Macrothink Institute™

International Journal of Linguistics
ISSN 1948-5425
2013, Vol. 5, No. 6

The Effect of Active Learning Instruction on the Intermediate Iranian EFL Learners' Listening Self-Efficacy Beliefs

Samane Naderi (Corresponding author)

English Department, Islamic Azad University, Torbat-e Heydarieh Branch, Iran

Tel: 98-915-122-9935 E-mail: Samane.naderi61@yahoo.com

Hamid Ashraf

English Department, Islamic Azad University, Torbat-e Heydarieh Branch, Iran

Tel: 98-915-314-5037 E-mail: h.ashraf@iautorbat.ac.ir/hamid.ashraf.elt@gmail.com

Received: Sep. 29, 2013 Accepted: October 21, 2013 Published: December 8, 2013

doi:10.5296/ijl.v5i6.4349 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v5i6.4349

Abstract

The present study aimed at exploring the effects of active learning instruction of listening on the listening self-efficacy beliefs of the intermediate Iranian EFL learners; furthermore, it investigated the difference between male and female learners who had experienced active learning instruction in terms of listening self-efficacy beliefs. To homogenize the subjects, a placement test was administered. As a result, the number of participants reduced to 52 EFL learners who were distributed into control and experimental groups. At the first session, the listening self-efficacy questionnaire (Rahimi and Abedini, 2009) was applied as the pre-test. For experimental groups, active learning instruction was employed as the treatment by the use of peer teaching and four types of tasks (jigsaw task, gap filling task, graphic organizer task, and information transfer task). In the last session, the same listening self-efficacy questionnaire was applied as the post-test. The results of statistical analyses revealed that active learning instruction of listening comprehension had a significant effect on the learners' listening self-efficacy. Moreover, it was indicated that there was no significant difference in terms of listening self-efficacy between males and females of the experimental groups. The results can be useful for teacher trainers in providing some in service courses for EFL teachers to make them aware of the student-centered instruction including active learning

instruction aspects and advantages in teaching methodology.

Keywords: Active learning instruction, Task, peer teaching, Listening self-efficacy beliefs

1. Introduction

Active learning instruction is considered as a device to achieve quality; it means that in the higher education, the deep learning has changed into an effective form in learning and teaching (Haack, 2008). According to Shimazoe and Aldrich (2010) active learning has some benefits for students such as having better grades, developing deep learning of materials, promoting positive attitudes toward autonomous learning, and acquiring social skills and self-efficacy beliefs.

Self-efficacy, which is defined by social learning theorists as "a sense of confidence regarding the performance of specific tasks", has an important role in successful learning (Lorsbach and Jinks, 1999. P. 158). Bandura (1986) defined self-efficacy as "people's judgment of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required to attain designated types of performance" (p. 391). He points out two components for motivating students to learn. First, it is needed for teacher to teach the cognitive skills, which are necessary for students to learn. Second, teacher must improve learners' self-efficacy to apply these skills and ways successfully. He believes that if a learner achieves his goal his self-efficacy will be improved.

The aim of this study is, firstly, to investigate the effect of active learning instruction on the intermediate Iranian EFL learners' listening self-efficacy beliefs; and secondly, to investigate the difference in the terms of the degree of listening self-efficacy beliefs between male and female EFL learners who have experienced active learning instruction in teaching listening comprehension.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

In active learning learners have their own plan of time, they have their own goals and activities of learning process, they themselves try to assess their learning progress, they take the responsibility of learning and understanding and they think critically on the successes and errors in learning process (Simons, 1997). According to Huber (1992), on the one hand, this kind of instruction is considered threatening for some learners, they do not tend to admit the challenges and they prefer to be more passive rather than active in class. On the other hand, some teachers think that in this kind of instruction they cannot control the class appropriately; therefore, they do not like that the teaching and learning processes are organized based on the learners' inputs.

Bandura (1984) believes that students' judgments of their capability to perform some tasks and activities, that is, their self-efficacy beliefs, show their capability to actively engage in and implement such tasks and activities. In addition, he suggests that these judgments of capability mediate the influence of other effects, such as the next performance, aptitude, or previous achievement. When people believe in their capability of handling special tasks, they are more confident in performing the related activities but when people judge themselves unable in doing a certain task; they tend to avoid performing it and consider it threatening (Yang, 1999).

1.2 Research Questions

The present study investigates the following research questions:

1) Does active learning instruction of listening have any significant effect on the intermediate Iranian EFL learners' listening self-efficacy beliefs?
2) Is there any significant difference in terms of listening self-efficacy beliefs development between male and female EFL learners who have experienced active learning instruction in teaching listening comprehension?

