. The participants were (n= 95) learners enrolled in third and fourth semesters French courses. Significant gender differences reported about self-efficacy and LA. The results showed that there was a negative relationship between listening self-efficacy and LA. Similarly, a negative correlation between LA and listening proficiency reported by the researcher.

In another study, Bekleyen (2009) aimed at finding out the relationship between the FL Classroom Anxiety Scale (FLCAS), Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS), and listening achievement levels. The Participants are 71 first-year students majoring in English language teaching at a University in Turkey who took Kim's FLCAS and FLLAS. The results indicated that FLCAS had a moderate positive correlation with FLLAS, suggesting that participants with higher levels of FL classroom anxiety tended to have a higher level of FLLAS. A negative correlation appeared between FLLAS and FLCAS with the participants' listening achievement, suggesting that participants with high LA or language classroom anxiety levels tentatively attained lower final grades in the listening course.

In a longitudinal study, Zhang (2013) investigated the causal relationship between LA level and listening performance. In this study, Elkhafaifi's (2005) FLLAS divided into the following three dimensions using principal component analysis: LA, self-belief of listening skill, and listening skill. Next, structural equation modeling (SEM) used to measure a possible relationship between LA and listening performance. The participants were 300 freshmen English learners in China. First, they complete an online survey of the FLLAS, and then they were asked to complete the IELTS listening test twice during the study. The results indicated that FLLA was a situation-specific and differed from FL classroom anxiety. He also provided a piece of statistical evidence that FL anxiety could be a cause of poor performance. He states that IELTS scores cannot have a systematic effect on the FLLA.

To measure the relationship between the Second Language (L2) LA and a range of tasks, listener characteristics (such as working memory), and LA, many of university graduates and postgraduates (n=93) in the United Kingdom participated in Brunfaut and Revesz's study (2015). An adapted version of Elkhafaifi's (2005) FLLAS was used to measure their LA. The findings suggested that LA levels correlate negatively with listening performance.

In a more recent study by Chow, Chiu, and Wong (2017), the relationships between EFL learning motivation, EFL language strategies, and EFL performance with FL reading and LA examined. The participants were (n=306) Chinese undergraduate students, and their LA level is measured using Elkhafaifi's FLLAS (2005). Highly anxious students exhibit lower levels of listening and reading performance. Language performance indirectly affected their reading and LA through the mediation of EFL learning motivation.

Drawing on the literature review on LA, there is a general argument that LA correlates negatively with LC in different contexts. Besides, the effect of listening strategy instruction on reducing LA is not adequately address in various settings. There have been very few studies in the literature of language learning strategies to date that have explored the effect of listening strategy instruction on reducing LA. Thus, the present study aims to examine the impact of a listening strategy instruction course on Iraqi learners' LA and explore the relationship between LC and LA in different learning contexts (Golchi, 2012). Therefore, the present study addresses the following questions:

- 1) Does a listening strategy instruction have a significant effect on decreasing learners' listening anxiety?
- 2) Is there any relationship between the learners' listening anxiety and their listening comprehension?

Method

Participants

The participants of this study consisted of (n=60) sophomore Iraqi EFL learners, between the ages of 19 and 20, studying English in the College of Education at the University of Kufa, Iraq. They were all native speakers of Arabic and had learned English at previous primary and secondary schools for nine years with the same English experiences. All of them had passed a compulsory course for one year in listening and speaking in their Freshman Year. Their English proficiency levels assessed through the Preliminary English Test (PET). Their listening proficiency level appeared to extend from Basic User (Level A2) to Low-intermediate level (Level B1) in accord with the Common European Framework of References levels (CEFR) (Cambridge English, 2019).

