



## The Effect of Teaching Interactional/Transactional Teaching Materials on the Oral Language Ability: State of Art

Abbas Mehrbakhsh

Islamic Azad University of Science and Research Damavand Branch, Damavand, Iran.

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received: 10 April 2017;

Received in revised form:

18 May 2017;

Accepted: 30 May 2017;

#### Keywords

Interactional,  
Transactional and  
Listening.

### ABSTRACT

Listening skills is one of the most fundamental and important skills which can enhance speaking as well as listening skills. However, listening skills has Cinderella skills in language teaching for many years. For FL learners, listening is more difficult than reading. This challenging nature is manifest in Purdy's (1997, p. 8) definition of listening as "active and dynamic process of attending, perceiving, interpreting, remembering, and responding to the expressed (verbal and nonverbal) needs, concerns, and information offered by other human beings." The capability to grasp spoken language encompasses complicated, immediate and concurrent processing of various sorts of information. To apprehend spoken language, one is required to organize sounds, vocabulary, grammatical constructions, and prior knowledge (Vandergrift, 1999). Many experts acknowledge the challenging nature of listening (Vogely, 1999; Gonen, 2009). The present study tries to indicate the relevant literature and study about role of transactional and interactional materials on oral productivity.

© 2017 Elixir All rights reserved.

### Introduction

#### The Significance of Listening

Being the two leading channels of language input, reading and listening contribute vehemently to FL learning. The more learners read and listen, the more they come across language. This contact addresses what culminates in language acquisition (Krashen, 1985; Peterson, 2001). It is consequently confident to utter that language learning is hinged upon the amount learners read and listen to the FL. Listening is remarkably noticeable in language development than reading because targets the highly regularly employed language skill (Ferris, 1998; Vogely, 1998; Morley, 1999). Through listening, language learners interiorize linguistic input without which they fail to generate language (Brown, 2001).

For FL learners, listening is more difficult than reading. This challenging nature is manifest in Purdy's (1997, p. 8) definition of listening as "active and dynamic process of attending, perceiving, interpreting, remembering, and responding to the expressed (verbal and nonverbal) needs, concerns, and information offered by other human beings." The capability to grasp spoken language encompasses complicated, immediate and concurrent processing of various sorts of information. To apprehend spoken language, one is required to organize sounds, vocabulary, grammatical constructions, and prior knowledge (Vandergrift, 1999). Many academics hence acknowledge the challenging nature of listening (Vogely, 1999; Gonen, 2009).

Listening comprehension unfolds online analysis (Gonen, 2009) of linguistic and existing information, and tackling the wild speed of delivery. It thus involves an enormous amount conceptual processes (Vandergrift, 1999). This makes listening apprehension arising (Vogely, 1999; Gonen, 2009), particularly for FL learners whose narrow linguistic proficiency exacerbates the situation.

Another significant root of FL listening anxiety refers to what Joiner (1986) calls undesirable listening self-concept. This negative self-concept constitutes another facet of nervousness and deprivation of self-assurance or confidence. Research has documented an opposing association between listening apprehension and listening comprehension (e.g. Elkhafaifi, 2005; Golchi, 2012; Ghapanchi & Golparvar, 2012; Tsai, 2001; Serraj & Noordin, 2013). Contrariwise, self-efficacy or self-assurance in listening has been reported to be confidently consistent with listening accomplishment (Chen, 2007; Magogwe & Oliver, 2007; Rahimi & Abedini, 2009).

A number of issues have aroused the most passionate debates about how to develop language abilities. Speaking and listening come naturally, unless one is born dumb and deaf. They also have to be learnt, of course while being young and being devoid of any formal or informal instruction. Speech comes first in our life history as individuals. We may have learnt to read and write, but we still go on talking and listening, and we still keep on learning by talking and listening.

Every human language has potential for meaning in two ways, it is a resource for doing with, and it is a resource for thinking with. We have no intention to go into nuts and bolts of which has resided in the brain. As Halliday (1985) stated, language has pragmatic and aesthetic functions that is, it is a resource for doing and for learning. Therefore, language is at once a part of and an image of the world we live in.

According to the historical overview of listening comprehension, listening was viewed as a passive process in which our ears were receivers into which information was poured, and all the listener had to do was passively register the message. Today we recognize that "listening is an active process and that good listeners are just as active when listening as speakers are when speaking" (Lynch, 2002, p.

193). The ability to hear is “a natural process that develops in all normal infants. Indeed most of us begin to hear sounds before we are even born” (Richards, 2005, p. 21).

Purdy (1991, p. 11) believed that listening is “the active and dynamic process of attending, perceiving, remembering, and responding to the expressed needs, concerns, and information offered by other human beings”. According to Rubin (1995, p. 151), listening is as “an active process in which a listener selects and interprets information which comes from auditory and visual clues in order to define what is going on and what the speakers are trying to express”. He has argued that, listening is the single most important aspect of tutoring. Without the tutoring there is no way to know what the tutee needs. It is also a rare and generous gift – to listen to someone – in this media bombarded society.

Lately the skill of listening comprehension had been ignored both as far as its place in language methodology the implementation of techniques and materials for teaching the oral skills are taken into account. Listening comprehension is now felt to be an essential opening to language adeptness, as well as a significant skill in its own right. The requirement to prepare learners, from the beginning, to interact with the speakers of English, listening and speaking at a natural speed, in a usual manner, constitutes now one of the crucial purposes of ESL/EFL instruction (Richards, 2008; Celce-Murcia, 2003; Nobuko Osada, 2004; Morley, 1991; Paulston, & Burder, 1976; Rivers, 1981; Rivers, & Temperley, 1978; Chastain, 1988; Dunkel, 1991; Celce-Murcia, & McIntosh, 1979; Winitz, 1981; Rubin, 1994; Chastain, 1971; Anderson, & Lynch, 1988; Brown, & Yule, 1983a; Brown, 1993).

Both language teachers and students tend to discard the prominence of listening comprehension skill. They do so because their attention is caught so entirely on their definitive goal, speaking, that they fail to recognize the requirement for implementing functional listening comprehension skills as a precondition to evolving language skills (Chastain, 1988). Chastain indicates that the oral comprehension process is central thus not liable to direct, external observation, examination, and rectification. Consequently, language teachers and students seem to display indifference towards its prerequisite weightiness in language learning process due to the lack of instant recognizable output. The crucial supposition fundamental to this, addresses that language acquisition refers to an implicit process in which linguistic instructions are interiorized by abundant exposure to realistic texts and especially to comprehensible input that engenders a balanced challenge to the listener.

To reject the passive role of listening comprehension as a part of oral skill, Byrnes (1984) and Brown (2007) characterize listening comprehension as a largely-complex-problem-solving activity, and Joiner (1986) notes that “listening is a young field and, as such, one with not only many unanswered questions, but also many questions that have yet to be raised” (p. 445). Rivers (1981) stresses Byrnes’ opinion of listening comprehension and believes that listening doesn’t refer to a passive skill, nor even, as has conventionally been supposed, a receptive skill; “listening is a creative skill” (p. 160).

Driven and Oakeshott-Taylor (1984), Richards (1990), Nunan (1991), and Haley & Austin (2004) note that whereas in the past interest had been mainly directed towards smaller linguistic unit like the phoneme or the syllable, recent years have seen an increasing concern with ever larger units such as the word, the sentence, the text, the interaction. Nord

(1981), in Winitz (1981, p. 98), also makes the point that, listening as an oral skill does not appear to be a skill learned by casually listening to radio or television. In order to learn to understand language rapidly and effectively, a number of requirements appear necessary. It seems necessary to develop attentive and retentive listening skills in hierarchical stages in order to develop a complete and accurate cognitive map. Carefully graded exercises need to be designed to ensure correct understanding every step along the way. Then it seems that “the building of listening comprehension through meaningful listening exercises must be carefully researched, tried and tested” (p.98).

