

Assessment of Implementing SBI in English Listening Courses Delivered to Non-English Majors

Yunlin Shi

Hubei University of Technology and Engineering College, China

[Abstract] The purpose of the reported study is to assess the effectiveness of combining Strategy-Based Instruction (SBI) with listening teaching practice in English courses delivered to Non-English Majors in a Chinese university. On a fundamental level, SBI helps to improve the awareness of student strategies and guides them towards improved learning outcomes. The exploration of various learning strategies is a common theme in international scholarship, but, in China, listening experimental research has not been well studied on an empirical level, especially SBI. Consequently, this pioneering study is one of the few in this field. The authors' research focused on a longitudinal listening intervention study that took place in China over a 12-week semester among 65 non-English university majors. The final results show that SBI positively improved students' listening ability.

[Keywords] strategy-based instruction, SBI, listening intervention, assessment English language acquisition, Taba's 7-step model

Introduction

The vast majority of companies are targeting foreign markets mostly as a result of saturation of the domestic markets. This trend towards economic globalization has changed the processes of employee-selection procedures, as the vast majority of firms are looking for personnel who are, at least, bilingual, have a university diploma/degree, and are qualified to do business and can travel both domestically and abroad (Hugenberg, LaCivita, & Lubanovic, 1996). Thus, in the present era of economic globalization, it is vital that students in higher education are well-equipped to participate effectively in international employment. One of the crucial graduate skills required to participate effectively in international employment is foreign language proficiency.

Responding to the need to develop foreign language proficiencies, the China State Council published the *State Guidelines for Medium-to-Long-Term Education Reform and Development Plan between 2010 and 2020*, in 2010. In the publication, it was proposed that a foreign language human resource development strategy was proposed. The China State council argued that the foreign language human resource development strategy will contribute to improving the overall quality of education in China because it will nurture more internationally qualified personnel with international vision who have a working knowledge of international conventions and are capable of participating in international affairs and international competitions (Ministry of Education, PRC, n.d.).

The acquisition of foreign language proficiency extends beyond simply speaking the language. Language is a communication tool, and, thus, learning a foreign language and achieving effective communication in that language importantly involves understanding cultural nuances. Strategy-Based Instruction (SBI) encompasses this aspect of language learning. It is acknowledged by many scholars that curriculum development, assessment, and instruction emphasizing SBI in foreign language education is not simply limited to the development of language ability (O'Malley & Chamot 1990; Oxford 1990; Rubin & Thompson 1994; Weidong, 2001; Wenden 1991; Yunlin,

2008) but also involves the enhancement of intercultural communication competence (IC) as an element of this process.

The study reported in this article emerges from a consideration of the current situation of foreign language education in a foreign language university in China and from the need to achieve the anticipated goal of increasing the IC of foreign language learners. The study places emphasis on the importance of developing models that go beyond the traditional framework of the current bicultural models. The present study explores whether or not SBI with listening teaching practice is an effective tool for non-native student speakers of English to increase English language acquisition and learning outcomes. Thus, the goal of the study is to determine if there is any significant difference between SBI experimental classes and non-SBI classes on the listening comprehension proficiency of Chinese non-English-major undergraduates that can lead to further outcomes in intercultural communication, particularly the awareness of student strategies as they relate to English language acquisition and comprehension.

In China, there is a perceived strategic need to develop multicultural and multilingual education. As Dai Weidong (2001), the Chair of Foreign Language Education Consultants Committee¹ under the Ministry of Education of People's Republic of China, summarized in the internationalized context, multicultural and multilingual education foreign language education is a strategic development trend, since the competition in cultural soft power is becoming increasingly needed as China interfaces with global industry. The present study aligns with this need. The belief underlying the study is that the strategic development of intercultural communication (IC) and strategic-based instruction (SBI) in China should be implemented in a combination of theories and practices in order to continuously explore new concepts and new strategies in language and culture education in order to meet the challenge and demands of continuously-developing foreign language education in the 21st Century.