Instruments

Two instruments used to measure learners' LC and LA before and after the strategy instruction. The first instrument was the listening section of the PET to measure the listening proficiency level of both groups at pre-test, and post-test phases. Preliminary English Test listening part selected from Cambridge Preliminary English Test (Cambridge Preliminary, 2008) used during the pilot, pre-test, and post-test phases. The test consisted of four parts and 25 questions. Each item carried one mark. Before Listening to tracks, participants provided with an illustrative example. Then, they listened to seven short neutral or informal monologues or dialogues accompanied by illustrative pictures. This part had three-option multiple-choice items for each section. In the second part, there were six long monologues followed by six three-option multiple-choice questions. In the third part, learners listened to a long monologue and filled the six gaps with one or two words from the track. In part four, learners selected the right answers for six items by deciding if the statement is correct or incorrect. Learners asked to circle the correct answers on the answer sheet and write two or three words from the track. Learners listened to each part twice and completed the test in about 35 minutes.

The second instrument used for examining the LA level of the participants was a modified version of the Foreign Language listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS), developed by Elkhafai (2005). It was administered to the participants to measure their degree of LA before and after the intervention. This questionnaire administered immediately after the completion of the listening test. It consisted of 20 items on a Likert Scale ranging from (1) strongly disagree to (5) strongly agree. Learners' scores on the scale could vary between 20 (the lowest degree of LA) to 100 (the highest degree of LA). Three items (12, 13, and 18) were reverse scoring. This questionnaire displayed high internal consistency in previous research studies (Brunfaut & Revesz, 2015; Chow, Chiu & Wong, 2017; Elkhafai, 2005; Zhang, 2013). Cronbach's alpha reliability of the FLLAS in the present study was equal to (0.80).

Procedures

Before the beginning of the listening strategy instruction course, the Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS) and the Preliminary English Test (PET) piloted with (60) sophomore volunteers who were similar to the participants of the main study in terms of proficiency and language learning experience. The results of the pilot study indicated that their language proficiency level was low-intermediate according to the CEFR levels; therefore, the PET listening part was considered suitable for measuring their listening proficiency. A modified FLLAS was

developed based on the feedback of the learners concerning the difficulty of word meanings; difficult words were replaced by more accessible synonyms to facilitate their comprehension of the questionnaire (Appendix 1).

The listening part of the PET used to homogenize learners in terms of LC. Learners were randomly assigned to two groups (Group A and Group B) by the Department administration. Group A received explicit instruction in listening strategies (henceforth called the experimental group), and Group B received the conventional education on listening without any explicit teaching of strategies (henceforth called the control group). Both groups were taught by the researcher to ensure the control of the contribution of the teacher variable.

Intervention course lasted for ten sessions, held once a week for about an hour. The experimental group explicitly taught cognitive and metacognitive listening strategies. The listening strategies taught were *planning, monitoring, focussing attention, evaluation, prediction, interference, elaboration, listening for gist, listening for details, phoneme discrimination, and word segmentation*. These strategies taught in an orchestrated manner and elicited from the listening texts of the coursebook '*Real Listening and Speaking 3*' by Graven (2008). This book was used as a coursebook to teach LC and to introduce and practice listening strategies. Strategies trained according to the following plan:

1. The teacher introduced the topic, and the type of listening text with words expected to hear during the lesson. Learners asked to view the pictures in their books before listening. The teacher reviewed the strategies from previous lessons before introducing the new ones. Reviewing strategies helped in raising the learners' awareness of their past experiences about similar topics, making them focus on specific information while listening, and activating their schemata before listening.
2. The teacher sample performed a think-aloud for the learners; he explained his thinking processes before approaching a listening text and during listening. He first focused on top-down strategies used and then introduced bottom-up strategies. The teacher modeled the cognitive processes by playing the audio text in short pieces. This process would set a model for students to emulate by describing how they could prepare for the processing of the input and monitoring of their processing progress. Also, it could draw learners' attention to how phonemes' segmentations, the parsing of the words, and the intonation of the sentences.
3. Strategies explicitly named and reviewed with useful examples taken from the text and then combined with other strategies to be recycled in new listening texts and with different tasks. The recycling helped learners to transfer the strategies covered during the course to new listening events, encouraging strategy retention for future use, and promoting strategies coordination. Recycling of strategies accomplished by providing the learners with a different text from the same genre in which they could recycle the strategies (Siegel, 2015).
4. Learners asked to apply the same strategies while listening to another text with the same topic; this provided an opportunity for them to practice strategies they had just learned. Before attending to listening, they told to note down their expectations of what they might be listening to and how