In discussing the broad distinction between purposes of communication, Brown and Yule (1983a) coined the terms ‘interactional talk’ and ‘transactional talk’. Interactional is used to refer to speech that is primarily social but in transactional communication the main purpose is to achieve a successful transfer or exchange of information. However, the two terms represent what is in fact a continuum, from the social to the informative aspects of language.

### Teaching listening

Listening, hardly mentioned at all in journals in the 1970s has today been spotlighted. Although it continues to be disregarded in second language acquisition theory and research, at least in teaching, it now plays a weight role. University entrance exams, school leaving and other examinations have started to embrace a listening component, admitting that listening competency is a noteworthy facet of second language proficiency, and if it isn't assessed, teachers won't take it into account. A premature observation of listening saw it as the mastery of discrete skills or *microskills* (e.g. Richards 1983) and that these are expected catch the attention to teaching and testing.

A skills approach accentuated such things as (Rost 1990):

- Recognizing sounds in words, particularly phonemic dissimilarities.
- Inferring the meaning of unaccustomed words.
- Foreseeing content.
- Noticing inconsistencies, insufficient information, obscurities.
- Discriminating between fact and opinion.

The transformed position of listening was moderately encouraged by Krashen's stress on the role of comprehension and *comprehensible input*, i.e. the *input hypothesis*, in activating language development, which originates from his *Natural Approach*. In the 80s and 90s applied linguists also launched to borrow novel theoretical models of comprehension from the area of cognitive psychology. It was from this source that the division between *bottom-up processing* and *top-down processing* was extracted, a discrepancy that culminates in an mindfulness of the prominence of background knowledge, and schema in comprehension. The *bottom-up model* maintains that listening is a linear, data-driven process. Comprehension takes place to the degree that the listener wins in decrypting the spoken text. The *top-down model* of listening, contrarily, involves the listener in vigorously building meaning hinged upon expectations, inferences, intentions, knowledge of *schema* and other related *prior knowledge* and by a selective processing of the input. Listening was considered to be treated as an interpretive process.

At the same time the fields of *conversation analysis* and *discourse analysis* were manifesting a tremendous deal

regarding the construction of spoken discourse and lead to a consciousness that written texts read aloud could not afford an appropriate foundation for evolving the abilities required to process realistic genuine discourse. *Authenticity* in materials became a locution and part of a pedagogy of teaching listening that is now well well-known in TESOL.

Mendelsohn (1994) recapitalizes the conventions principally to current methodology as:

- Listening materials should target a broad extent real-life texts, including both monologues and dialogues.
- Schema-establishing tasks should emerge prior to listening.
- Strategies for successful listening should be combined into the materials.
- Learners should be gifted opportunities to increasingly construct their listening by listening to a text repeatedly and by working through strongly demanding listening tasks.
- Learners should be aware of what they are listening for and why.
- Tasks should afford opportunities for learners to be cooperatively responsible for their own learning.

#### **EFL Learner's Difficulties Regarding Listening**

In addition to the previously mentioned barricades, Underwood (1989, as cited in Osada, 2004) has offered seven imaginable causes of difficulties to effectual listening learning:

First, listeners cannot govern the speed of delivery. Many English language learners believe that the most tremendous obstacle with listening comprehension, as contrary to reading comprehension, is that the listener cannot understand as quickly as the speaker speaks.

Second, listeners cannot always have words reiterated. This is viewed a crucial obstacle in learning contexts. In the classroom, the decision as to whether or not to replay a recording or a section of a recording doesn't constitute the students' responsibility. Teachers decide what and where to reiterate listening passages; nonetheless, it is inflexible for the teacher to arbitrate whether or not the students have grasped any particular fragment of what they have heard.

Third, listeners possess a trifle vocabulary storage. The speaker may select words the listener isn't acquainted with. Listeners sometimes face with an alien word, which may cause them to pause and reflect on the meaning of that word therefore causing them not to adhere to the next fragment of the speech.

Fourth, listeners may be poor to identify the signals, which indicate that the speaker is rambling, is presenting an example, or is reiterating a point. Dissimilar to discourse markers which are utilized in prescribed situations or extemporaneous discussions, signals are equivocal as in pauses, gestures, accelerated loudness, a lucid transfer of pitch, or different intonation patterns. These signals can smoothly be overlooked particularly by less talented listeners.

Fifth, listeners may be in need of contextual knowledge. Imparting knowledge and common context makes communication more facile. Even if listeners can comprehend the superficial meaning of the text, they may meet substantial hitches in understanding the entire meaning of the text unless they are acquainted with the context. Nonverbal cues, such as facial expressions, signals, gestures or tone of voice, can also be easily misjudged by listeners from multifarious cultures.

Sixth, it can be challenging for listeners to focus on the text. In listening comprehension, even the shortest pause in

attention can seriously damage comprehension. Attentiveness is easier when students discover the topic of the listening passage thought-provoking; nonetheless, students sometimes feel the listening task very arduous even if they are fascinated because it requires an ample extent of determination to follow the meaning.

Seventh and last, students may have designated particular learning practices such as a desiring to grasp every word. Conventionally, teachers expect students to comprehend every word they hear by reiterating and articulating words cautiously, by measuring the language to correspond to their level, by speaking unhurriedly and so on. Subsequently, students tend to become apprehensive if they are not capable of understanding a certain word or phrase and they will be disheartened by the breakdown. It is therefore sometimes essential for students to endure bulousness and partialness of comprehending.

#### **Schema and Listening Comprehension**

There have been moderately scarce empirical research studies on the conceivable connection between schema constructing and listening comprehension. Researchers have argued that schematic knowledge lubricates listening comprehension and assists listeners tackle obstacles in listening learning.

Rost (1990, pp. 23,183-189) asserted that "the listeners have numerous sources of information which make listening comprehension easier". In other words, listening comprehension is affected the information that an individual has in the mind. Consequently, schematic knowledge is obviously valuable to listening comprehension and "relevant schemata must be activated" (Carrel, 1988a, p. 105).

Also, O'malley and Chamot (1989) argued that "listening comprehension is an active and conscious process in which the listener constructs meaning by using cues from contextual information and existing knowledge, while relying upon multiple strategic to fulfill the task requirement" (p. 420).

Likewise, Long (1989, p. 32) expressed the idea that "comprehension is based on learner's ability to draw on their existing knowledge". According to Fang (2008, p. 22), "listening comprehension is regarded theoretically as an active process in which individuals concentrate on selected aspects of aural input, form meaning from passages, and associate what they hear with existing knowledge"; Then, applicable schemata need to be stimulated during text processing so as to simplify effectual comprehension (Carrell & Eisterhold, 1998).

In a study, Markham and Latham (1987) evaluated the impact of religious-specific background knowledge on listening comprehension of adult ESL students. Sixty five ESL students who were categorized as Muslim, Christian, and neutral, took part in the study. The analysis of recollected data revealed that the students who abided by a particular religious group remembered messages and generated substantial amount of pertinent clarifications. They also faced with rare rim precise distortions regarding the passages joined with their certain religion. Thus, background knowledge does considerably affect ESL students' listening comprehension.

Long (1990) underlined the requirement to examine how background knowledge affects aural comprehension in second language.

Outcomes from her investigation and recall protocols which were gleaned from 188 students taking Spanish

courses revealed that “background knowledge was not available to L2 listeners” (p. 92).

Schmidt-Rinehart (1994) investigated a research to figure out whether there existed a relationship between topical knowledge and L2 listening comprehension. Since the effect of background knowledge on listening comprehension is not transparent particularly when it addresses L2 listening ability, she extended the research of Long (1990) by taking proficiency level as a variable into account. The results collected from ninety university students of Spanish classes of various levels of proficiency, talking immediate recall-protocols displayed that topic acquaintance had influences on the scores of the recall measures and that there was a constant growth in the comprehension scores across the various levels. Additionally, the outcomes manifested no correlation between topic familiarity and course level; that is, L2 listening proficiency, which unveiled that students of different course levels scored higher on the acquainted passage.

