

Listening Assessment Task Types, Time-on-Task, and the Use of Listening Strategies among Iranian EFL Learners

Rahele Khosravi¹ , Nasibeh Bagherpour² , Kaveh Jalilzadeh³ 

¹ M.A., Department of English Language and Literature, Faculty of Language and Literature, University of Kurdistan, Sanandaj, Iran, Email: rahelekhosravi52@gmail.com

² *Corresponding author*, Assistant Professor, English Department, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran, E-mail: bagherpour.ns@gmail.com

³ Instructor, School of Foreign Languages, Istanbul University Cerrahpasa, Istanbul, Turkey, E-mail: kaveh.j@iuc.edu.tr

Abstract

This study aimed to investigate the relationship between listening assessment task types, time on task, and the use of listening strategy by Iranian EFL learners. For this purpose, a group of 44 Iranian EFL students (Males and Females; 14 to 25 years old) selected through convenience sampling from an English language institute in Sanandaj participated in this study. Then, they were randomly assigned into four experimental groups. In one group, note-taking was considered the listening assessment task, while in the second group oral reproduction was specified as the assessment task for assessing listening comprehension. After that, each group was further subdivided randomly into a shorter time-on-task group (20 minutes) and a longer time-on-task group (40 minutes). Next, all groups completed Vandergrift, Goh, Mareschal, and Tafaghodtari's (2006) Meta-cognitive Awareness Listening Strategy Questionnaire. A two-way ANOVA was run to examine the effects of both listening assessment task type and time on task on listening strategy use among the four groups. The results revealed that the students in the oral reproduction task with high time on task group significantly showed higher preferences for choosing Planning-Evaluation, Mental Translation, and Problem-Solving strategies and those in the note-taking with low time on task group preferred the Directed-Attention strategy, while those in the note-taking with high time on task group preferred Person-Knowledge strategy.

Keywords: listening assessment task, time-on-task, listening strategy, listening strategy use

1. Introduction

The neglect of the listening skill can be attributed to the commonly-held belief that exposure to spoken speech is sufficient for the improvement of L2 learners' listening comprehension (Carter & Nunan, 2001). Task-based language teaching (TBLT) as an offspring of the communicative movement in language teaching is widely recognized by scholars in the field (e.g., Brown, 2007; Ellis, 2003; Skehan, 2003), and Ur (1984) emphasizes the use of task-based instruction for teaching the listening skill because she believes that task-based instruction improves listening comprehension by engaging students in real-life-like activities and experiences and encouraging real processing of language while being centered on the negotiation of meaning through the target language.

Time-on-task refers to the amount of time students spend attending to school-related tasks (Prater, 1992). Prater (1992) distinguishes between three types of classroom time and maintains that Classroom time may be divided into three types: Allocated time, time-on-task, and engaged-learning time. Allocated time is the amount of time scheduled for instruction, time-on-task refers to the number of time students spend attending to school-related tasks, and engaged learning time is the number of time students spend attending to relevant instructional activities (Prater, 1992).

Previous research suggests that there is a high correlation between student achievement and the time teachers allocate to instruction (e.g., Wittrock, 1986). The more time teachers spend instructing, the more their students achieve. However, as Wittrock (1986, p. 289) asserts, "The students' constructive use of the time, not the time per se, affects learning and achievement". Teachers who successfully keep students actively engaged during group or seatwork tasks achieve higher levels of class performance than teachers who do not maintain similarly high levels of task involvement (Englert & Thomas, 1982).

Furthermore, it seems that assessment significantly influences study habits, teaching methods and activities, and the rate and amount of learning. For example, Alderson and Wall (1993) refer to the washback effect of language tests and testing. Also, different instruction and assessment techniques seem to differentially raise language learners' consciousness and alertness towards the learning points in language input which has been greatly emphasized in the literature (e.g., Schmidt, 1990). Similarly, considerable significance has been attached to the role of learning strategies used by language learners in their learning of a second language (O'malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990) especially listening strategies (Vandergrift, 1999). Attesting to the importance of such teaching-learning components as task type, engagement, and time-on-task in influencing second language learners' learning and achievement, the question that comes to mind is whether they are interrelated in any way and whether we can predict one by measuring the other. These questions constitute an essential part of the future inquiry in the area of second language learning and development.