they could monitor their comprehension. After the first listening, they looked at a few questions and tried to think of possible answers before listening again to the same audio. Thinking of possible answers could enable them to focus on what was needed and set a plan to follow while listening.

5. Learners reflected on their learning and practice of the strategies. They asked to keep a diary to reflect on the successful and unsuccessful strategies use. the researcher gave Hand-outs of the taught strategies to them for review purposes.

6. Learners received short listening tasks as homework. They provided with a coursebook, *NorthStar3 Listening and Speaking* (Solórzano & Schmidt, 2009), to practice what they had learned in the class.

The control group received the standard conventional procedure for teaching listening texts, usually called Listen-Answer-Check (Vandergrift, 2004). Learners listened to many listening texts, followed with LC questions, and answered the comprehension questions. After that, the teacher shared the correct answer with the students. The same procedure repeated in different texts. No explicit strategy instruction, whether direct or indirect, delivered to this group.

Results and Discussion

First, the mean scores for both groups at the pre-test compared using Independent Samples t-test to ensure that participants were similar at the outset of the study. No statistically significant difference found between the groups at the pre-test phase, indicating that the two groups were at similar levels of LA. Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics for both groups at pre-test and post-test phases.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Listening Anxiety for the Pretest and Posttest (N = 60)

	Pretest		Posttest	
	M	SD	M	SD
Experimental Group	68.73	7.29	62.83	9.20
Control Group	68.26	6.79	68.20	7.86

To address the first question, regarding the effect of listening strategy instruction on decreasing learners' LA, the mean scores of the experimental and control group at pre-test and post-test compared. The descriptive statistics indicate that the LA of the learners in the experimental group decreased after the intervention, while no significant change perceived in the anxiety level of participants in the control group, suggesting that the conventional teaching of listening is not effective in reducing the LA. The results of the independent samples t-test for both groups in Table 2 indicate that while there was no significant difference between the LA of both groups in the pre-test ($t=.025$, $P=.79$), in the post-test the difference between the two groups was significant. This difference points to the effect of instruction.

Table 2

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

	T	Df	P
Pretest of FLLAS	0.25	58	0.79
Posttest of FLLAS	-2.42	58	<.01

Table 3 presents the results of the Paired Samples t-test for the experimental group before and after the intervention. A significant decrease in the anxiety level of learners in the experimental group after the strategy instruction implies that listening strategy instruction was effective in decreasing learners' LA levels.

Table 3

Paired Samples t-test for the Experimental Group

	Paired Differences			T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean			
Pre and Post-test	5.90	7.81	1.42	4.13	29	.000

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient used to examine the relationship between the learners' LA level and their LC in the experimental group. The results pointed to a negative correlation between the overall LA and LC ($r = -0.550$) suggesting that LA could negatively affect LC (Appendix 2).

The negative relationship between LA and LC in the present study can lend support to the findings of previous studies concerning negative correlation between LC and LA (e.g., Elkhafafi, 2004; Mills, Pajares, & Herron, 2006; Bekleyen, 2009; Zhang, 2013; Brunfaut & Revesz, 2015, and Chow, Chiu & Wong, 2017). This negative relationship was a good indication that a decrease in anxiety level could increase learners' LC. Low LA among learners enables them to perform better on the PET Listening part.