Besides the above studies, the impact of prior knowledge was scrutinized by Jensen and Hasen (1995). They formulated that student’s pre-dwelled knowledge could be a source of partiality to the tests. After having examined the outcomes of 128 university level L2 learners, they draw the conclusion that existing knowledge does not dramatically play a role to L2 listening comprehension, and that extra research should be called to inspect whether schematic knowledge surely smooths listening comprehension.

Recently, Hohzawa (1998) found that Japanese listeners with high prior knowledge understood the acquainted text more than the alien one and more skillful L2 listeners comprehended more than less-proficient listeners in either familiar or unfamiliar text. Students were designated to a background-information group (experimental group) and to a no background-information group (control group). A proficiency test was presented to gauge their pre-dwelled knowledge concerning the topics of three new stories. Students in the experimental group negotiated the content of the stories concisely after the introductions of the novel stories were represented. Gathered scores from a written recollected protocol and a comprehension test demonstrated that students who are deprived of pre-swelled information are liable to generate ample instances of imprecise recollection of the text or distortions, which resembled to the outcomes yielded from studies conducted by Markham and Latham (1987).

As presented in the above studies, the discoveries of L2 listening investigations on the impacts which schematic knowledge have on listening comprehension are still rather debatable. The findings of the undetermined role of schematic knowledge in listening comprehension espouses the demand to devise a study, the central purpose of which addresses the examination of what degree schema-establishing activities have influences on listening comprehension.

### **The Importance of Authentic Materials**

During the past decades, teaching foreign languages has obtained ample focus in most countries across the world. Consequently, hunting for suitable and effective teaching materials occupies a great space of instructors’ thinking. The purpose of learning a foreign language is to gain the capability of making use of it in the real universe and in real circumstances. Hence, most language teachers reflect whether it is sufficient to instruct the language recruiting the

course book tasks, which are viewed non-natural because they are assumed for teaching purposes only, or if they should approve employing genuine materials to establish learners’ learning process.

The concern of utilizing genuine materials in language classrooms has been significant over the past two decades. Martinez (2002) defined authentic materials as the materials which are introduced for native speakers and not devised to meet teaching purposes. Kilickaya (2004) defined authentic materials as contact to real language and using it in one’s own community.

Also Bacon and Finnemann (1990, p. 459) stated that “teachers need to find ways and means of exploiting authentic materials in classroom instructions”. Many researchers declare that if students are keen to employ English language adequately, they must come up with the language, precisely as it is recruited in realistic circumstances by native speakers.

Widdowson (1990), proclaimed that making learners meet genuine materials is crucial, because of the wealthy language information they generate. Exposing students to such language forms will empower them to handle real life communication, whether it is inside or outside the classroom. Researchers avert that when authentic materials are recruited addressing the purpose of students’ learning, students will feel that the genuine language for communication is being grasped, as contrary to classroom language itself. In contrast to the design of the text books, authentic materials are inherently more participatory, exciting and inspiring (Lee, 1995; Little, Devitt & Singleton, 1988; Peacock, 1997).

Peacock (1997) described realistic materials as the materials that have been generated to satisfy some social goals in the language community. On the other hand, Nunan (1999) viewed authentic materials as spoken or written materials which are not planned for use in teaching. Widdowson (1990) supposed that authentic would address to the materials tailored for native speakers of English, and should be recruited in the classrooms in a way analogous to the one it was devised for. Realistic materials may embrace written or spoken ones. For instance, a radio news report was presented into the class, so students discuss the report on pollution in the city where learners dwell. Other instances of genuine materials are newspapers, magazines, posters, etc.

Furthermore, Kelly, Offner and Vorland (2002) believed that authentic materials are purposeful means to fill the gap between classroom and the real universe. Researchers have proven that the language dealt with in the classroom must be associated with its functions in the real world. Besides, Richards (2001) declares that the language which the learners are immersed in within the classroom, must symbolize the language employed in the real world.

In the history of teaching listening comprehension, the subject of authenticity of second language materials has always been a moot point for both theoreticians and practitioners. More remarkably, a compromise has not even been achieved on what sort of materials can be treated realistic. The definition largely verified in the language teaching profession in the 1970s and 1980s was that authentic texts were models of language being applied to genuine communication between native speakers, and not particularly recorded for language teaching purposes (Lynch, 2009).

### **Effective and Ineffective Listening Strategies**

Research has illustrated that not all of the strategies learners employ are influential in assisting them to increase

their listening. O'Malley and Chamot (1990) contended that there are momentous variances between competent and incompetent listeners on facets such as inspecting comprehension, particularizing, and inferencing. These researchers figured out that whereas "the effective listeners used both top-down and bottom-up approaches, the unskillful listeners relied specifically on a bottom-up approach to understand" (O'Malley & Chamot 1990, p. 132). Nonetheless, the research into what carries influence is still blurred because other researchers investigating types of listening recruited in formal test conditions explored that L2 learners utilize bottom-up processing more frequently than they use top-down processing (Tsui & Fullilove, 1998).

In a more previous study, O'Malley, Chamot, and Kupper (1989) found that competent and incompetent listeners varied in three main ways: perceptual processing, parsing, and utilization. Perceptual processing which is the characteristic of competent listener stakes place when listeners know whenever they stop attending and try readdressing their attention to the text. Incompetent listeners are regularly disheartened by the length of the text and by the number of unfamiliar words they come up. When they pause to focus because of these factors, they don't struggle much to readdress their attention to the text. Parsing which is present in effective listeners usually happens when they attend to expanding chunks (or parsing) of information and only attend to individual words when there is some message failure. They adhere to intonation and pauses and listen for phrases or sentences. Incompetent listeners are liable to accentuate largely on a word-by-word level - a bottom-up strategy. Utilization refers to another characteristic of competent listeners which occurs whenever these listeners recruit world knowledge, personal knowledge, and self-questioning as a way of adhering to the message. Incompetent listeners, on the other hand, don't rely much on these elaboration techniques. Whereas competent listeners can be described as vigorously contributing to the listening process, incompetent listeners are more unreceptive.

Although some learners may be classified as utilizing unproductive strategies, there are many instances of how these listeners can be skilled to intensify their strategy repertoire and use the strategies they possess more effectually (Derry & Murphy 1986; O'Malley et al., 1985; Weinstein & Mayer 1986).

### **Listening Strategies in the Classroom**

A second way in which students can become cognizant of how to engender recovering listening habits is by: the integration of listening learning strategies into language lessons such as think-aloud procedure (a technique in which learners are asked to record their thoughts or strategies as they perform a language task) and having learners to listen to various texts in a second language. (Vandergrift, 1997, pp. 392-394)

### **How Listening Comprehension is Achieved: Interactive Processing**

Richards (1990) offers a transparent delineation of how listening comprehension is attained by native or non-native listeners. He views this listening process as bottom-up and top-down processing. Bottom-up processing refers to the decoding process, the direct decoding of language into expressive components, from sound waves through the air, via our ears and into our brain where meaning is decrypted. To decode sounds students are expected to be familiar with the code.

The code comprises how the sounds work and how they are connected together and how the code can transfer in various ways when it is linked together. The majority of students have never been trained how English changes when it's integrated together in sentences. Alternatively, top-down processing refers to how we employ our world knowledge to ascribe meaning to language information; how our knowledge of social convention assists us grasp meaning.