As stated above, the literature on second language acquisition recognizes the significance of the number of time learners spend on the learning tasks and activities and of the role of assessment techniques for their consciousness-raising effect in the process of learning a second language. Furthermore, it was

mentioned that learning strategies make up an important part of a learner's repertoire of strategies that determine his ultimate success in learning a second language. The interrelationships among these variables have somewhat been investigated with reference to other language skills especially the writing skill (e.g., Ahmad Kord, 2018; Birjandi & Malmir, 2009; Ghavamnia et al., 2013; Salimi, et al., 2012). However, there seems to be little research, if any, investigating the relationship between assessment task types and time-on-task and the development of listening comprehension by EFL students. Therefore, in line with these theoretical and empirical premises about the role of assessment and time-on-task in learning, and considering the significance of learning strategies as an integral component determining students' learning, the present study has aimed at investigating whether there is any significant relationship between listening assessment task types and time on task on the one hand and the use of listening strategy by EFL learners on the other hand.

2. Research Questions

This study has particularly aimed at answering the following questions.

1. Does listening assessments task type (note-taking and oral reproduction) influence the listening strategy used by EFL learners?
2. Does time-on-task (ToT) interact with listening assessment task type in influencing listening strategy use by EFL learners?

3. Method

3.1. Participants

For the purpose of conducting this research project, a group of 50 EFL learners (both male and female, 26 and 24 learners, respectively) were recruited based on convenience sampling. They were studying English at two language institutions across the city of Sanandaj. Co-ordinations were made with the principals of the institutions to select learners with a congruent language proficiency background. To this end, the learners who were at the same level of proficiency according (pre-intermediate level) to the placement standards of the institutions and were studying the same coursebook were included in the design of the study. However, to make sure that they were really homogeneous in their background language proficiency, they were given the Oxford Placement Test (OPT) as a measure of their general English proficiency. Fortunately, they turned out to be at the same level of general English proficiency except for 4 learners whose total scores on the OPT did not fall within one standard deviation above and below the group mean. Those 4 learners were excluded from the study until a number of 46 learners (24 male and 22 female) remained. But, two of the learners (1 male and 1 female) refused to participate in the study. Therefore, the final number of the learners who agreed to be the participants of the study turned out to be 44 (23 male and 21 female). In addition to general English proficiency, their scores in the listening comprehension subsection

were cross-compared which indicated that they were homogeneous in their listening skill as well. Finally, they were randomly divided into two groups as follows: one experimental group with note-taking as the listening assessment task and another one with oral reproduction as the listening assessment task. Next, each of these two groups was subdivided into two groups as follows: one subgroup as the Low Time-on-Task (ToT) and the second subgroup as the High Time-on-Task subgroup. Consequently, there were four groups as follows.

- 1) Note-taking, Low ToT Group (including 11 students, 6 male and 5 female)
- 2) Note-taking, High ToT Group (including 11 students 6 male and 5 female)
- 3) Oral Reproduction Low ToT Group (including 11 students 6 male and 5 female)
- 4) Oral Reproduction High ToT Group (including 11 students 5 male and 6 female)

3.2. Instrumentation

The book *Tactics for Listening* was used as the coursebook for teaching listening comprehension in both language institutions. The Oxford Placement Test (OPT) was used to measure the participants' general English proficiency prior to the experiment. To assess the participants' use of listening strategies, the (2006) Meta-cognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire constructed by Vandergrift et al. (2006) was employed. It comprises 21 items each rated on a 6-point Likert scale (1=strongly disagree up to 6=strongly agree). The items totally measure 5 discrete categories as follows. The Planning-Evaluation Strategies category is measured by items 1, 10, 14, 20 and 21; the Directed-Attention Strategies category is measured by items 2, 6, 12 and 16; the Person-Knowledge Strategies category is measured by items 3, 8 and 15; the Mental-Translation Strategies category is measured by items 4, 11 and 18; and finally the Problem-Solving Strategies category is measured by items 5, 7, 9, 13, 17 and 19. The reliability of this questionnaire was estimated using Chronbach's Alpha which was 0.87.

3.3. Design

Based on the idea proposed by Mackey and Gass (2005), who state that to test the relationship between or among variables and make predictions about such relationships among variables, research studies are called correlational studies, the present study has been a correlational method study conducted following the *ex-post facto* design. As this study has aimed at examining the relationship between listening assessment task types and ToT on the one hand and the use of listening strategies by Iranian EFL students, on the other hand, listening assessment task types and ToT were the independent variables as the use of listening strategies as was the dependent variable.