1.3 Significance of the Study

The world is changing very fast, and learners must get familiar with the appropriate skills and knowledge needed to be successful, they should be exposed to new methods and technologies of learning from an early age to cope with modern education successfully (Prensky, 2001). Therefore, our definition of learning goes beyond just understanding of text and listening to lectures to the abilities that need more learners' engagement, taking control of their own learning process by engaging in active learning and using meta-cognitive skills (Bransford, Brown, and Cocking, 1999).

The role of Self-efficacy is obvious in teaching and learning situations (Schunk, 1985). Based on Bandura's definition (1986), in the academic situations, self-efficacy refers to personal judgment of one's capabilities to perform in certain situations or tasks that include ambiguity and new elements. This efficacy can influence motivation**.** A student with a high self-efficacy level is more confident and motivated to effort toward a certain goal while a student with a low self-efficacy level is not motivated enough and tries toward a certain goal seems difficult for him. Moreover, a student with a high self-efficacy level is more likely to select more difficult tasks, tries more, takes risk, resists longer, uses suitable problem-solving strategies on tasks, and has less stress and anxiety in performing tasks in comparison with students with a low sense of efficacy for a task (Schunk, 1989).

Therefore, the findings of this study can be significant for those teachers who tend to provide more interactive and attractive environment for learners and for those who take into account the learners' self-efficacy beliefs during learning process. In addition, the results of this study can be significant for those who are involved in enhancing learners' self-efficacy such as teacher trainers, material designers and educational organizers.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Active Learning

Meyers and Jones (1997) believe that "Active learning means that they [learners] can no longer look on with glazed eyes while their minds wonder to other thoughts" (p. 162). Active learning activities help learners to get familiar with each other better and transform passive learners into active ones in learning process, they share their values and views and they create some groups for practicing (Wenger, 1992). According to Simons (1997) active learning instruction is a useful strategy with a long history and its usefulness in improving learning process was proven by an extensive body of literature.

2.1.1 Characteristics of Active Learning

According to Keyser (2000), the important characteristics of active learning are learners' engagement in something more than just listening and improving skills during learning process rather than just transmission of knowledge. Jacobson, Mark (1995) and Sheridan (1990) also point out to several characteristics of active learning, such as satisfying various needs and learning styles of different learners; helping learners in retention of information; increasing interaction of learners with the information and each other, and finally improving learner's responsibility in learning process. Buehl (2001) believes that active learning activities take learners beyond of their books, sometimes beyond of their seats, their classroom, their school, and sometimes beyond of their familiar ways of thinking. The goal of active learning activities is changing the learners into active participants in their own learning process.

2.1.2 Related Studies of Active Learning Instruction

Wilke (2003) investigated the effect of active-learning strategies on college students' achievement, motivation, and self-efficacy in a human physiology course for non majors in a quasi-experimental. The results revealed that the experimental groups acquired significantly more content knowledge and were significantly more self-efficacious than learners in the control groups. There were no significant differences in motivation. Attitude surveys showed that learners in both the experimental and control groups indicated a positive attitude toward active learning. Kalem and Fer (2003) also investigated the effect of the active learning instruction on the learners' learning, teaching and communication processes. They used both quantitative and qualitative research methods. The findings showed that there was a positive effect of active learning instruction on the learners' learning, teaching, and communication processes. Akınoğlu and Tandoğan (2007) conducted a research in which the effect of problem-based active learning instruction in science education on learners' academic achievement and concept learning was investigated. The results indicated that the application of problem-based active learning instruction has positive effect on the learners' academic achievement, concept learning and their attitudes towards the science course.

2.2 Tasks

Prabhu (1987) considers a task as "an activity which required learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought, and which allowed teachers to control and regulate that process" (p. 17).

2.2.1 Characteristics of Tasks

According to Lee (2000), a task is "(1) a classroom activity or exercise that has: (a) an objective obtainable only by interaction among participants, (b) a mechanism for structuring and sequencing interaction, and (c) a focus on meaning exchange; (2) a language learning endeavor that requires learners to comprehend, manipulate, and/or produce the target language as they perform some sets of work plans" (p. 32).

2.2.2 Types of Tasks

Pedagogical tasks: These kinds of tasks were introduced by Richards (2001). Some examples are:

- Jigsaw tasks in which students are involved in linking different segments of information to form a whole (Richards, 2001).
- Information-gap tasks in which one learner has some information and the other one has complementary information. They exchange the segments of information ntil completing the task (Richards, 2001).
- Graphic organizers tasks: Freeman (2003) believes that these tasks are visual models of information, concepts and knowledge. In this kind of task the learners can integrate the pictures and text.
- Information transfer tasks: These tasks are involved transferring oral information to a written or visual form or vice versa, such as: "labeling a diagram, identifying an element in a picture, completing a form, or showing routes on a map." This kind of tasks includes: "Multiple-picture cued selection", "single picture cued verbal multiple choice", and "chart filling" (Brown, 2004, pp. 127-128).