Evidently these two processes act jointly. The association between the two is not effusively perceived but it is lucid that there is some kind of compensatory bond, that is, when one process does not work successfully the other facilitates to bridge any gaps (Stanovich, 1980). This explicates why we say "*What did you say?*" when a segment of a second later we fill in what we did not completely decrypt and quickly follow it up with "*Don't worry.*" The association must go even further than simply compensatory, for that assumes that one type of processing is favored when in fact they work together. In various settings with different discourses one sort of processing may work harder than the other. When someone is in an acquainted circumstance, listening to a familiar voice, the bottom-up process may not be working as hard as the top-down process.

Richards (1990) discusses the significance of the transactional and interactional functions of language but manifests a very unsophisticated version of how these two functions are relevant to the two kinds of comprehension processes. While his representation may be simple it still brings about an important argument; teachers should be mindful that various functions or various discourse types are processed not similarly and that the level of bottom-up processing required by a learner is designated by the degree of top-down processing that a student can deal with their listening. Essentially students are capable to engage top-down process more in a text governed by interactional functions than they would in a text governed by transactional functions.

### **Psychological Processes: Bottom-up and Top-down Listening Schemata**

To understand how people make sense of the stream of sound we all hear, it is helpful to think about how we process the input. A useful metaphor often used to explain reading but equally applicable to listening is "bottom-up vs. top-down processing," proposed by Rumelhart and Ortony (1977) and expanded by Chaudron and Richards (1986), Richards (1990), and others. The distinction is based on the way learners attempt to understand what they read or hear. With bottom-up processing, students start with the component parts: words, grammar, and the like. Top-down processing is the opposite. Learners start from their background knowledge, either content schema (general information based on previous learning and life experience) or textual schema (awareness of the kinds of information used in a given situation) (See Long, 1989).

This use of the combination of top-down and bottom-up data is also called interactive processing (Peterson, 2001).

As useful and important as pre-listening activities are, Buck (1995) criticizes books that "provide twenty minutes of pre-listening activities for about three minutes of listening practice. This is unbalanced. We need pre-listening activities to do two things: provide a context for interpretation and activate the background knowledge which will help interpretation. Give them enough to do that, and then let them listen."

A second word of caution is suggested by Tsui and Fullilove (1998). Learners need to make use of their top-down knowledge but keep reevaluating information. If they lock into an interpretation too early, they may miss information that contradicts it.

Morley (1999) states that with respect to the sophisticated nature of listening to apprehend spoken language, it is hypothesized that two various modes work intimately in a collaborative process. One is the externally based bottom-up mode while the other is the internally based top-down mode.

#### **Bottom-up Processing**

The bottom-up mode of language processing involves the listener focusing generously to all features of the language input (Morley, 1999). *Bottom-up* contains that part of the audio comprehension process in which the comprehension of the 'heard' language is perceived proceeding from sounds to words to grammatical associations to lexical meanings. That is, the meaning of the message arrives at bottom to top based on the received language data.

#### **Top-down Processing**

On the other hand, the top-down facet of listening involves the listener's competent to bring prior information to cast on the task of comprehending the 'heard' language (Morley, 1999). This internal resource embraces a bank of previous knowledge and universal expectations about language and the world. It is recruited by the listener to make predictions about what the incoming message is anticipated to be at any point, and how the constituents corresponds to the whole. Chaudron and Richards (1986) notify, "top-down processing involves prediction and inferencing on the basis of hierarchies of facts, propositions, and expectations, and it enables the listener or the reader to bypass some aspects of bottom-up processing" (pp. 114-115).

Taking dual viewpoints into account, Richards (1990) proposes a model of materials design for second or foreign language listening comprehension that mingles language functions (interactional and transactional) and language processes (top-down and bottom-up). He observes that the degree to which one or the other processes governs is specified by (a) whether listening serves transactional or interactional purpose, (b) what kind of background knowledge can be applied to the task, and (c) what degree of acquaintance listeners have with the topic. He concludes:

Too often, listening texts requires students to adopt a single approach in listening, one which demands a detailed understanding of the content of a discourse and the recognition of every word and structure that occurs in a text. Students should not be required to respond to interactional discourse as if it were being used for a transactional purpose, nor should they be expected to use a bottom-up approach to an aural text if a top-down one is more appropriate. (p.83)

#### **Teach Listening Strategies**

Considering listening, it is worthwhile to note the items Rost (2002, p. 155) identifies "as strategies that are employed by effective listeners.

- Predicting: Effective listeners think about what they will hear. This fits into the ideas about pre-listening mentioned earlier.
- Inferring: It is useful for learners to "listen between the lines."
- Monitoring: Good listeners notice what they do and don't understand.

- Clarifying: Efficient learners ask questions (What does \_\_\_\_ mean? You mean \_\_\_\_ ?) and give feedback (I don't understand yet.) to the speaker.

- Responding: Learners react to what they hear.

- Evaluating: They check on how well they have understood".

#### **Psychosocial Functions of Listening: Transactional Listening and Interactional Listening**

Brown and Yule (1983a) suggest halving language functions into two main sections: language for transactional purposes and language for interactional purposes. They note that "transactional language corresponds to Halliday's notion of ideational, while interactional language corresponds to his term interpersonal" (Halliday, 1970, p. 143).

When the interactional function is considered, the speaker intends to sustain social relationships. It is chiefly listener-focused. When a transactional function is the focus of attention, the speaker intends to convey the information. It is mainly message-focused. Listening comprehension in interactive circumstances, consequently, denotes not only comprehending the unwritten message but grasping it in the setting in which it takes place. This interactional/transactional distinction has been approved by fairly a few researchers (e.g., Galvin, 1985 as cited in Rost, 1990; Richards, 1990; Vandergrift, 1992, 1997, 2002) in negotiating listening goals. Galvin (1985, as cited in Rost, 1990, p. 11) was among the first to employ the term interactional listening. Richards (1990), though not picking out the term interactional listening or transactional listening, has addressed methodically the division of interactional and transactional functions and goals in understanding language.

Research examining listening in authentic situations (e.g., Anderson & Lynch, 1988; Brown, 2004; Carroll, 1980; Geddes, 1981; Oprandy, 1994; Oxford, 1993; Underhill, 1987) has adequately proven that listening generally takes place in interactive settings. As Brown (2004, p. 138) puts it:

...A significant proportion of real world listening performance is interactive. With the exception of media input, speeches, and eavesdropping, many of our listening efforts are directed towards a two-way process of speaking and listening in face-to-face conversations.

Therefore, evaluation of listening in non-interactive settings "has long been recognized as anomalous" (McNamara & Roever, 2006, p. 51). The term 'anomalous' might not receive consensus, but few researchers would disagree on the insufficiency of contemporary listening tests in representing a full image of candidates' listening ability, and many have looked for attempts to be targeted toward the evaluation of interactive listening (e.g., Brindley, 1998; Brindley & Ross, 1997; Dunkel, 1991; Lynch, 1998; McNamara & Roever, 2006; Thomas, 1992).

#### **Transactional Language Functions**

According to Brown and Yule (1983a) transactional language is message oriented and can be viewed as 'business-type' talk with the emphasis on content and transferring realistic or propositional information. Transactional language is recruited for demonstrating guidelines, elucidating, describing, giving directions, commanding, investigating, demanding, associating, checking on the accuracy of specifics, and authenticating comprehension. They pointed out that the premium is on message transparency and exactitude.

Speakers frequently utilize verification checks to assure what they are saying conveys clarity; they may even

contradict the listener if he or she seems to have misapprehended.

### Interactional Language Function

The most significant dissimilarity between the two types of language use is that interactional language is 'social-type' talk; it denotes *person oriented* more than message oriented. Its purpose addresses the construction and conservation of genial social relationships. Brown and Yule (1983a) comment that a great deal of informal conversation unfolds phrases or echoes of phrases which seem to be viewed more as facilitators to a conversation than as instances of information presenting. Significant characteristics of interactional language of those identifying with the other person's demands, being agreeable to the other person, and sustaining and respecting 'face'.