3.4. Data Collection Procedure

First, the research participants were selected, homogenized, and randomly assigned to four experimental groups. One experimental group was specified as the group whose listening comprehension

was assessed through note-taking as the assessment task with 20 minutes ToT. The second experimental group was defined as the group whose listening comprehension was assessed through note-taking as the assessment task with 40 minutes ToT. The third group was specified as the group whose listening comprehension was assessed through oral reproduction with 20 minutes ToT. The fourth group was the group whose listening comprehension was assessed through oral reproduction with 40 minutes ToT. Then, they were made familiar with listening strategies that second language learners usually employ while listening to target language aural input by the researchers who were the instructors. Finally, they filled out Vandergrift et al.'s (2006) Meta-cognitive Awareness Listening Questionnaire to assess their use of the listening strategies. In order to probe the relationship between listening assessment task types, ToT, and the use of listening strategies, a number of statistical analyses were done on the data collected from the participants.

3.5. Data Analysis

The reliability of the listening strategies questionnaire was checked by calculating Chronbach's Alpha. To answer both research question and test the corresponding research hypotheses about the effect of listening assessment task type and time-on-task on the use of listening strategies by Iranian EFL students, a two-way ANOVA was run.

4. Results

To test both research hypotheses of this study, the scores of the four groups on Vandergrift et al.'s (2006) listening strategy use questionnaire were compared through a two-way ANOVA. The results are presented in the following statistical tables below.

Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics of the Participants between-Subjects Factors

		Value Label	N
Task type	1	Or Rep	22
	2	Note-taking	22
ToT	1	high ToT	22
	2	low ToT	22

Table 4.1 shows the grouping of the participants and the corresponding numbers of each group.

Table 4.2

Normality of the Scores

Strategy Categories	ToT	Kolmogorov-Smirnov		
		Statistic	df	Sig.
Planning-Evaluation	high ToT	.263	22	.096
	low ToT	.151	22	.200 [*]
Directed-Attention	high ToT	.135	22	.200 [*]
	low ToT	.172	22	.088
Mental Translation	high ToT	.233	22	.083
	low ToT	.228	22	.074
Person-Knowledge	high ToT	.212	22	.110
	low ToT	.135	22	.200 [*]
Problem-Solving	high ToT	.196	22	.087
	low ToT	.134	22	.200 [*]

Table 4.2 demonstrates the normality of the scores obtained from the different categories of listening strategies. All the obtained scores were normally distributed, which satisfied the normality assumption underlying the two-way ANOVA.

Table 4.3

Descriptive Statistics of the Planning-Evaluation Strategy

Dependent Variable: Planning-Evaluation Strategy				
Task type	ToT	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Or Rep	high ToT	58.91	2.914	11
	low ToT	23.18	9.282	11
	Total	41.05	19.478	22
Note-taking	high ToT	23.18	9.506	11
	low ToT	17.91	5.665	11
	Total	20.55	8.099	22
Total	high ToT	41.05	19.529	22
	low ToT	20.55	7.975	22
	Total	30.80	18.023	44

Table 4.3 displays the descriptive statistics on the Planning-Evaluation strategy for the four groups, including the mean, standard deviation, and a number of participants in each group. The results indicated that the highest mean for planning-evaluation strategy (58.91) belongs to the Oral Reproduction/High ToT group.

Table 4.4

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

F	df1	df2	Sig.
4.47	3	40	.08

As indicated in Table 4.4, there was no significant difference between error variances, which justifies the use of two-way ANOVA ($F(3, 40)=4.47, P>.05$). To check the data in the Table for comparing between-group differences, a between-subjects test was performed. The results are presented in Table 4.4 as follows.

Table 4.5

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Planning-Evaluation Strategy						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	11796.068	3	3932.023	72.443	.000	.845
Intercept	41727.841	1	41727.841	768.790	.000	.951
Task type	4622.750	1	4622.750	85.169	.000	.680
ToT	4622.750	1	4622.750	85.169	.000	.680
Task type *ToT	2550.568	1	2550.568	46.991	.000	.540
Error	2171.091	40	54.277			
Total	55695.000	44				
Corrected Total	13967.159	43				

a. R Squared=.845 (Adjusted R Squared=.833)

As shown in table 4.5, two-way ANOVA indicated that there was a statistically significant interaction effect for task type and time on the task [$F(1, 40)=46.991, p<.001$], and the effect size was large (partial eta squared=.540). Considering the mean scores in Table 4.3 above, it can be argued that the highest mean for the Planning-Evaluation strategy belongs to the Oral Reproduction listening assessment task types combined with high time on task. Therefore, the two independent variables interacted in influencing this category of listening strategies.