Real-world tasks: This type of task was introduced by Richards (2001) as those which are important in real-world performance.

2.2.3 Related Studies of Tasks

Yang and Lin (2012) conducted the study in which the effects of writing-oriented tasks and reading-oriented tasks on learners' reading comprehension of geometry proof were investigated. The findings revealed the application of writing-oriented tasks and reading-oriented tasks has positive effect on the learners' reading comprehension of geometry proof. Cerdán, R., Abarca, E. V., Martínez, T., Gilabert, R. and Gil, G. (2009) investigated the effects of questions in high- and low-level and pre-reading of the text on performance, text recall with delay, deep comprehension of the text, and certain text-inspection parts. The results revealed that high-level questions had positive effect on deep comprehension but not on the immediate performance or text recall with delay, also it was indicated that both questions in high and low-level affected text-inspection parts differentially. *Motallebzadeh and Defaei (2013)* examined the effect of task-based listening activities on EFL learners' listening self-efficacy. The results indicated that task-based listening activities had positive effect on the intermediate EFL learners' listening self-efficacy.

2.3 Peer Teaching

According to Vygotsky (1997), in interactive peer-based learning learners interact and work in group actively to achieve an objective or performing tasks such as role plays, solving some problems, and presenting a material. He believes that in this kind of teaching and learning, learners make meaning by the use of the language and through interaction with peers.

Correa, Brugal, Valentin, Perez, and Perez-Guma (2009) state that in peer teaching the groups

work together, discuss in detail, determine duties to peers, analyze, integrate the material with other courses, and then share their findings and final conclusions with their classmates and the faculty. Faculty members evaluate learners' performance and graded their final outcomes. According to Mynard and Almarzouqi (2006) as sited in Bradford (2011), providing the chances for networking, improving self-esteem, self-confidence, and team-working skills, and promoting skills of leadership are some benefits of peer teaching. In fact, peer teaching and learning is based on the Communicative Language Teaching approach (CLT) which involves interaction and communication between peers and with the teacher (Canale & Swain, 1980).

2.3.2 Related Studies of Peer Teaching

Riazi, and Rezaii (2011) investigated the effect of peer-scaffolding on EFL learners' writing ability. The findings revealed that teacher scaffolding was more successful on enhancing the learners' writing. It was also indicated that both the teacher and peers used many different scaffolding behaviors but teacher used more such behaviors. Vasay (2010) carried out a study of peer teaching in college mathematics. The results showed that peer teaching had positive effect on the moral and intellectual values of the learners including the ability of expressing their view points, learning of concepts, resourcefulness, management of the time, cooperation, taking responsibility, interacting, self discipline, self confidence.

2.4 Self- Efficacy Beliefs

According to Bandura (1986), self-efficacy refers to "people's judgment of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required attaining designated types of performance. It is concerned not with the skills one has but with the judgments of what one can do with whatever skills one possesses" (p. 391). He mentions that self-efficacy as individuals' beliefs in their capabilities to perform a task prove to be an important variable in predicting learners' performance in doing a task (Bandura, 1986). Also he believes that the learners are usually eager to continue the tasks and activities, which they think, can do well and usually try to keep away from ones, which they believe they are not able to do effectively.

Self-efficacy is defined by Delcourt and Kinzie (1993) as "perceived self-efficacy reflects an individual's confidence in his or her ability to perform the behavior required to produce specific outcomes" (p. 36). Self-efficacy is considered as a significant source of motivation for learners (Fahim and Nasrollahi, 2013).

2.4.1 The Ways of Increasing Learner's Self-Efficacy

Pintrich and Schunk state several suggestions (as cited in Fahim and Nasrollahi, 2013) for instructors to be used for increasing the learners' self-efficacy and success:

1) Pay attention to all learners' differences.
2) In presenting the materials make sure that all learners understand them.
3) Select some materials which the learners are competently ready for.
4) Point out to the effectiveness of learning process in the life.

5) Introduce different strategies of learning to learners and ask them to evaluate the influence of using different strategies on their performance.

6) Be aware of learning process and make learners aware of it too.

7) Reward learners in their learning process accordingly.

8) Use a method of teaching and materials, which improve learners' motivation.

9) Provide learners appropriate and necessary feedback.

10) Introduce the goals of learning and keep learners aware of them during learning process.