### Definitions of Interactive Listening

Vandergrift (1992, 1997, & 2002) has manifested certain willingness towards interactional listening. The central point of interactional listening in his research, though, doesn't address sustaining social binds or identifying individual components of message. Instead, the concept of listener-speaker interaction is highlighted, as represented in the quasi-definition he provided as interactional listening is exceedingly contextualized and reciprocal, including interaction with a speaker (Vandergrift, 2002). More researchers (e.g., Lynch, 1995; Rost, 2002; Tokeshi, 2003; Yule, 1991) are subject to manifest consensus with Vandergrift and view mutual interaction or engaging with an interaction with a speaker as the main unique feature of interactional listening, no matter whether the listening goal addresses the comprehension of the message or to fulfill the social requirements of the participants.

Taking listening into account in interactive conditions, Vandergrift employed both interactive listening (Vandergrift, 1997) and interactional listening (Vandergrift, 2002). Moreover, a novel term bidirectional listening was adopted in two of his review articles (Vandergrift, 2004, 2007). Lynch also utilized multiple terms, including two-way listening (Anderson & Lynch, 1988; also Nunan, 1997), interactive listening (Lynch, 1995), and reciprocal listening (Lynch, 1997). Terms such as active listening (e.g., Dunkel, 1991; Richards, 1990) and cooperative listening (Buck, 2001) have also been recruited. Of the plenteous terms, interactive listening is preferred by most researchers (e.g., Alderson, 2005; Bahns, 1995; Ducasse & Brown, 2009; Gardner, 1998; Kaplan & Stefanopoulos, 1994; Kaurate, 1996; Rost, 2002; Tokeshi, 2003; Yule, 1991).

### Listening Strategies

Effective listening can also be perceived regarding the strategies the listener employs when listening. Does the learner focus chiefly on the content of a text, or does he or she also take into account how to listen? A heed to how to listen emerges the issues of listening strategies. Strategies can be considered as the ways in which a learner manipulates and manages a task and listeners can be practiced ways of coping with and governing their listening. These activities seek to get listeners actively immerse in the process of listening.

Buck (2001, p. 104) recognizes "two types of strategies in listening: cognitive strategies and meta-cognitive strategies".

### Cognitive Strategies

These strategies refer to those intellectual activities germane to understanding and sustaining input in working memory or long-term memory for future retrieval (Buck,

2001). He proposes three categories for this type of listening strategy as follows:

- Understanding processes: related to the analyzing of linguistic and non-linguistic input;
- Keeping and memory processes: related to the maintaining of linguistic and non-linguistic input in working memory or long-term memory.
- Utilizing *and retrieval processes*: relate to accessing memory, to be readied for output.

### Metacognitive Strategies

Buck(2001, p. 104) indicates that "these types of strategies refer to those conscious or unconscious mental activities that perform an executive function in the management of cognitive strategies". He specifies "four functions for this type of listening strategy as follows:

- *Assessing the situation*: taking stock of conditions surrounding a language ask by assessing one's own knowledge, one's available internal and external resources and the constraints of the situation before engaging in a task.
- *Monitoring*: determining the effectiveness of one's own or another's performance while engaged in a task;
- *Self-evaluating*: determining the effectiveness of one's own or another's performance after engaging in the activity;
- *Self-testing*: testing oneself to determine the effectiveness of one's own language use or the lack thereof."

### Listening in Three Modes: Bidirectional, Unidirectional, Audiodirectional

#### Bidirectional Listening Mode

The obvious mode is reciprocal or bidirectional communicative listening. Here the mutual speech chain of speaker/listener is smoothly experimented (Denes & Pinson, 1963). Two (or more) members take turns swapping speaker role and listener role as they engage in face-to-face or telephone verbal communication.

#### Unidirectional Listening Mode

A second mode is one-sided or unidirectional communicative listening. Auditory information besieges us as we move through the day. The input arises from a diversity of foundations: overheard conversations, public address announcements, recorded messages (including those on telephone answering machines), the media (e.g. radio, television, films), pedagogical contexts of all kinds, and public performances (e.g. lectures, religious services, plays, operas, musicals, concerts). As we hear speakers, but are incapable to interact, we often talk to ourselves in a reactive or a monologue manner as we scrutinize what we hear. We may sub-express or even express these responses.

#### Audiodirectional Listening Mode

The third communicative listening mode refers to audio directional. We can view this as monologue interaction in which we may not be aware of our internal roles as both speaker and listener/reactor in our own thinking processes. Sometimes, we re-create language internally and 'listen afresh' as we retell and revive communicative intervals. Occasionally, we simply follow our own internal language which we generate as we search for alternatives, design strategies, and make decisions- all by soliloquizing.

In all of these communicative listening modes, pay heed that that listening doesn't encompass an inactive experience. Each listening mode contains a vastly dynamic, evidently participatory, verbal experience.

### Pervious L2 Listening Comprehension Research

According to Morley (2001), during the 1980s, specific attention was integrated into new instructional bases, that is,

functional language and communicative approaches. Throughout the 1990s, attention to listening in language instruction improved abruptly. "Listening comprehension is now universally approved as a significant aspect of language; nonetheless, much work remains to be done in both theory and practice" (Morley, 2001, p. 69). Until recently, listening comprehension absorbed slight attention in terms of both theory and practice, while the other three language skills (i.e., reading, writing, & speaking) obtained direct instructional attention (Mendelsohn, 1984; Oxford, 1993).

Call (1985) maintained that the belief in the Audio lingual method holds that if students listen to the target language all day, they will enhance their listening comprehension skill through gaining the experience. The fact that listening has been discarded or poorly taught may have originated from the belief that it is a passive skill and that merely exposing students to the spoken language offers sufficient instruction in listening comprehension.

The origins of Audiolingualism lie in the primary years of the 20th century, and left a important impact on theories of language teaching. Among these were: (a) the fortification of positivistic pragmatism, (b) the growing of American structural linguistics and behaviorist psychology, and (c) the expression of scientific through formalisms (Johnson & Johnson, 1998).

Meyer (1984, p. 343) has referred that, "behaviorists drew inspiration from Pavlov's conditioning experiments which promoted an account of behavior in terms of stimulus and response and suggested that these could be expanded into an ever widening network through association and newly learned responses strengthened through reinforcement". Language development was thought to be explained in a similar way; language consists of ultimately finite entities and might be learned through imitation and practice oriented activities that has trapped students in a frenzied Hear it, repeat it! Hear it, answer it! or „Hear it, translate it!" nightmare.

In addition to the American Audio lingual Approach, the English language teaching program of the British Situational Approach did take listening into account beyond its contribution in grammar and pronunciation exercises and learners' modeling of dialogues during the 1940s, 1950s, and 1960s (Morley, 2001).

Then, slowly and gradually, more consideration was casted to listening comprehension. In the 1970s, the status of listening began to transfer from being incidental and peripheral to a status of crucial significance. Instructional programs stretched their attention on pragmatic skills to enfold listening as well as reading, writing, and speaking. During the 1980s, as researchers became increasingly interested in exploring the complexities of this complicated skill, more research, theory constructing and curriculum progress on listening comprehension were executed. Throughout the 1990s, focus to listening in language teaching advanced dramatically. Aural comprehension in second or foreign language acquisition constituted a chief scope of study.

Celce-Murcia (1995) specified that, research into listening over the past three decades has, above all, underlined the essential complexity of the processes involved (Lynch, 1998).

Thompson and Rubin (1996) examined a longitudinal study to inspect the affect of both cognitive and metacognitive strategy instruction on college level L2

learners' listening comprehension performance. The study was executed at a private university in Washington, D.C., and participants comprised students enrolled in a Russian language course. A total of 36 participants were arbitrarily assigned to a control and experimental group, and both groups undertook roughly 15 hours of video instruction in total in an academic year. Nonetheless, the content of the lesson plan was dissimilar. While the control group only employed the videos as a source for speaking and writing activities, the experimental group took the enhancement of various metacognitive and cognitive strategies. Two different tests were taken as measures of listening comprehension, including the listening portion of the Comprehensive Russian Proficiency Test that contained 22 multiple-choice questions and a researcher-tailored video comprehension test which consisted of 29 open-ended and guided recollection questions.