The main effects for each independent variable separately were also significant, but, due to the significance of the task type*time-on-task interaction effect, these main effects will not be taken into further consideration.

Table 4.6*Descriptive Statistics of the Directed-Attention Strategy*

Dependent Variable: Directed-Attention Strategy				
Task type	ToT	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Oral Rep.	high ToT	17.73	4.407	11
	low ToT	24.82	8.987	11
	Total	21.27	7.802	22
Note-taking	high ToT	13.27	2.453	11
	low ToT	56.82	6.765	11
	Total	35.05	22.832	22
Total	high ToT	15.50	4.160	22
	low ToT	40.82	18.123	22
	Total	28.16	18.244	44

Table 4.6 shows the descriptive statistics on the Directed-Attention strategy for the four groups, including the mean, standard deviation, and the number of participants in each group. As shown in Table 4.6, the highest mean on this strategy (56.82) belongs to the Note-Taking/Low ToT group.

Table 4.7*Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances*

F	df1	df2	Sig.
4.07	3	40	.07

As Table 4.7 indicates, there was no significant difference between error variances, which justifies the use of two-way ANOVA ($F(3, 40)=4.07, P>.05$). To check the data in the Table for comparing between-group differences, a between-subjects test was performed. The results are presented in Table 4.8 as follows.

Table 4.8*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

Dependent Variable: Directed-Attention						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	12792.250 ^a	3	4264.083	112.240	.000	.894
Intercept	34889.114	1	34889.114	918.354	.000	.958
Task type	2086.568	1	2086.568	54.923	.000	.579
ToT	7051.114	1	7051.114	185.600	.000	.823
Task type * ToT	3654.568	1	3654.568	96.196	.000	.706
Error	1519.636	40	37.991			
Total	49201.000	44				
Corrected Total	14311.886	43				

a. R Squared=.894 (Adjusted R Squared=.886)

As indicated in table 4.8, the results of the two-way ANOVA suggest that there was a statistically significant interaction effect for task type and time on task on using the Directed-Attention strategy by the relevant group [$F(1, 40)=96.196, p<.001$], and the effect size was large (partial eta squared=.706). With reference to the mean scores in Table 4.6 above, it could be claimed that the highest mean for the Directed-Attention strategy belongs to the Note-Taking listening assessment task types coupled with low time on task. Therefore, the two independent variables interacted in influencing this category of listening strategies. Again, the main effects for each independent variable in isolation were significant, but, as the priority in such circumstances is the interaction effect of both independent variables (which was the case here), their main effects should not be considered.

Table 4.9*Descriptive Statistics of the Mental Translation Strategy*

Dependent Variable: Mental Translation				
Task type	ToT	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Oral Rep.	high ToT	58.82	4.355	11
	low ToT	18.82	6.615	11
	Total	38.82	21.188	22
Note-taking	high ToT	19.45	4.886	11
	low ToT	21.45	8.618	11
	Total	20.45	6.913	22
Total	high ToT	39.14	20.645	22
	low ToT	20.14	7.618	22
	Total	29.64	18.134	44

Table 4.9 shows the descriptive statistics of the Mental Translation strategy for the four groups, including the mean, standard deviation, and the number of participants in each group. As shown in Table 4.9, the highest mean for this strategy (58.82) belongs to the Oral reproduction/High ToT group.

Table 4.10*Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances*

F	df1	df2	Sig.
1.603	3	40	.204

Table 4.10 indicates that there was no significant difference between error variances, which justifies the use of two-way ANOVA ($F(3, 40)=1.603, P>.05$). To check the data in Table for comparing between-group differences, a between-subjects test was performed. The results are presented in Table 4.11 below.