2.4.2 Related Studies of Self-Efficacy

Ashsha, Awwad, Shalabi, and Abed (2012) investigated the impact of active learning strategies in the development of self-efficacy and academic achievement. The results of the study revealed the presence of statistically significant differences between the results of learners in the two groups of the study in self-efficacy and academic achievement, for the benefit of the experimental group. In a recent correlational study, Fahim and Nasrollahi (2013) investigated the relationship between Iranian students' self –efficacy and their critical thinking ability. The results showed that there are a strong significant and positive relationship between Iranian students' critical thinking ability and self-efficacy. It means that "the higher the students' self efficacy, the higher their critical thinking ability. Generally, the finding provides empirical support that self-efficacy should be considered for developing learners' critical thinking skills" (p. 538**).** In another study related to self-efficacy and L2 achievement, which was carried out by Barkley (2006), it was investigated whether learner's self-efficacy beliefs were predictors of their reading comprehension achievement. The findings revealed that there are significant and positive relationship between learners' self-efficacy beliefs and their reading comprehension achievement.

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants and Setting

To homogenize the participants' level of proficiency the Interchange/Passages Objective Placement Test (Lesly, Hasen and Zukowski, 2005) was administered at the beginning of the term. According to the results of the test 52 participants were selected out of 68 EFL learners. They were distributed to four classes (two control classes consist of 11 males in one class and 14 females in the other one and two experimental ones comprised12 males in one class and 15 females in another one). The educational levels of the participants varied from high school to Bachelor degree and their ages varied from 13 to 35.

3.2 Instrumentation

To achieve the purpose of this study, three instruments were applied: 1) The proficiency test, Interchange/Passages Objective Placement Test (Lesly, Hasen & Zukowski, 2005), to homogenize the participants' level of proficiency. This test is a kind multiple choice evaluation package for the intermediate level consists of 70 items in 3 parts: listening 20

items (15 minutes), reading 20 items (20 minutes), and language use 30 items (15 minutes). 2) Listening Self-efficacy questionnaire which has been constructed by Rahimi and Abedini (2009). The questionnaire comprises 20 questions in the five-interval Likert scale responses: (1) strongly disagree (2) moderately disagree (3) slightly disagree (4) moderately agree (5) strongly agree. 3) The book from which the related tasks as the treatment were chosen was Listen In, book 3 (David Nunan, 2003). This book includes listening strategies and different tasks for listening comprehension and was designed for the Intermediate level.

3.3 Procedure

Sixty eight EFL language learners in Khorasan Foreign Language Institute in Mashhad, Iran were selected for the study. At the beginning of the term, the placement and evaluation package of the interchange book (3rd Edition) was applied to homogenize the participants. In addition to administration of the placement test, the supervisor's confirmation concerning the level of learners was fulfilled to ensure the real proficiency level of learners. As a result, 52 EFL learners were selected out of 68 ones. They were distributed to four classes (two control classes consist of 11 males in one class and 14 females in the other one and two experimental ones comprised 12 males in one class and 15 females in another one). At the first session, the Listening Self-efficacy questionnaire was used as a pre-test to evaluate learners' listening Self-efficacy. The total sessions of the term was 20 ones during which for the experimental groups active learning instruction of listening comprehension was implemented as the treatment by the use of peer teaching and four types of tasks (jigsaw task, gap filling task, graphic organizer task, and information transfer task). To fulfill peer teaching practices, some students were selected voluntarily in advance to teach their classmates in appointed sessions some parts of the *Listen In, book 3* which were determined before. This assignment was done after three sessions during which the students got familiar with the book and the kind of listening instruction in the class. They were required to teach listening comprehension interactively and creatively, and they were encouraged to use different techniques and strategies to make their classmates involved actively in listening comprehension tasks. In contrast, in the control groups the traditional instruction of listening comprehension was fulfilled. This kind of instruction includes teacher-fronted instruction, repetition of listening parts, memorization, and answering to some comprehension questions, which mainly tested learners' listening comprehension, rather than teaching it. At the last session of the term, the very Listening Self-efficacy questionnaire was again applied to both the experimental and control groups as a post-test to seek the presumable variations on their listening self-efficacy because of the treatment they experienced.

4. Results

To address the research questions of the study, data collected through the posttest and the pretest and statistical analyses were applied to the data. For this purpose, (SPSS), version 19, was employed and the level of significance was set at 0.05.