Analysis of the pre- and post-test scores on the video test discovered that the treatment group scored considerably higher than the control group. However, there tracked no difference between the two groups concerning the audio test. The two researchers later explained the reason why such results appeared: (1) the audio test conformed with the type of instruction designed for the learners, and (2) some participants had exhibited high listening skills prior to the instruction, so there existed slight difference in the pre- and post-test scores.

In spite of the short research period and some what inadequate results, this study was the first longitudinal, classroom-based strategy instruction that displayed the positive effect of listening strategy training. In order to authenticate these results, the researchers also attempt to seek for more studies considering other languages, numerous samples, a prolonged instruction period, and an optimal relationship between the instruction and evaluation test.

A more recent study examined by Chen (2009) examined the impact of strategy instruction in a systematic college EFL class in Taiwan. Rather than inspecting a causal-effect association, this study targeted at finding out learners' listening strategy progress over a 14-week span. The participants were 31 non-English major students enrolled in an EFL listening course, and their language proficiency levels were dissimilar. The instruction was integrated as an extension of the listening curriculum, and metacognitive, cognitive, and social-affective listening strategies were instructed in the strategy instruction. Within each strategy category, the researcher manifested selective strategies that had been proven operational in the literature. Participants were expected to keep reflective journals where they reflected and assessed how they made efforts to grasp the input and what they had perceived immediately after accomplishing their listening tasks. Journal entries were examined both quantitatively and qualitatively. The results exhibited that the whole students discovered considerably higher consciousness and control of their listening strategies. For individual strategy utilization in cognitive category, the most frequent strategies announced by students encompassed inferencing, comprehending each word, and replay. In the metacognitive category, in spite of the fact that different strategies were used mostly at a wide range of steps over the course, the whole range of all strategies were implemented justly similarly. Moreover, the quantitative results demonstrated that the recruitment of affective strategies



improved dramatically, typically by low and medium proficiency students.

Overall, Chen's (2009) study displayed that strategy instruction could be incorporated in the EFL listening classroom and might culminate in optimistic influences for learners' comprehending and employment of listening strategies. Nevertheless, some limitations of the study, including the small sample size and no prevailing comparison group, might trigger difficulties in generalizing the findings to a more extended population. Also Chen's study solely recruited one sort of instrument, which referred to the reflective journal. Forthcoming research should include exercising multifarious instruments for data triangulation in order to elicit more unbiased and exhaustive outcomes.

Liu (2008) examined 101 university male and female non-English major students at three universities in Taipei from the Departments of Computer Sciences, Spanish, Marketing, International Business, Multimedia Design, and Mechanic Engineering. They comprised of three groups of listening proficiency levels: the advanced, upper-intermediate and lower-intermediate/elementary levels. The outcomes of his study exhibited that the majority of skillful listeners recruited greater number of planning strategies than the less skillful listeners and that the more skillful listeners were more observant than the less competent listeners. The study also displayed that the planning strategies of handling consideration, directed and selective attention, and advanced organization were exceedingly associated with listening proficiency. Liu also discovered that more proficient listeners possessed richer knowledge of the high level in the grading of strategy utilization to affect their comprehension, and they did not cast focus on translating from their first language into the target language. To put differently, they were highly capable of recruiting the top-down processing (e.g., elaboration), whereas the less-competent listeners stressed on unfamiliar lexis or grammar and thus experienced hurdles making use of the higher order strategy. Nonetheless, the employment of the translation strategy did not vary considerably between less skillful listeners and more skillful listeners. Furthermore, more competent listeners gained capability in highly governing their feelings and manifest edyearning to act optimally at deploying strategies to illuminate meaning while entering in an interactive process with a native speaker of the language. Nevertheless, less competent listeners appeared to be apprehensive when met the obstacle of coming across unfamiliar lexis, or they absent from social strategies for asking about vague meanings from their conversational peers. These research studies highlighted sorts of listening strategies exercised by more-skillful and less-skillful listeners.

Zahedi and Tabatabaei (2012) tried to examine the impact of cooperative learning on oral skill performance and enthusiasm of Iranian EFL Learners. The participants were 72 adult students out of whom 50 were designated based on their performance on a general English placement test (Interchange Objective Placement Test) at the intermediate level in Shahreza Nahid Foruzan Art and Cultural Institute. A pretest-posttest control group design was used. The participants were divided into two groups; the experimental group was taught in collaborative learning for one semester using the techniques such as Learning Together and Pair Talk; the control group was taught in the conventional method. The data included: 1) the results of the two oral tasks, and 2) the results of the motivational questionnaire.

The independent samples *t*-test and paired samples *t*-test were used to determine whether there were significant inter and intragroup differences. The results provided evidence that collaborative learning helps to enhance significantly the adult EFL learners' oral skill performance and their motivation toward learning English.

Although these types of communication skills (i.e. interactional/transactional) are used often in teaching situations, little attention is paid to the effectiveness of these models on the oral skills. In other words, the speculations concerning the impact of interactional/transactional is rarely been derived from empirical investigations and the related existing studies (Thompson & Rubin, 1996; Chen, 2009; Liu, 2008; Zahedi & Tabatabaei, 2012) didn't specifically target the investigation of this topic. This absence summons the urgency of conducting such an investigation and consequently necessitates devising three the research questions. The first research question targets at 'does interactional materials-based instruction have any significant effect on developing listening comprehension ability?'. The second research question focuses on 'does transactional materials-based instruction have any significant effect on developing listening comprehension ability?', and the third research question addresses 'is there any significant difference between interactional/transactional materials-based instruction and traditional materials-based instruction on developing listening comprehension ability?'

#### References

- Alderson, J., C. (2005). Diagnosing foreign language proficiency: The interface between learning and assessment. London: Continuum.
- Anderson A., & Lynch T. (1988). Listening. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bacon, S., M., & Finnemann, M., D. (1990). A study of the attitudes, motives, and strategies of university foreign students. *Modern Language Journal* 74-459-473.
- Bahns, J. (1995). There's more to listening than meets the ear (review article). *System*, 23(3), 531-537.
- Brindley, G. (1998). Assessing listening abilities. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 18, 171-191.
- Brindley, G., & Ross, S. (1997). Trait-method comparisons across three language test batteries using exploratory, MTMM and structural equation modelling approaches. Paper presented at 19th Annual Language Testing Research Colloquium. (April, Orlando, Florida).
- Brown, A. (1993). The role of test-taker feedback in the test development process: Test-takers' reactions to a tape-mediated test of proficiency in spoken Japanese. *Language Testing* 10, 277-303.
- Brown, H., D. (2001). Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983a). Teaching the spoken language. Cambridge University Press.
- Brown, H., D. (2004). Language assessment: Principles and classroom practices. NY: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Brown, H., D. (2007). Principles of language learning and teaching. New York: Pearson Education.
- Brown G., & Yule G. (1983). Teaching the Spoken Language. Chapter 3 (pp. 54-76). Cambridge: CUP.
- Buck, G. (1995). How to become a good listening teacher. In D.J. Mendelsohn, & J. Rubin (Eds.), A guide for the teaching of second language listening (pp. 113-131). San Diego, CA: Dominic Press, Inc.