Weidong (2001) further extrapolated that scholars in the foreign language research community generally believe that in the era of the 21st Century, excellent foreign language majors should be equipped with various capabilities to deal with foreign affairs in their future workplaces. These capabilities include intercultural oral and written communication competence and mental and critical faculties in dealing with foreign cultures, which include familiarity with new and different thinking patterns.

Whether the Chinese universities can cultivate more internationalized foreign language talents with robust theoretical foundations of IC, and SBI with broad relative knowledge and outstanding IC skills, is the foremost problem to be addressed in the new round of reforming foreign language education in China, especially for the higher education sectors in the major foreign language education fields. Therefore, leadership must design strategic goals towards the implementation of these competencies.

Literature Review

Scholars found that many foreign language learners are deficient of the knowledge of other cultures (Mendelsohn, 1994; McDonough, 1995). To highlight this point, Mr. Qixin, a professor from the Beijing Foreign Languages Studies University, implemented a survey of the knowledge of other cultures in the foreign affairs service workplace in China (2000). The results showed that 52% of those surveyed were deficient in the area of understanding the differences between Chinese and foreign cultures. To address this need, language learning strategies (LLS) in English language curriculum design and SBI in recent years have received growing attention in teaching and learning (Brown, 1991; Chamot, 2005; Cohen, 1990, 1996; Mendelsohn, 1994, McDonough, 1995;

O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990; Rubin & Thompson, 1994; Wenden, 1991; Yunlin, 2008).

Applied linguists have been exploring language-learner strategies for more than 30 years (Gu, 2007; Dingfang, 2013; Qingquan, 2014), though much of this history has been sporadic. In the Western nations, the 1980s and early 1990s saw periods of substantial research on learning strategies. Recently, a number of new investigations have reinvigorated the field (Chamot, 2005; Oxford, 1990; Rubin & Thompson, 1994; Wenden, 1991).

Due to the globalization and modernization, gaining proficient English acquisition has gained popularity and importance around the world. Therefore, the need for educators to accelerate teaching efficiency has become a hot topic, despite some criticisms of the field. An example of one such criticism came from Dornyei (2005), who opined that learning strategies should be abandoned. This study offers a response to such critics. Whether there is any significant difference between SBI experimental class and non-SBI classes on the listening comprehension proficiency of Chinese non-English-major undergraduates leading to further outcomes in IC, particularly the awareness of student strategies, this research proposes a practical case to test whether listening strategies should be abandoned or utilized.

Preliminary Analysis from the Research

Though there are many theoretical and empirical studies on many factors affecting learning strategy use, there are few empirical studies conducted in China of this sort. The present study is among the few pioneers in the field. The authors' research focused on a listening intervention study, which was demonstrated among 60 non-English university majors in China over a 12-week semester. After SPSS analysis, together with interviews of students and teachers, the study revealed differences between the SBI group and non-SBI group, and most students in the SBI group confirmed that SBI played a positive role in substantial English language learning.

As noted in Table 1, taken as a whole system, non-learner and learner factors function together in affecting proficient English acquisition (Wen & Johnson, 1997). Non-learner factors include both the environment and the institution. Environmental factors encompass social, economic, cultural, linguistics, family, background, and the context in which these factors relate to one another. Likewise, the institutional variables, such as institutional resources, teaching abilities, curriculum, assessment, and methods play a crucial role in affecting English language proficiency. Among the learner factors that affect positive student English language acquisition, there are the modifiable and the unmodifiable variables. Whereas intelligence, aptitude, sex, age, and prior learning are the unmodifiable factors, the modifiable factors include learning purposes, beliefs, effort, management strategies, and language learning strategies, which have affected the outcomes the most.