In the first phase of the data analysis, Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics of the experimental and control groups in listening self-efficacy at the pre-test.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the experimental and control groups in listening self-efficacy beliefs at the pre-test

		N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Pre-test listening self-efficacy	Experimental	27	38	73	54.259	10.200
	Control	25	39	74	55.080	10.850

A Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run to ensure the normality of the distribution of the scores. The results indicated that there was normal distribution of scores in each group ($p > .05$) except for the listening self-efficacy gain scores of both experimental and control groups. ($p < .05$)

Table 2. Test of normality for the experimental and control groups in listening self-efficacy beliefs at the pre-test, post-test and gain scores

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]		
	group	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre-test self-efficacy	experimental	.099	27	.200*
	control	.120	25	.200*
Post-test self-efficacy	experimental	.093	27	.200*
	control	.112	25	.200*
gain scores for self-efficacy	experimental	.231	27	.001
	control	.233	25	.001

The distribution of scores for the experimental and control groups at the pre-test self-efficacy was normal; therefore, to compare their mean scores an independent-samples t-tests was applied.

Table 3. Independent-Samples T-Tests for the Experimental and Control Groups' Listening Self-Efficacy at the Pre-Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality						
								95% confidence interval of the Difference	
	F	sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Post-test self-efficacy Equal variances	.459	.501	.141	50	.888	.41185	2.920	-5.455	6.278

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances	t-test for Equality					
Equal variances assumed	.140	48.276	.889	.41185	2.933	-5.485	6.309
Equal variances not assumed							

The result revealed that there was no significant difference [t (50) = .141, p = .888 (two-tailed)] between the mean scores of the experimental (M=54.85, SD=9.94) and control (M=54.44, SD=11.11) groups' listening self-efficacy at pre-test. The p-value (.888) was higher than the significance level of .05 and it can be concluded that the participants are homogeneous and appropriate for a quasi-experimental research in the terms of listening self-efficacy too (p> .05).

The descriptive statistics for the experimental and control groups in listening self-efficacy at the post-test are illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics of the experimental and control groups in listening self-efficacy at post-test

		N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Post-test self-efficacy	Experimental	27	42	86	61.740	10.900
	Control	25	40	81	60.160	11.032

The descriptive statistics for the experimental and control groups in listening self-efficacy at the gain scores are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5. Descriptive statistics of the experimental and control groups in listening self-efficacy at the gain scores

		N	Min	Max	Mean	SD
Gain scores for self-efficacy	Experimental	27	0	20	7.481	6.908
	Control	25	0	20	5.080	5.484

The distribution of the experimental and control groups' listening self-efficacy scores at the post-test was normal. To compare the mean scores of these groups at the post-test, an independent-samples t-tests was conducted. The p-value (.001) was lower than the significance level of .05 (p< .05).

Table 6. Independent-Samples T-Tests for the Experimental and Control Groups' Listening

Self-Efficacy at the Post-Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality						
								95% confidence interval of the Difference	
	F	sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Post-test self-efficacy									
Equal variances assumed	1.441	.236	3.545	50	.001	9.669	2 .727	4.190	15.148
Equal variances not assumed			3.521	47.027	.001	9.669	2.746	4.144	15.194

According to the Table 6 result, there was significant difference [t (50) = 3.54, p = .001 (two-tailed)] between the mean scores of the experimental (M=65.62, SD=8.96) and control (M=55.96, SD=10.68) groups' listening self-efficacy at post-test. This difference shows that the learners of the experimental group outperformed the learners of the control group in the terms of listening self-efficacy. Therefore, the second null hypothesis of the study that active learning instruction of listening comprehension has no significant effect on the intermediate Iranian EFL learners' listening self-efficacy beliefs was rejected. The effect size, calculated via eta squared, was found to be 0.546. This shows the degree of relationship between the dependent (post-test self-efficacy listening scores) and independent (active learning instruction) variable, which is large size (Dornyei, 2007).

For comparing the mean scores of the experimental and control groups' listening self-efficacy gain scores, again Mann-Whitney U test from non- parametric tests was conducted because its distribution was non-normal too. The p-value (.000) was lower than the significance level of .05.

Table 7. Mann-Whitney U for the Experimental and Control Groups' Listening Self-Efficacy at Gain Scores.

Test Statistics[a]				
	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Self-efficacy gained scores	43.500	368.500	-5.417	.000
a. Grouping Variable: group				

The results indicate that there was significant difference [U=43.50, Z=-5.41, p=.000(two-tailed)] between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups' listening self-efficacy at gained scores (p= .000, p< .05). According to this result, it can be concluded that active learning instruction has a significant effect on the Iranian intermediate EFL learners' listening self-efficacy. The effect size was calculated and was .75 which

indicates the high degree of association between the dependent (gain scores of self-efficacy listening) and independent (active learning instruction) variable.

To address the second question of the study, first descriptive statistics of males and females of experimental groups in listening self-efficacy at the pre-test, post-test, and gained scores were displayed in table 8.