- Buck, G. (2001). *Assessing Listening*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bueno, A. D., Madrid & N. McLaren, (eds). (2006). *TEFL in secondary education*. Granada: Editorial Universidad de Granada.
- Byrnes, H. (1984). The role of listening comprehension: A theoretical base. *Foreign Language Annals*, 17(4), 317-329.
- Call, M. E. (1985). Auditory short-term memory, listening comprehension, and the input hypothesis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19/4, 765-781.
- Carrell, P. L. (1988).—Interactive text processing: Implications for ESL/Second language reading classroom. In Carrell, P. L., Daniel, J., and Esley, D. E. (eds.) *Interactive approaches to second language reading*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Carrell, P., L., & Eisterhold, J., C. (1983). Schema theory and ESL reading pedagogy. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 553-573.
- Carroll, B., J. (1980). *Testing communicative performance: An interim study*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M. (1995). Discourse analysis and the teaching of listening' in G. Cook and B. Seidlhofer (eds.). *Principle and practice in applied linguistics: Studies in Honour of H. G. Widdowson*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Celce ÅMurcia, M., & L. McIntosh. (1979). *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*. Newbury House Publishers, Inc. Massachusetts.
- Chastain, K. (1971). *Developing second- language skills: Theory and practice*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing.
- Chastain, K. (1988). *Developing second language skills: Theory and practice*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Chaudron, C., & Richards, J., C. (1986). The effect of discourse markers on the comprehension of lecture. *Applied Linguistics*, 7(2), 113-127.
- Chen, H. (2007). The Relationship between EFL Learners' Self-Efficacy Beliefs and English Performance. Retrieved from <http://diginole.lib.fsu.edu/etd/3846/>
- Chen, A. H. (2009). Listening strategy instruction: Exploring Taiwanese college students' strategy development. *Asian EFL Journal*, 11(2), 54-85.
- Denes, P., B., & Pinson, E., N. (1963). *The speech chain*. New York, NY: Bell Telephone Laboratories [distributor: Williams & Wilkins Co., Baltimore].
- Dirven, R., & Oakeshott-Taylor, J. (1984). Listening comprehension (Part I). *Language Teaching* 17, 326-342.
- Ducasse, A., M. & Brown, A. (2009). Assessing paired orals: Raters' orientation to interaction. *Language Testing*, 26(3), 423-443.
- Dunkel, P. (1991). Computerized testing of non-participatory L2 listening comprehension proficiency: An ESL prototype development effort. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75(1), 64-73.
- Elkhafaifi, H. (2005). Listening comprehension and anxiety in the Arabic language classroom. *The Modern Language Journal*, 89(2), 206-220.
- Fang, X. (2008). Listening comprehension in EFL teaching. *China Foreign Language*, 6(1), 539-8080. [Online] Available: <http://www.linguist.org.cn/doc/uc200801/uc20080105.pdf> (January 15, 2010)
- Ferris, D. (1998). Students' views of academic aural/oral skills: A comparative needs analysis. *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 289-318.
- Gardner, R. (1998). Between speaking and listening: The vocalization of understandings. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(2), 204-224.
- Ghapanchi, Z., & Golparvar, E. (2012). Foreign language listening anxiety in Iranian EFL context. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 1, 16-22.
- Grunkemeyer, F. (1992). Add two cups of flour and one cup of salt. *Texas Child care* 21,(4), 25.
- Geddes, M. (1981). Listening. In K. Johnson & K. Morrow (eds.), *Communication in the classroom: Applications & methods for a communicative approach*, 78-86. Harlow: Longman.
- 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(4), 115-128. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ijel.v2n4p115>
- Gonen, M. (2009). The relationship between FL listening anxiety and foreign language listening strategies: the case of Turkish EFL learners. *Proceedings of the 5th WSEAS /IASME International Conference on Educational Technologies (EDUTE' 09)*.
- Goss, Blaine. (1982). Listening as information processing. *Communication Quarterly*, 30(4), 304-307.
- Haley, M., H., & Austin, T., Y. (2004). *Content-Based second language teaching and learning: An interactive approach*. Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Halliday, M., A., K. (1970). *Language Structure and Language Function*. In J. Lyons (ed) *New Horizons in linguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Halliday, M., A., K. (1985). *Spoken and written language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English language teaching*. Essex: Pearson Longman.
- Hohzawa, A. (1998). Listening comprehension processes of Japanese students of English as a second language (ESL): Does background knowledge really matter? Unpublished doctoral dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo.
- Jensen, C., & Hansen, C. (1995). The effect of prior knowledge on EAP listening-test performance. *Language Testing*, 12, 99-119.
- Johnson, K., & Johnson, H. (Eds.). (1988). *Encyclopedic dictionary of applied linguistics: A handbook for language teaching*. Cambridge, M.A.: Blackwell.
- Joiner, E. (1986). Listening in the foreign language, 43-70. In B. H. Wing (Ed.), *Listening, reading, and writing: Analysis and application*. Middlebury, VI: Northeast Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
- Kaplan, M., A., & Stefanopoulos, L. (1994), April. Before we get down to business: Acquiring conversational skills in a foreign language. Paper presented at the 13th Annual Conference on Languages and Communication for World Business and the Professions. Ypsilanti, MI. (ED 377718).
- Kaurate, G. (1996). Synthesis of methods for developing interactive listening skills. Retrieved from <http://www.salzburgseminar.org/ASC/csac/progs/interactive/gunta.htm>
- Kelly, C., Kelly L., Offner, M., and Vorland, B. (2002). Effective ways to use authentic materials with ESL/EFL students. *The Internet TESL Journal*, (8)11. Available at: <http://iteslj.org/Techniques/Kelly-Authentic.html>
- Kilickaya, F. (2004). Authentic materials and culture content in EFL classrooms. *The Internet ELT Journal*, 10(7).