Table 1
Conceptual Model of Factors Affecting Proficient English Acquisition

Non-learner factors		Learner factors		Outcomes
Environmental	Institutional	Unmodifiable	Modifiable	
Social	School	Intelligence	Learning purposes	
Economic	resources	Aptitude	Beliefs	
Cultural	Teaching	Sex	Effort	
Linguistic	abilities	Age	Management strategies	
Contexts	Assessment	Prior learning	Language learning	
Family	methods		strategies	
background				
Presage	→		process	→ product

(Wen & Johnson, 1997)

The model in Table 1 captures the notion that although both non-learner and learner factors can affect outcomes, it is the modifiable factors that are key to positively affecting the learning outcomes of English language acquisition and through which the non-learner variables influences learning outcomes. According to the research, the unmodifiable learner variables were found to either directly or indirectly affect learning outcomes through language learning strategies (Wen & Johnson, 1997). English language learning strategies were found to be significant for English learners when the factors that affect the outcome were analyzed. Within the field of language acquisition, especially English as a Second Language (ESL), there is considerable debate on defining learning strategies. Strong consensus has yet to be reached (Ellis, 1994). As Rubin (1987) described, learning strategies are strategies that contribute to the development of the language system that construct and affect learning directly. As Oxford (1990, pp. 18-22) defined, learning strategies are specific actions, behaviors, steps, or techniques that students (often intentionally) use to improve their process in developing second language (L2) skills. Strategies can facilitate the internalization, storage, retrieval, use of the new language and its cultural contextual nuances and meanings. In addition, strategies are tools for the self-directed (student) involvement necessary for developing communicative ability.

Oxford (1990) proposed a strategy classification system that has been used over the years as a tool to develop a more comprehensive and detailed process of learning. Oxford's (1990) system includes acquiring systematic knowledge in four categorical English language skills (listening, reading, speaking, and writing). The system divides learning strategies into two main classifications: direct and indirect strategies. As shown in Table 2, direct strategies deal with the understanding ability of the new language in a variety of specific tasks and situations. Direct strategies comprise memory, cognitive, comprehension, while indirect strategies involve metacognitive, social, and affective tasks. Memory in the context of a direct strategy is the ability to remember or recognize whether or not a word or phrase has occurred previously in the past or has not occurred.

Table 2
Learning Strategies (Oxford 1990)

Strategies for listening, speaking, writing reading	Direct	Memory	Keeping and recalling new input
		Cognitive	Understanding & generating a new language skill
		Comprehension	Using linguistic & contextual clues
	Indirect	Metacognitive	Planning, managing, monitoring or evaluating one's own learning
		Social	Interacting with other people in society
		Affective	Controlling & developing one's emotion

Craik and Lockhart (1972) formulated the idea that levels of processing or the depth of encoding determined the amount of data remembered or was recognized. This awareness was explored in more depth by Craik and Tulving (1975) in a series of experiments. In these experiments, participants were encouraged to process words at different levels and were then tested on recall and recognition. It was found in the recognition circumstances that the deeper the processing or involvement of semantics, the higher and more accurate the recognition of the word or phrase was. Cognition in the context of direct strategies implies that linguists believe language is both embodied and situated in a specific environment (Evans, 2007). Cognition also refers to but not limited to the learners' ability in deduction, recombination, physical response, imagery grouping, note taking, repetition auditory representation, and translation contextualization (O'Malley, Chamot, & Kupper1989). The indirect metacognitive aspects refer to (but are not limited to) factors such as self-evaluation, advanced organizational skills, directed attention, inference, selective attention, self-management, advance preparation, and self-monitoring.

Socio-affective strategies are the schemes that help learners normalize and control their motives, emotions, and attitudes towards learning, and help learners learn through contact and interaction with others. Collaborating with classmates, exchanging opinions with each other, and collectively sharing students' learning experiences are also part of this process (O'Malley & Chamot, 1990).