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of the Males and Females of Experimental Groups in Listening Self-Efficacy at the Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Gain Scores

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Min	Max
Pre-testself efficacy	male	12	56.000	10.072	42	73
	female	15	53.933	10.095	38	71
Post-testself efficacy	male	12	68.333	8.876	55	86
	female	15	63.466	8.716	51	81
Gain scores of self efficacy	male	12	12.333	6.005	1	20
	female	15	9.533	5.396	1	20

To ensure the normality of the scores distribution of males and females of experimental groups, a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was run. The results revealed that there was normal distribution of scores in each group ($p > .05$) except for the self-efficacy gain scores of males. ($p < .05$)

Table 9. Test of Normality for the Males and Females of the Experimental Groups in Listening Self-Efficacy at the Pre-Test, Post-Test, and Gain Scores

		Kolmogorov-Smirnov[a]		
	Gender	Statistic	df	Sig.
Pre self- efficacy	male	.167	23	.200*
	female	.127	29	.200*
Post self- efficacy	male	.182	23	.200*
	female	.142	29	.200*
gain scores for self-efficacy	male	.245	23	.044
	female	.144	29	.200*

The distribution of the male and female listening self-efficacy scores at the pre-test was normal; therefore, to compare the mean scores of these groups at the pretest-test, an independent-samples t-tests was conducted. The p-value (.601) was higher than the significance level of .05 ($p > .05$). (see Table 10).

Table 10. Independent-Samples T-Tests for the Males and Females of the Experimental Groups in Listening Self-Efficacy at the Pre-Test

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality						
								95% confidence interval of the Difference	
	F	sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed) Difference	Mean Difference	std. Error	Lower	Upper
Pre-test self-efficacy									
Equal variances assumed	.092	.765	.529	25	.601	.066	3.906	-5.978	10.111
Equal variances not assumed			.529	23.739	.602	2.066	3.905	-5.997	10.131

The result shows that there was no significant difference [t (25) = .529, p = .601 (two-tailed)] between the mean scores of the male (M=56.00, SD=10.07) and female (M=53.93, SD=10.09) listening self-efficacy at the pre-test. It can be concluded that there was no difference between male and female in the terms of their listening self-efficacy at the outset of the study.

Since the distribution of the males and females listening self-efficacy scores at the post-test was normal an independent-samples t-tests was applied. The p-value was higher than the significance level of .05 (p> .05).

Table 11. Independent-Samples T-Tests for the Males and Females of the Experimental Groups in Listening Self-Efficacy at the Post-Test

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances			t-test for Equality						
								95% confidence interval of the Difference	
	F	sig	t	df	sig. (2-tailed) Difference	Mean Difference	std. Error	Lower	Upper
Post-test self-efficacy									
Equal variances assumed	.037	.85	1.430	25	.165	4.866	3.403	-2.142	11.875
Equal variances not assumed			1.427	23.521	.167	4.866	3.410	-2.179	11.913

It showed that there was no significant difference [t (25) = 1.430, p = .165 (two-tailed)] between the mean scores of the male (M=68.33, SD=8.87) and female (M=66.46, SD=8.71) listening self-efficacy at the post-test.

Since the listening self-efficacy gain scores of the male had non-normal distribution; therefore, Mann-Whitney U test from non- parametric tests was run. The p-value (.221) was higher than the significance level of .05 (see Table 12):

Table 12. Mann-Whitney U for the Male and Female of the Experimental Group in Listening Self-Efficacy at Gain Scores

Test Statistics[a]				
	Mann-Whitney U	Wilcoxon W	Z	Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)
Self-efficacy gain scores	65.00	185.00	-1.225	.221

a. Grouping Variable: gender

According to Table 19, there was no significant difference [U=65.00, Z=-1.225, p =.221(two-tailed)] between the mean scores of the male and female listening self-efficacy at the gain scores. It can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the terms of the degree of listening self-efficacy development between male and female EFL learners of the experimental group.

5. Discussions and Conclusion

In this study the effect of active learning instruction of listening comprehension on the intermediate Iranian EFL learners' listening self-efficacy beliefs and the difference between male and female of experimental groups in the terms of their listening self-efficacy were investigated.

According to Simmons & DiStasi (2008) active learning instruction requires learners to apply various techniques of learning, improve retention of different information, and make learners interact with peer in learning process; therefore, having enough and suitable motivation and good self-beliefs has essential role in all of these processes. Self-efficacy beliefs is considered as a significant source of motivation for learners (Fahim and Nasrollahi, 2013). The present research was a further investigation in the same area.

The results of the study revealed that active learning instruction in teaching listening comprehension has significant effect on the intermediate Iranian EFL learners' listening self-efficacy; moreover, it was concluded that there is no difference in terms of listening self-efficacy between male and female EFL learners of the experimental groups.