- Krashen, S.,D. (1985).The input hypothesis.London, UK: Longman.Lee, WY-c (1995). Authenticity revisited: Text authenticity and learner authenticity', *ELT Journal*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 323-328.
- Lindsay, C., & Knight, P. (2006) *Learning and Teaching English*.Oxford: OUP.
- Little, D., Devitt S., & Singleton, D. (1988).Authentic texts in foreign language teaching, theory and practice, Dublin, Authentic.
- Liu, H. (2008). A Study of the interrelationship between listening strategy use, listening proficiency, and learning style.*ARECLS*, 8, 84-104
- Long, M. (1990). Maturation constraints on language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 12, 251-285
- Long,D.,R.(1989).Second language listening comprehension: A schema-theoretic perspective. *The Modern Language Journal*, 73, 32-40.
- Lynch T. (1995). The development of interactive listening strategies in second language academic settings. In J. Rubin and D. Mendelsohn (eds.) *A guide to teaching second language listening comprehension* (pp. 166-85). San Diego:Domine Press.
- Lynch T. (1997). Life in the slow lane: observations of a limited L2 listener. *System* 25/3: 385-398.  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0346251X97000304>.
- Lynch, T. (1998). Questions of presentation: Evaluating success in EAP seminar skills classes.*Edinburgh Working Papers in Applied Linguistics*, 9, 52-62.
- Lynch, T., & D. Mendelsohn. (2002). Listening. In N. Schmitt (ed.) *An introduction to applied linguistics*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Lynch, Tony (2009). *Teaching second language listening*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Magogwe, J., & 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.
- Markham, P.L., & Latham, M. (1987).The influence of religion-specific background knowledge on listening comprehension of adult second language students. *Language Learning*, 37, 157-170.
- Martinez,A.(2002). Authentic materials: An overview. Karen's linguistic issues. Retrieved November 20, 2003 from <http://www3.telus.net/linguisticsissues/authenticmaterials.html>.
- McNamara,T., F. & Roever, C. (2006).*Language testing: The social dimension*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Mendelsohn,D., J. (1984). There ARE strategies for listening. *TEAL Occasional Papers*, 8, 63-76.
- Mendelsohn, D.,J. (1994). Learning to listen: A strategy-based approach for the second language learner.San Diego: Domine Press.
- Meyer, R. (1984). Listen my children and you shall hear... *Foreign Language Annals* 17, 343-344.
- Morley,J.,M.(1991).Listening Comprehension in Second /Foreign Language Instruction.In Marianne Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language (Second Edition)* (pp. 81-106).New York: Newbury House.Morley, J. (1999). Current perspectives on improving aural comprehension.*ESL Magazine*, 2(1), 16-19.
- Morley,J. (2001).Aural comprehension instruction: Principles and practices. In M.Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as second or foreign language (3rd ed.)* (pp. 69-85). Boston: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Nobuko, Osada, (2004). Listening comprehension research: A brief review of the past thirty years. *Dialogue journal*, Vol, 3, pp. 53-66, ISSN 1349-5135.
- Nord, J. (1981). Three Steps Leading to Listening Fluency: A Beginning. In Harris Winitz (Ed.), *The comprehension approach to foreign language instruction*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Nunan, D. (1991). *Language teaching methodology*. UK. Prentice Hall.Nunan, D. (1997). Listening in language learning.*The language teacher*, 23 (9), 47-51.
- Nunan, D. (1998). Approaches to Teaching Listening in the Language Classroom. Paper presented at the Korea TESOL Conference, Seoul.
- Nunan,D.(1999). *Second language teaching and learning*. Boston: Heinle and HeinlePublishers.O'Malley,J.,M. & Chamot, A.,U. (1989).*Listening comprehension strategies in second language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.O'Malley,J.,M. & A.,U. Chamot. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Malley,J.,M., Chamot, A.,U., & Kupper,L. (1989). *Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition*. *Applied Linguistics*, 10 (4), 418-437.
- Oprandy, R.(1994). Listening/speaking in second and foreign language teaching. *System*, 22(2), 153- 175.
- Osada, N. (2004). *Dialogue*, Vol. 3, pp.53-66. Talk. ISSN 1349-5135.Oxford, R. (1993). Research update on L2 listening. *System*, 21, 205-211.
- Paulston, C., B., & Bruder, M. N. (1976).*Teaching English as a second language: Techniques and procedures*.Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.Peacock, M. (1997). The effect of authentic materials on the motivation of EFL learners.*ELT Journal* 51 (2), 144-156.
- Peterson, P., W. (2001). Skills and strategies for proficient listening.In M.Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as second or foreign language (3rd ed.)* (pp. 87-100). Boston: Heinle & Heinle publishers.
- Purdy, M. (1997). What is listening? In M. Purdy & D. Borisoff (Eds.),*Listening in everyday life:A personal and professional approach (2nd ed.)* (pp. 1-20). Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Purdy, M. (1991) *Listening and community: The role of listening in communityformation*. *Journal of the International Listening Association* 5, 51-67.
- Rahimi, A., & Abedini, A. (2009).The interface between EFL learners' self-efficacy concerning listening comprehension and listening proficiency. *Novitas Royal*, 3 (1), 14-28.
- Richards,C. (1983). *Listening Comprehension: Approach, Design, Procedure*. In M.H. Long & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *Methodology in TESOL* (pp. 161-176). Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.
- Richards, J.,C. (1990).*The language teaching matrix*. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge.
- Richards, J.,C. (2005). How research informs and influences teaching materials.Paper presented at the 39th Annual TESOL Convention and Exhibit, San Antonio, TX.
- Richard, J.,C. (2001). Curriculum development in language teaching. Cambridge C.U.P Richards,J. (2005). *American new interchange( 3rd ed.)*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

- Richards, J., C. (2008). *Teaching listening and speaking: From theory to practice*. Cambridge University Press. New York.
- Rivers, W.M. (1981). *Listening Comprehension: Approach Design, Procedure*. TESOL Quarterly, USA
- Rivers, W. M., & Temperley, M. S. (1978). *A practical guide to the teaching of English as a second or foreign language*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Rost, M. (1990). *Listening in language learning*. Longman: London.
- Rost, M. (2002). *Teaching and researching listening*. London: Longman.
- Rubin, J. (1994). A review of second language listening comprehension research. *Modern Language Journal* 78/2: 199-221.
- Rubin, J. (1995). An overview to a guide for the teaching of second language listening. In D. J. Mendelsohn, & J. Rubin (Eds.), *A guide for the teaching of second language listening* (pp. 7-11).
- San Diego, CA: Dominic Press, Inc.
- Rumelhan, D., E., & Ortony, A. (1977). The representation of knowledge in memory. In R. C. Anderson, R. J. Spiro, & W. E. Montague (Eds.), *Schooling and the acquisition of knowledge*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Serraj, S., & Noordin, N. (2013). Relationship among Iranian EFL students' foreign language anxiety, foreign language listening anxiety and their listening comprehension. *English Language Teaching*, 6 (5), 1-12.
- Schmidt-Rinehart, Barbara C. (1994). The effect of topic familiarity on second language listening comprehension. *Modern Language Journal*, 78 (2), 190-89.
- Schwartz, Ana Maria. (1998). *Listening in a foreign language*. Center of Applied Linguistics, Washington, DC.
- Stanovich, K., E. (1980). Toward an interactive compensatory model of individual differences in the development of reading fluency. *Reading Research Quarterly* 16, 32-71.
- Steinberg, S. (2007). *An introduction to communication studies*. Cape Town.
- Juta Swanson, C. (1996, March 14). Who is listening in the classroom? A research paradigm. Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the International Listening Association, Sacramento, CA.
- Thomas, L. (1992). Interactive listening: An examination of listening ability and gender differences in an interactive conversational context. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Listening Association (13th, Seattle, WA).
- Thompson, I., & Rubin, J. (1996). Can strategy instruction improve listening comprehension? *Foreign Language Annals*, 29 (3), 331-342.
- Tokeshi, M. (2003). *Listening comprehension processes and strategies of Japanese junior high school students in interactive settings* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Wollongong, Australia.
- Tsai, C. (2001). An investigation into English as a foreign language listening anxiety among Taiwanese senior high school students. *International Journal of Learning & Development*, 3(4), 108-113.
- Tsui, A., B., M., & Fullilove, J. (1998). Bottom-up or top-down processing as a discriminator of L2 listening performance. *Applied Linguistics* 19(4), 432-451.
- Underwood, M. (1989). *Teaching listening*. London: Longman.
- Underhill, N. (1987). *Testing spoken language: A handbook of oral testing techniques*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vandergrift, L. (1992). The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners (Doctoral dissertation). University of Alberta.
- Vandergrift, L. (1997). The comprehension strategies of second language (French) listeners: A descriptive study. *Foreign Language Annals*, 30, 387-409.
- Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: acquiring successful strategies. *ELT Journal*, 53 (3), 168-176
- Vandergrift, L. (2002). Listening: Theory and practice in modern language listening competence. Retrieved from [www.lang.ltsn.ac.uk/resources/goodpractice.aspx?resourceid=67](http://www.lang.ltsn.ac.uk/resources/goodpractice.aspx?resourceid=67).
- Vandergrift, L. (2004). Learning to listen or listening to learn? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 3-25.
- Vandergrift, L. (2007). Recent developments in second and foreign language listening comprehension research. *Language Teaching*, 40, 191-210.
- Vogely, A., J. (1998). Listening comprehension anxiety: Students' reported sources and solutions. *Foreign Language Annals*, 31, 67-80.
- Vogely, A. (1999). Addressing listening comprehension anxiety. In D. J. Young (Ed.), *Affect in Foreign Language and Second Language Learning: A Practical Guide to Creating a Low-Anxiety Classroom Atmosphere* (pp. 106-123).
- Widdowson, H. (1990). *Aspects of language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winitz, H. (1981). *The comprehension approach to foreign language instruction*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.
- Yule, G. (1991). Developing communicative effectiveness through the negotiated resolution of referential conflicts. *Linguistics and Education*, 3 (1), 31-45.