Conclusions

This study investigated the effect of listening strategy instruction on the Iraqi EFL learners' LA level and examined the relationship between the learners' listening performance and LA level. Concerning the effect of listening strategy instruction on decreasing the learners' LA, the findings revealed that listening strategy instruction had a positive impact on reducing learners' FLLAS of the experimental group. This finding could expand the current understanding of the Iraqi listening instructors on how to measure and find solutions to the learners' LA.

The results indicated that there is a close connection between listening and anxiety in an FL, and the level of anxiety changes depending on different internal or/ and external factors such as language proficiency or emotional reaction to language learning. The teacher's role is to keep

learners' LA at a low to a moderate level to allow them to focus on the process of listening and increase their attention.

The results revealed a negative correlation between LC and LA, suggesting that learners with a higher level of LA tend to have lower levels of LC. Therefore, teachers should help learners feel more relaxed during listening; this relaxing-decreased setting achieved through different means, such as familiarizing them with listening strategies. The present study suggested that listening strategy instruction reduces the anxiety of Iraqi learners.

There are some limitations to the current study. First, in this study, learners were not assigned to the control or the experimental group randomly. The university policy would allow the researcher to teach and test LC only if the classes remained intact. Second, there was no delayed post-test to examine if the effects of listening strategy instruction could remain constant in decreasing LA. Finally, further studies can observe the impact of other listening strategy instruction models on LC and LA of learners at different levels of language proficiency.

About the Authors:

Shiva Kaivanpanah, Ph.D. is an Associate Professor at the University of Tehran. She has published numerous articles in the area of language teaching. Her current research interests include vocabulary studies, teacher education, and issues in teaching academic writing to English language learners. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5484-3869>.

Sayyed Mohammad Alavi, Ph.D is a Professor in applied linguistics from Lancaster University. He is currently a member of the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Literatures at the University of Tehran. His research interests include language assessment, language test development, and item analysis. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1740-3869>

Hussein AL-Shammari is a Ph.D. candidate of TEFL at the University of Tehran, Iran. He has taught several undergraduate courses as a lecturer in the Department of English, College of Education at the University of Kufa-Iraq for ten years. His main research interests are listening anxiety, listening comprehension, Learning Strategies and Teacher education. ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1740-2164>.

References

- Bekleyen, N. (2009). Helping teachers become better English students: Causes, effects, and coping strategies for foreign language listening anxiety. *System*, 37, 664-675.
- Brunfaut, T. & Revesz, A. (2015). The role of task and listener characteristics in second language listening. *TESOL Quarterly*, 49(1), 141-68.
- Cambridge English Language Assessment (2019). *The Cambridge English Scale explained. A guide to converting practice test scores to Cambridge English Scale scores*. Retrieved August 1, 2019, from <https://www.cambridgeenglish.org/Images/210434-converting-practice-test-scores-to-cambridge-english-scale-scores.pdf>.
- Cambridge Preliminary English Test 5 with Answers. (2008). *Examination Papers from University of Cambridge ESOL Examinations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chamot, A.U. (2004). Issues in Language Learning Strategy Research and Teaching. *Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching* 1(1), 14-26.