Theoretical Foundations: Leading to Positive SBI Strategies, Using Taba's Model

Effective strategic planning and teaching strategies leading to the design of English language acquisition curriculum development that have a strong focus on SBI and that can positively affect student listening skills will have clear objectives and assessment that is contextually organized and focused on learning outcomes. The development of effective teaching strategies is defined as the process of planning, implementing, and evaluating that leads to cultural competent strategic planning in order to positively affect student learning outcomes. Towards this end, Taba (1962) proposed the 7-step principles that were found to positively affect student learning outcomes:

- Diagnosis of needs
- Formulation of objectives (SBI)
- Listening (selection of content)

- Organization of content
- Selection of learning experience
- Organization of learning experience
- Determination of what to evaluate and the means to evaluate

Taba's model contains several elements designed to support effective teaching strategies, such as attention to objectives and contents; learning experience selected and organized according to the objectives and content; teaching strategies that pay attention to the methods, and design of evaluation process. Taba also gave consideration to the surrounding contextual factors and mentioned some factors external to the 7 steps, such as the environment of the school and community; the nature of the institutional values and resources; the policies of the institution; the characteristics of the teaching staff, and, finally, the nature of the student population. The elements of Taba's model, along with Taba's consideration of contextual factors, provide a strong foundation for strategic planning and implementation of effective language teaching strategies.

Defining effective teaching and assessment of IC and multicultural awareness in the context of SBI has been a challenge among scholars of the field. Deardorff (2004) claimed that teaching intercultural competence is based on a subfield of communication competence. Another scholar reported that teaching intercultural competence is the capacity to adapt one's knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors to act openly and flexibly to other cultures (Alfred & Byram, 2002). The intersection of intercultural competence in the context of acquiring a foreign language is a critical aspect of intercultural communication that has been defined by Chen and Starosta (1998) as the capacity to effectively and appropriately implement communication behaviors that negotiate each other's cultural identity or identities in a culturally diverse communication. A person who has the capacity of IC is able to apply relational competence towards people from different cultures, solve conflicts by finding alternatives that occur as a result of differences, and, also, do business with counterparts from different cultures (Deardorff, 2004). Moreover, in its broadest sense, acquiring intercultural competence can be defined as a complex set of abilities needed to perform effectively and appropriately when interacting with others who are linguistically and culturally different from oneself (Fantini, 2006).

Teaching and educational models of IC have not been sufficiently explored in China. Therefore, as global educators of the 21st Century, especially as language teachers, we need to explore how to more effectively teach, communicate IC, and improve language learners' knowledge, attitudes, skills, and awareness regarding English language acquisition as the foundation for strategy-based instruction.

Strategy-Based Instruction

Strategy-based instruction has the potential, if used effectively, to accelerate the learning process (Cohen, 1998). Since learning strategies are playing promising roles in English learning acquisition, many scholars recommend that students use such strategies. The students using learning strategies tend to accelerate their knowledge of English at a faster pace than students not using strategies (Yildirim, 2015; Yunlin, 2008; Thitipat, 2012).

As a form of learner-focused language teaching, SBI explicitly combines strategy- training activities and IC with everyday classroom language instruction (Cohen & Dörnyei, 2002; Oxford, 2001). SBI emphasizes both explicit and implicit integration of language learning and uses both strategies in the language classroom. The key underlying premise of SBI is that the learners should

be given the opportunity to understand not only what they can learn in the language classroom, but also how they can learn more effectively and efficiently (Cohen & Macaro, 2007). After teacher-assisted SBI, the learners have a sharper sense of strategy options, particularly what the concrete approaches are and how to organize and use them systematically and effectively. This is especially true when taken on an individual basis. Gu (2007) believed that a strategy suitable for one particular person, task, or learning context may not be suitable for another. SBI is more or less individually tailored, task-related, or contextually learning related; therefore, SBI is beneficial to every learner.

Teaching the SBI model is practiced by many international researchers and instructors around the world. Cohen (1996) connected the teacher's role using SBI with speaking and found SBI was favorable to a foreign-language classroom. As Table 3 shows, this is especially true if the teacher was able to diagnose/assess properly, negotiate strategies with students in a helpful manner, and was a language learner. In this way, both the students and the teacher are empowered in the processes of acquiring a new language rich in content-centered and strategy-centered teaching and learning.