Table 4.11*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects*

Dependent Variable: Mental Translation						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	12531.455 ^a	3	4177.152	103.862	.000	.886
Intercept	38645.818	1	38645.818	960.904	.000	.960
Task type	3709.455	1	3709.455	92.233	.000	.698
ToT	3971.000	1	3971.000	98.736	.000	.712
Task type * ToT	4851.000	1	4851.000	120.617	.000	.751
Error	1608.727	40	40.218			
Total	52786.000	44				
Corrected Total	14140.182	43				

a. R Squared=.886 (Adjusted R Squared=.878)

Table 4.11 shows the results of a two-way ANOVA for comparing the scores of all four groups on the Mental Translation strategy, indicating a statistically significant interaction effect for task type and time-on-task on using this strategy by the relevant group [$F(1, 40)=120.617, p< .001$], and the effect size was large (partial eta squared=.751). With reference to the mean scores in Table 4.9 above, it is clearly understood that the highest mean for the Mental Translation strategy was obtained by the Oral Reproduction/High ToT group. Therefore, the two independent variables interacted in influencing this category of listening strategies. The same with previous analyses, the main effects for each independent variable in isolation were significant, but, as the priority in such circumstances is the interaction effect of both independent variables (which was the case here), their main effects should not be considered.

Table 4.12*Descriptive Statistics of the Person Knowledge Strategy*

Dependent Variable: Person Knowledge				
Task type	ToT	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Oral Rep.	high ToT	21.00	8.343	11
	low ToT	25.18	8.577	11
	Total	23.09	8.530	22
Note-taking	high ToT	59.82	4.167	11
	low ToT	22.64	10.230	11
	Total	41.23	20.498	22
Total	high ToT	40.41	20.882	22
	low ToT	23.91	9.304	22
	Total	32.16	18.024	44

Table 4.12 shows the descriptive statistics of the Person Knowledge strategy for the four groups, including the mean, standard deviation, and number of participants in each group. As shown in Table 4.12, the highest mean on this strategy (59.82) belongs to the Note-Taking/High ToT group.

Table 4.13*Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances*

F	df1	df2	Sig.
2.540	3	40	.07

Table 4.13 indicates that there was no significant difference between error variances, which justifies the use of two-way ANOVA ($F(3, 40)=2.540, P > .05$). To check the data in the Table for comparing between-group differences, a between-subjects test was performed. The results are presented in Table 4.14 below.

Table 4.14*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Person Knowledge)*

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable: Person Knowledge						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	11318.068 ^a	3	3772.689	56.907	.000	.810
Intercept	45505.114	1	45505.114	686.399	.000	.945
Task type	3618.205	1	3618.205	54.577	.000	.577
ToT	2994.750	1	2994.750	45.173	.000	.530
Task type * ToT	4705.114	1	4705.114	70.972	.000	.640
Error	2651.818	40	66.295			
Total	59475.000	44				
Corrected Total	13969.886	43				

a. R Squared=.810 (Adjusted R Squared=.796)

Table 4.14 shows the results of a two-way ANOVA for comparing the scores of all four groups on the Person Knowledge strategy, indicating a statistically significant interaction effect for task type and time-on-task on using this strategy by the relevant group [$F(1, 40)=70.972, p < .001$], and the effect size was large (partial eta squared=.640). A glance at the mean scores in Table 4.12 above will indicate that the highest mean for the Person Knowledge strategy was obtained by the Note-Taking/High ToT group. Therefore, the two independent variables interacted in influencing this category of listening strategies. As was the case with other components of listening strategies, the main effects for both listening assessment task type and time-on-task by themselves on using this strategy were significant, but, when there is a significant interaction effect, the main effects will not be of concern.

Table 4.15*Descriptive Statistics of the Problem-Solving Strategy*

Dependent Variable: Problem-Solving Strategy				
Task type	ToT	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Oral Rep.	high ToT	56.73	5.689	11
	low ToT	21.82	11.754	11
	Total	39.32	20.051	22
Note-taking	high ToT	21.18	12.719	11
	low ToT	23.82	6.210	11
	Total	22.50	9.860	22
Total	high ToT	39.00	20.617	22
	low ToT	22.82	9.231	22
	Total	30.91	17.781	44

Table 4.15 shows the descriptive statistics of the Person Knowledge strategy for the four groups, including the mean, standard deviation, and the number of participants in each group. As Table 4.12 indicates, the highest mean for this strategy (56.73) belongs to the Oral Reproduction/High ToT group.