- Chow, B. W.-Y., Chiu, H. T., & Wong, S. W. L. (2017). Anxiety in reading and listening English as a foreign language in Chinese undergraduate students. *Language Teaching Research*, from <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362168817702159>.
- Cohen, A. D. & Weaver, S. J. (2006). *Styles and strategies-based instruction: A teachers' guide*. Minneapolis, MN: Center for Advanced Research on Language Acquisition, University of Minnesota.
- Golchi, M.M. (2012). Listening anxiety and its relationship with listening strategy use and listening comprehension among Iranian IELTS learners. *International Journal of English Linguistics*, 2, 115–128.
- Graven, M., (2008). *Real Listening & Speaking 3 with answers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Elkhafaifi, H. (2005). Listening Comprehension and Anxiety in the Arabic language classroom. *Modern Language Journal*, 89, 206-222.
- Graham, S., & Santos, D. (2015). *Strategies for second language listening: Current scenarios and improved pedagogy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Flowerdew, J. & Miller, L. (2010). Listening in a second language. In A.D. Wolvin (Ed.), *Listening and human communication in the 21st century* (pp. 158–177). West Sussex, UK: Blackwell.
- Horwitz, E. K., Horwitz, M., & Cope, J. (1986). Foreign language classroom anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 70, 125–132.
- Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. London, England: Longman.
- MacIntyre, P. D., & Gregersen, T. (2012). Affect: The role of language anxiety and other emotions in language learning. In S. Mercer, S. Ryan, & M. Williams (Eds.), *Psychology for language learning: Insights from research, theory & practice* (pp. 103–118). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mills, N.A., 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, 273–292.
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A. U. (1990). *Language learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle.
- Rubin, J. (1975). What the “Good Language Learner” Can Teach Us*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 9, 41–51.
- Rubin, J., Chamot, A. U., Harris, V., & Anderson, N. J. (2007). Intervening in the use of strategies. In A. D. Cohen & E. Macaro (Eds.), *Language learner strategies: 30 years of research and practice* (pp. 141–160). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Saito, Y., Garza, T., & Horwitz, E. (1999). Foreign language reading anxiety. *Modern Language Journal*, 83, 202–218.
- Siegel, J. (2014). *Exploring L2 Listening Instruction: Examination of Practice*. *ELT Journal*, 68(1), 22-30

- Siegel, J. (2015). *Exploring listening strategy instruction through action research*. Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Solórzano, H. S., & Schmidt, J. P. L. (2009). *Northstar 3. Listening and Speaking (Third Edition)*. White Plains, New York: Pearson Education.
- Stern, H. H. (1975). What can we learn from the good language learner? *Canadian Modern Language Review*, 31, 304–318.
- Stern, H.H. (1992). *Issues and Options in Language Teaching*. Oxford: OUP.
- Vandergrift, L. (1997). The Comprehension Strategies of Second Language (French) Listeners: A Descriptive Study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30, 387-409.
- Vandergrift, L. (2003). Orchestrating Strategy Use: Toward a Model of the Skilled Second Language Listener. *Language Learning*, 53(3), 463–496.
- Vandergrift, L. (2004). Listening to learn or learning to listen? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 3–25.
- Vandergrift, L., & Cross, J. (2018). *Listening to Learn Versus Learning to Listen*. *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*. Wiley & Sons, Inc. DOI: 10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0567
- Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Vogely, A. J. (1998). Listening comprehension anxiety: Students' reported sources and solutions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31, 67-80
- Zhang, X. (2013). Foreign language listening anxiety and listening performance: Conceptualizations and causal relationships. *System*, 41, 164-177

Appendix A: Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS)

Statements (1) through (20) describe how you feel about listening to English. Please indicate whether you (1) *Strongly Disagree (SD)*, (2) *Disagree (D)*, (3) *Neither Agree nor Disagree (N)*, (4) *Agree (A)*, or (5) *Strongly Agree (SA)*. Please read each statement carefully, give your first reaction to each statement. Circle the number which best shows your level of agreement with the statement.

1. I get upset when I'm not sure whether I understand what I'm hearing in English.	1	2	3	4	5
2. When I listen to English, I often understand the words but still can't quite understand what the speaker is saying.	1	2	3	4	5
3. When I'm listening to English, I get so confused I can't remember what I've heard.	1	2	3	4	5
4. I feel intimidated (afraid) whenever I have a listening passage in English to listen to.	1	2	3	4	5
5. I am nervous when I am listening to a passage in English when I'm not familiar with the topic.	1	2	3	4	5