The findings of the present study corroborate some studies conducted in the active learning areas such as: Yuretich, Khan and Leckie, 2001; Wilke, 2003; Kalem and Fer, 2003; Akınoğlu and Tandoğan, 2007; Merwin, 2003 studies in which the effects of active learning was explored on different domains. For example, Kalem and Fer (2003) investigated the effects of the active learning instruction on the learners' learning, teaching and communication processes. The results revealed that active learning instruction had positive effect on the learners' learning, teaching, and communication processes. In another study the effect of active-learning instruction was sought on enhancing learners' performance and scientific interest in the oceanography course. The results showed that active learning

instruction such as interactive activities and discussion instead of lecturing and teacher-fronted instruction in class causes learners' improvement in learning process (Yuretich, Khan and Leckie, 2001). In addition, the results of the study which was conducted by Akınoğlu and Tandoğan (2007) indicated that problem-based active learning affected positively on the students' academic achievement and even their attitudes towards the science course. Such results confirm the effectiveness of active learning instruction in different domains and prove that active learning instruction is preferable to the traditional method of teaching listening which is based on merely asking and answering questions. There are many Reasons for Active Learning Instruction effectiveness such as: providing Enjoyable learning process for learners and teachers (House, 2009), helping learners keep knowledge in their mind for a longer time (Mabry, 1995), transforming passive learners into active ones in learning process (Wenger, 1992), learners' involvement in learning process (Bonwell and Eison ,1991; Prince, 2004; Keyser , 2000), provoking critical Thinking (Simons, 1997), motivation raising , more focus on the learners' attitudes and values exploration, providing the possibility of immediate feedback from peers and instructor and higher level of thinking includes: analysis, evaluation, and synthesis.

This study implies some Pedagogical Implications: 1) For teachers to become aware of different aspects and benefits of active learning instruction in providing enjoyable and attractive environment for teaching listening comprehension and helping learners believe in their capabilities 2) For learners to get familiar with each other better and transform from passive learners into active ones in learning process, they can share their values and views and they can create some groups for practicing (Wenger, 1992). 3) For material developers and teacher trainers in providing some in service courses for EFL teachers to make them aware of the student-centered instruction including active learning instruction aspects and advantages in teaching methodology. 4) For syllabus designers, supervisors and managers of the language institutions to include active leaning instruction in the materials and syllabus.

The researchers faced some limitations in conducting this study such as: shortage of the time to include all aspects and activities of active learning instruction, small sample size of the participants, various ages of the participants, their different personal variables and their different educational background. This study investigated the effect of active learning instruction of listening on the listening self-efficacy beliefs of the intermediate Iranian EFL learners, in other researches the effect of active learning instruction can be investigated on the other learners' psychological characteristics such as learners' autonomy, self-confidence, Motivation, etc. The same study can be done at high schools and universities to see whether the same results will be achieved or not and the study can be replicated with different ages and levels of language proficiency.

References

Akınoğlu, O., & Tandoğan, R. Ö. (2007). The effects of problem-based active learning in science education on students' academic achievement, attitude and concept learning. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education, 3*(1), 71-81.

Ashsha, I., Awwad, F. A., Shalabi, E., & Abed, E. (2012). The impact of active learning

strategies in the development of self-efficacy and academic achievement among ESF students of UNRWA. *Damascus University Journal*, *28*(1), 519-542.

Bandura, A. (1984). Recycling misconceptions of perceived self-efficacy. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 8*, 231–255.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bonwell, C. C., & Eison, J. A. (1991). *Active learning: Creating excitement in the classroom.* ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 1. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University.

Bradford-Watts, K. (2011). *Students teaching students? Peer teaching in the EFL classroom in Japan. The Language Teacher*, *35*(5), 31-35

Bransford, J., Brown, A., & Cocking, R. (Eds.) (1999). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school.* Washington, D.C.: National Research Council.

Brown, H. Douglas. (2004). *Language assessment principles and classroom practices.* White plains, NY: Pearson Education.

Buehl, D. (2001). *Classroom Strategies for Interactive Learning* (2nd ed.)。 Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language testing and teaching. *Applied Linguistics*, *1*(1), 1-47.

Cerdán, R., Abarca, E. V., Martínez, T., Gilabert, R., & Gil, G. (2009). Impact of question-answering tasks on search processes and reading comprehension. *Learning and Instruction 19*(1), 13–27.

Correa, R., Brugal, Y., Valentin, L., Perez, J., & Perez-Guma, J. (2009). Peer- teaching: An effective learning experience? *Puerto Rico Health Science Journal*, *28*(1).

Delcourt, M. A. B., & Kinzie. M. B. (1993). Computer technologies in teacher education: The measurement of attitudes and self-efficacy. *Journal of Research and Development in Education, 27*(1), 35-41.