Table 4.16*Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances*

F	df1	df2	Sig.
4.202	3	40	.068

Table 4.19 indicates that there was no significant difference between error variances, which justifies the use of two-way ANOVA ($F(3, 40)=4.202, P>.05$). To check the data in the Table for comparing between-group differences, a between-subjects test was performed. The results are presented in Table 4.17 below.

Table 4.17*Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Problem-Solving)*

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects						
Dependent Variable: Problem-Solving Strategy						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	9887.091 ^a	3	3295.697	35.547	.000	.727
Intercept	42036.364	1	42036.364	453.400	.000	.919
Task type	3111.364	1	3111.364	33.559	.000	.456
ToT	2880.364	1	2880.364	31.067	.000	.437
Task type * ToT	3895.364	1	3895.364	42.015	.000	.512
Error	3708.545	40	92.714			
Total	55632.000	44				
Corrected Total	13595.636	43				

a. R Squared=.727 (Adjusted R Squared=.707)

Table 4.17 shows the results of a two-way ANOVA for comparing the scores of all four groups on the Problem-Solving strategy, indicating a statistically significant interaction effect for task type and time-on-task on using this strategy by the relevant group [$F(1, 40)=42.015, p<.001$], and the effect size was large (partial eta squared=.512). A glance at the mean scores in Table 4.15 above will indicate that the highest mean for the Person Knowledge strategy was obtained by the Oral Reproduction/High ToT group. Therefore, the two independent variables interacted in influencing this category of listening strategies. Similar to other components of listening strategies, the main effects for both listening assessment task type and time-on-task by themselves on using this strategy were significant, but, when there is a significant interaction effect, the main effects need not be considered for further analysis

5. Discussion and Conclusion

Inspired by the assumed significance of assessment task type and the amount of time spent by learners on particular listening tasks, this study aimed to investigate whether the type of tasks used for assessing language learners' listening comprehension and the amount of time they are given to perform on these tasks would influence the listening strategies that they employ while they are dealing with listening comprehension tasks.

Generally, the results indicated that the students who were required to take notes while listening to audio input with shorter periods of time to perform the listening tasks preferred to rely on the Directed-Attention category of listening strategies, while those with the same assessment requirement but with higher time on task made significantly more use of the Person-Knowledge category of listening strategies. The first finding might be indicating that while taking notes based on the listening materials with a shorter time on the task, the students have to resort to their ability to direct their attention as distinctively as possible on the most important pieces of materials which are significant for comprehending the listening texts or accomplishing a task based on them. That is, note-taking in itself rests on one's ability to extract the relevant pieces of information from an audio or visual text. To do so, they have to concentrate as much as possible in order to grasp the most important ideas and details, an act which is dependent on one's ability to control one's deliberate attention and concentration on something.

The second finding of the relationship between note-taking with longer periods of time on task can be justified by saying that when learners have adequate time for doing a listening task, they feel safe and free to resort to their personal background knowledge to decipher the audio input they are listening to. In other words, in situations where there is less time to be spent on doing a task, the learners have to exclusively rely on the linguistic clues in the text itself rather than referring back to their conceptual schemata to comprehend the newly arriving information through relating it to what they already know.

Another finding was that learners who were required to orally reproduce what they had heard with higher time on task preferred to make use of the Planning-Evaluation category of listening strategies. This could be interpreted by saying that, to be able to orally reproduce a piece of linguistic input especially when

there is more time at their disposal, learners should make as much planning as they can so that they would be able to make the right decisions about what to reproduce and how best to reproduce it. In addition to the planning component, they would also have to evaluate the extent to which they have succeeded in accomplishing the tasks efficiently. Therefore, inherent in the nature of oral reproduction as a listening assessment task type coupled with higher time on task is the use of planning and evaluation, which was endorsed by the findings of this study.

Still, a further finding was that oral reproduction together with high time on task encouraged the learners' inclination to use the Mental Translation and Problem-Solving categories of listening strategies. The first part can support the theoretical assumption that when learners have to reproduce an audio text while they are enjoying sufficient time to do the task, they naturally and unconsciously refer to the mother tongue translation of, at least, some parts of the target language text in order to better and more easily understand and remember what they have been hearing and reproduce it in their own language. However, if the same assessment task is combined with less time on task, probably the learners do not have enough time to mentally translate the original message into their first language, because their attentional resources are directed to extracting the main ideas and reproducing them in their own words. The latter part of the finding can also mean that oral reproduction of an original audio text is a demanding task that should be regarded as a problem if there is enough time. So, this finding is naturally and logically grounded because it provides evidence for the same idea.