6. I get upset whenever I hear unknown grammar while listening to English.	1	2	3	4	5
7. When listening to English I get nervous and confused when I don't understand every word.	1	2	3	4	5
8. It bothers (annoys) me to encounter (meet) words I can't pronounce while listening to English.	1	2	3	4	5
9. I usually end up translating word by word when I'm listening to English.	1	2	3	4	5
10. By the time you get past the strange sounds in English, it's hard to remember what you're listening to.	1	2	3	4	5
11. I am worried about all the new sounds you have to learn to understand spoken English.	1	2	3	4	5
12. I enjoy listening to English.*	1	2	3	4	5
13. I feel confident (assured) when I am listening to English.*	1	2	3	4	5
14. Once you get used to it, listening to English is not so difficult.	1	2	3	4	5
15. The hardest part of learning English is learning to understand spoken English.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I would be happy just to learn to read English rather than having to learn to understand spoken English.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I don't mind listening to English by myself but I feel very uncomfortable when I have to listen to English in a group.	1	2	3	4	5
18. I am satisfied (pleased) with the level of listening comprehension in English that I have achieved so far.*	1	2	3	4	5
19. English culture and ideas seem very foreign to me.	1	2	3	4	5
20. You have to know so much about English history and culture in order to understand spoken English.	1	2	3	4	5

* Items were reverse scoring.

Appendix 2: FLLAS items with numbers and percentages of learners who selected each alternative (n = 60).

	SD	D	N	A	SA
1. I get upset when I'm not sure whether I understand what I'm hearing in English.	2/3.3	4/6.7	9/15	15/25	30/5
2. When I listen to English, I often understand the words but still can't quite understand what the speaker is saying.	3/5	7/11.7	15/25	18/30	17/28.3
3. When I'm listening to English, I get so confused I can't remember what I've heard	2/3.3	8/13.3	17/28.3	15/25	18/30
4. I feel intimidated whenever I have a listening passage in English to listen to.	7/11.7	15/25	8/13.3	17/28.3	13/21.7
5. I am nervous when I am listening to a passage in English when I'm not familiar with the topic.	8/13.3	6/10	11/18.3	22/36.6	13/21.7

6. I get upset whenever I hear unknown grammar while listening to English	4/6.7	8/13.3	13/21.7	18/30	17/28.3
7. When listening to English I get nervous and confused when I don't understand every word.	4/6.7	7/11.7	11/18.3	11/18.3	27/45
8. It bothers me to encounter words I can't pronounce while listening to English.	3/5	6/10	16/26.6	20/33.3	15/25
9. I usually end up translating word by word when I'm listening to English.	7/11.7	15/25	12/20	18/30	8/13.3
10. By the time you get past the strange sounds in English, it's hard to remember what you're listening to	3/5	5/8.3	17/28.3	17/28.3	18/30
11. I am worried about all the new sounds you have to learn to understand spoken English.	5/8.3	8/13.3	13/21.7	21/35	13/21.7
12. I enjoy listening to English.	19/31.6	20/33.3	11/18.3	6/10	4/6.7
13. I feel confident when I am listening to English.	11/18.3	16/26.6	16/26.6	10/16.6	7/11.7
14. Once you get used to it, listening to English is not so difficult.	4/6.7	14/23.3	15/25	22/36.6	5/8.3
15. The hardest part of learning English is learning to understand spoken English.	3/5	8/13.3	21/25	17/28.3	11/18.3
16. I would be happy just to learn to read English rather than having to learn to understand spoken English.	7/11.7	14/23.3	9/15	20/33.3	10/16.6
17. I don't mind listening to English by myself but I feel very uncomfortable when I have to listen to English in a group.	1/1.6	15/25	18/30	18/30	8/13.3
18. I am satisfied with the level of listening comprehension in English that I have achieved so far	8/13.3	13/21.7	17/28.3	12/20	10/16.6
19. English culture and ideas seem very foreign to me.	3/5	12/20	21/35	10/16.6	14/23.3
20. You have to know so much about English history and culture in order to understand spoken English	9/15.0	7/11.7	17/28.3	18/30	9/15.0