Dornyei, Z. (2007). Quantitative data analysis. *Research methods in applied linguistics: Qualitative, Quantitative, and mixed methodologies.* Oxford University Press, New York.

Fahim, M., & Nasrollahi, M. A. (2013). The relationship between Iranian EFL students' self-efficacy beliefs and critical thinking ability. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 3*(3), 538-543.

Freeman, G. (2003). Index graphic organizers. Retrieved November 28, 2012, from http://www.graphic.org/goindex.html

Haack, K. (2008). UN studies and the curriculum as active learning tool. *International Studies Perspectives, 9*(4), 395–410.

House, J. Daniel. (2009). Effects of classroom instructional strategies and self-Beliefs on science achievement of elementary schools students in Japan: Results from the TIMSS 2003 Assessment. *Education, 129*(2), 259-264.

Huber, G. L. (1992). *European perspectives on co-operative learning.* Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the International Association for the Study of Cooperation in Education, Utrecht.

Jacobsen, R. E., & Mark, B. E. (1995). Teaching in the information age: Active learning techniques to empower students. *Reference Librarian, 24*(51-52), 105- 120.

Kalem, S., & Fer, S. (2003). The effects of the active learning model on students' learning, teaching and communication. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 3* (2), 455-461.

Keyser, M. (2000). Active learning and cooperative learning: Understanding the difference and using both styles effectively. *Research Strategies, 17*(1), 35-44.

Lee, J. (2000). *Tasks and Communicating in Language Classrooms*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lorsbach, A.W. & Jinks, J. L. (1999). Self-efficacy theory and learning environment research. *Learning Environment Research, 2*, 157-167.

Mabry, C. H. (1995). Using cooperative learning principles in BI. *Research Strategies, 13*(3), 182-185.

Meyers, C., & Jones, T. B. (1993). Developing and assessing instructional expertise'. *Promoting active learning*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Motallebzadeh, K., & Defaei, S. (2013). *T*he effect of task-based listening activities on improvement of listening self-efficacy among Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *International Journal of Linguistics, 5*(2), 24-33.

Prabhu, N. S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prensky, M. (2001). Digital natives, digital immigrants, *On the Horizon*, *9*(5), 1-9.

Prince, M. (2004). Does active learning work: A review of the research. *Journal of Engineering Education, 93*(3), 223-232.

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

Riazi, M., & Rezaii, M. (2011). Teacher- and peer-scaffolding behaviors: Effects on EFL students' writing improvement. In A. Feryok (Ed.), CLESOL 2010: Proceedings of the 12thNational Conference for Community Languages and ESOL (pp. 55-63). Retrieved November, 2012, from http://www.tesolanz.org.nz/

Richards, J. C. (2001). *Curriculum development in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schunk, (1989). Self-efficacy and cognitive skill learning. In C. Ames, & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education: Goals and cognition*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Schunk, D. H. (1985). Participation in goal setting: Effects on self-efficacy and skills of learning-disabled children. *The Journal of Special Education, 19*(3) 307-317.

Sheridan, J. (1990). The reflective librarian: Some observations on bibliographic instruction in the academic library, *The Journal of Academic Librarianship. 16*, 22-26.

Shimazoe, J., & Aldrich, H. (2010). Group work can be gratifying: Understanding and overcoming resistance to cooperative learning. *College Teaching, 58*, 52-57.

Simmons, K., & DiStasi, A. (2008). Active learning techniques: Engaging students on the road to success. *Athletic Therapy Today, 13*(6), 6-8.

Simons, P. R. J. (1997). Definitions and theories of active learning. In Stern, D., & Huber, G. L. (Eds.), *Active learning for students and teachers: Reports from eight countries.* Frankfurt & New York: Peter Lang.

Vasay, E.T. (2010). The effects of peer teaching in the performance of students of mathematics. *E International Scientific Research Journal, 2*(2), ISSN 2094-1749.

Vygotsky, L. (1997). *Thought and language*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Wenger, E. (1998*) Communities of practice: learning, meaning, and identity.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Wilke, R. R. (2003). The effect of active learning on student characteristics in a human physiology course for non-majors. *Advances in Physiology Education, 27*(4), 207-223.

Yang, K. L., & Lin, F. L. (2012). Effects of reading-oriented tasks on students' reading comprehension of geometry proof. *Mathematics Education Research Journal, 24*(2), 215-238.

Yang. N. D. (1999). The relationship between EFL learners' beliefs and learning strategy use. *System, 27*, 515-35.

Yuretich, R. F., Kahn, S. A., Leckie, R. M., & Clement, J. J. (2001). Active learning methods to improve student performance and scientific interest in a large-scale oceanography course. *Journal of Geoscience Education, 49*(2), 111-119.