This study endorses some other previous studies which have addressed similar issues. For example, the b study resembles Ahmad Kord's (2018) study that examined the effect of task complexity and strategic planning time on the writing accuracy of undergraduate EFL learners and showed a significant effect of task complexity under different planning conditions on accuracy as defined in terms of grammatically correct clauses and verb forms. Shabani et al.'s (2018) study also support these findings.

This study endorses some other previous studies which have addressed similar issues. For example, the b study resembles Ahmad Kord's (2018) study that examined the effect of task complexity and strategic planning time on the writing accuracy of undergraduate EFL learners and showed a significant effect of task complexity under different planning conditions on accuracy as defined in terms of grammatically correct clauses and verb forms.

The study also somewhat echoes the finding obtained by Nasirian (2012) who tested the relationship between listening task type (matching, form-filling, labelling, and selecting) and EFL students' proficiency level with their listening comprehension and found that there were significant correlations between labeling, selection and matching tasks and advanced and lower intermediate students' proficiency levels, while only the matching task was significantly correlated to upper-intermediate students' proficiency level. also, Pan and In'nami (2015), exploring the relationship between strategy use, listening proficiency level, task type, and listening comprehension scores of Taiwanese university students, conclude that such strategies as voice and imagery inference and elaboration, and top-down processing strategies were used similarly regardless of learner' proficiency, while other strategies including planning, monitoring and evaluation, linguistic

inference and elaboration, and bottom-up processing were used by advanced learners more frequently than students at other levels of proficiency. The scope of this study was delimited to the students at the pre-intermediate level within a specified age range. The inclusion of a sufficient number of participants with different characteristics which would allow a researcher to address many variables in his investigation is a serious practical issue that normally restricts the scope of a study and the present study is no exception.

The conclusion which can be arrived at based on the findings of this study is that some factors influence which strategies are used by language learners while doing listening tasks. Among these factors are task characteristics and the amount of time available to the learners for working on a listening task. Therefore, not all students should be expected to use the same strategies while performing listening tasks, as each type of task necessitates the use of a particular listening strategy.



References

- Ahmad Kord, M. (2018). The effect of task complexity and strategic planning time on writing accuracy: A case study of undergraduate students at AMU. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics*, 6(1), 1-7.
- Ainsworth, L. (2006). *Common formative assessments: How to connect standards-based instruction and assessment*. Thousand Oaks, Crown Press.
- Bahrami, M. (2010). The effect of task types on EFL learners' listening ability. *Undergraduate Research Journal for the Human Sciences*, 9.
- Birjandi, P., & Malmir, A. (2009). The effect of task-based approach on the Iranian advanced EFL learners' narrative vs. expository writing. *The Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies (IJALS)*, 1(2), 1-23.
- Black, P. J. (1999). *Testing: Friend or foe? Theory and practice of assessment and testing*. Falmer Press.
- Black, P., & William, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education*, 5(1), 7-74.
- Brindley, G., & Slatyer, H. (2002). Exploring task difficulty in ESL listening assessment, *Language Testing*, 19(4) 369-394.
- Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching (Fifth edition)*. Longman.
- Bruton, A. (2002). From Tasking Purposes to Purposing Tasks. *ELT Journal*, 15, 2011, <http://eltj.oxfordjournals.org/content/56/3/280.abstract?sid=49c4bd80-f8a3-454f-8c93-604fe6f6dca9>
- Carter, R., & Nunan, D. (2001). *The Cambridge guide to teaching English to speakers of other languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, S. (2005). *Targeting assessment in the primary classroom*. Hodden Muurray.
- Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
- Englert, C. S., & Thomas, C. C. (1982). Management of task involvement in special education classrooms: Implications for teacher preparation. *Teacher Education and Special Education*, 5(2), 3-10.
- Gass, S. & Mackey, A. (2002). Frequency effects and second language acquisition: *A complex picture?*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24, 249-260.
- Ghavamnia, M., Tavakoli, M., & Esteki, M. (2013). The effect of pre-task and online planning conditions on complexity, accuracy, and fluency of EFL learners' written production. *Porta Linguarum*, 20, 31-43.
- Good, T. (1983). Classroom research: A decade of progress. *Educational Psychologist*, 18, 127-144.
- Hofmeister, A. M., & Lubke, M. (1990). *Research into practice: Implementing effective teaching research*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Irons, A. (2008). *Enhancing learning through formative assessment and feedback*. Routledge.
- Kellough, R. D., & Kellough, N. G. (1999). *Secondary school teaching: A guide to methods and resources; planning for competence*. Upper Saddle River, Merrill.
- Knight, P. (2001). A briefing on key concepts: Formative and summative, criterion and norm-referenced assessment. *Assessment Series*, No.7. LTSN, Generic Centre.
- Khoshsima, H., & Sadighi Tasuj, Z. (2014). The impact of task types on listening comprehension of Iranian intermediate EFL learners. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature*, 3(3), 97-103.
- Lamber, D., & Lines, D. (2000). *Understanding assessment: Purposes, perceptions, practice*. Routledge Falmer

- Liao, S. (2012). Listening Strategies and Applications in EFL Classroom. Report on English education resource center of senior high schools in Taiwan. http://english.tyhs.edu.tw/xoops/html/tyhs/teach_source101/02plan.
- Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2005). *Second language research: Methodology and Design*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Miller, C. M. I., & Parlett, M. (1974). *Up to the mark: A study of the examination game*. Society for Research into Higher Education.
- Nasirian, M. R. (2012) Task-type and Listening Ability of Iranian Male Learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 3(6), 1144-1149.
- O'Malley, J., & Chamot, A. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Newbury House.
- Palmer, R. (2014). Listening strategies that develop active listeners. *TESOL Connections*, 1-5.
- Pan, Y. C., & In'nami, Y. (2015). Relationship between strategy use, listening proficiency level, task type, and scores in an L2 listening test. *Canadian Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 18(2), 45-77.
- Passerini, K., & Granger, M. J. (2000). A developmental model for distance learning using the Internet. *Computer & Education*, 34, 1-15.
- Pelligrino, J. W., Chudowsky, N., & Glaser, R (Eds.) (2001). *Knowing what students know: The science and design of educational assessment*. National Academies Press.
- Prater, M. A. (1992). Increasing time-on-task in the classroom: Suggestions for improving the amount of time learners spend in on-task behaviors. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 28(1), 22-27.
- Rich, H. L., & McNeils, M. J. (1988). A study of academic time-on-task in the elementary school. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 12(1), 37-46.
- Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. Cambridge Language Teaching Library.
- Robinson, P. (2001). Task complexity, task difficulty, and task production: Exploring interactions in a componential framework. *Applied Linguistics*, 22(1), 27-57.
- Salimi, A., Shafaei, A., & Kuhi, D. (2012). The impact of the generic features of tasks on L2 learners' written production. *Elsevier- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 653-662.
- Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11, 129-158.
- Shabani, M. B., Malmir, A., & Arjmand, F. (2018). The contribution of lexical, grammatical, and propositional knowledge preparation to L2 listening comprehension. *The Iranian Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 10(2), 175-208.
- Shirani Bidabadi, F., & Yamat, H. (2011). The relationship between listening strategies used by Iranian EFL freshman university students and their listening proficiency levels. *English Language Teaching*, 4(1), 26-32.
- Skehan, P. (1996). A framework for the implementation of task-based instruction. *Applied Linguistics* 17, 38-62.
- Skehan, P. (2003). Task based instruction. *Language Teaching*, 36(1), 1-14.
- Skehan, P., & Foster, P. (1999). The influence of task structure and processing conditions on narrative retellings. *Language Learning*, 49(1), 93-120.

- Thurlow, M. L., Ysseldyke, J. E., Graden, J., & Algozzine, B. (1983). Instructional ecology for students in resource and regular classrooms. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 6*, 248-254.
- Ur, P. (1984). *Teaching Listening Comprehension*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vandergrift, L. (1999). Facilitating second language listening comprehension: Acquiring successful strategies. *ELT Journal, 53*, 168-176.
- Vandergrift, L., Goh, C. C. M., Mareschal, C. J., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2006). The meta-cognitive awareness listening questionnaire: Development and validation. *Language Learning, 56*(3), 431-462.
- William, M., & Bruden, R. L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wittrock, M. C. (1986). Students' thought processes. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 297-314). Macmillan.
- Yorke, M. (2003). Formative assessment in higher education: Moves towards theory and enhancement of pedagogic practice. *Higher Education, 45*, 477-501.