Table 3

Teacher's Role: Diagnostician (Cohen, 2000, p. 99)

Researcher/Instructor	Diagnostician	
	negotiator	Learner trainer
		Coach
Language learner		

SBI is seen to empower not only the teachers but also the students. Gu (2007) presented a strategy intervention study in Singapore involving 246 primary school students in grade five over an entire semester and concluded that SBI was used as an empowering tool for learners and teacher development, which positively affected student language acquisition. Barry Bai (2015) had a longitudinal intervention on five grade primary students in Singapore and found that SBI had a positive effect. Gu (2007) confirmed that the question is no longer whether SBI should be encouraged; it is now a matter of how it shall be supported. Three prerequisites were stressed for this to be successful: 1) complete understanding and cooperation from the schools; 2) full support and cooperation from teachers involved; 3) close collaboration between researchers/scholarship, teachers, and the school management.

In research conducted in China and elsewhere on the globe, SBI has been shown to be effective. Elhamand Roohani (2014) conducted research on Iranian students to see whether or not the use of a practical approach to SBI on (second language development) L2 learners' persuasive writing was found to positively affect student outcomes. He found that the use of SBI allowed Iranian undergraduate college students studying English as a Foreign Language (EFL) to attain a positive sense of self-efficacy, which he found was essential in order to foster critical thinking skills. However, he opined that more work needed to be done in Iran, as seldom has research there been conducted with EFL undergraduate university students. A study by Thitipat (2012), which focused on listening comprehension strategies used by undergraduate students in Thailand, found that the frequencies of strategy use in students that were able to modify their learning environment were higher than the students that lacked this skill.

In China, however, research on strategies is about ten years behind the West (Yunlin, 2008; Yurong, 2011). Research on strategies has become a hot topic in the field of English acquisition learning (Dingfang, 2013; Wang, 2013). As a result of the popularity of this topic, there are increasing numbers of studies conducted in China. A comprehensive review of learner strategy studies by a number of researchers (for example, Qiufang, 2004; Qingquan, 2014; and Yurong, 2011) concluded that most of the studies that have been done in China are descriptive and very seldom empirical. In China, evidence of strategy training effectiveness can be found mostly for oral English (Xiaofang, 2004) and reading comprehension (Hong, 2011).

Overall research trends support the hypothesis that SBI models help learners develop a sharp sense of control over learning outcomes. Conclusive evidence also points to the fact that teachers and individual learners learn best if they cooperate together to strategically solve learning challenges (Chamot, 2005; Gu, 2007; Oxford 1990; Rubin & Thompson 1994; Wen & Johnson, 1997).

Listening and SBI

Listening comprehension has been neglected in empirical research and practice in many English language acquisition learning contexts until quite recently. This is why some researchers name listening as the Cinderella skill in second language learning (Nobuko 2004; Nunan, 1997; Thitipat, 2012). The listening process can be complex, such as when an English sentence is spoken. The listening process is conducted usually by the instructor but, without the cultural knowledge from a contextual base, the students' learning is not complete. English acquisition, like all language acquisition, is a contextually based language skill.

Nobuko (2004) opined that although listening comprehension is now well recognized as a critical dimension in language learning, it still remains one of the least understood processes that impose upon learners because it places a different cognitive load from that of reading comprehension. Thitipat (2012) points out, further, that listening difficulties can exist, which complicate the learning process. These linguistic features can be phonetic, phonological, morphological, syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and language variations. In addition, learning is affected by inappropriate learning environments (monolingual contexts, unauthentic teaching materials or tasks, lack of interaction, and a large number of learners per class).

As Chou (2015) emphasizes, listening is an essentially basic skill for English as a Foreign Language in order for learners to succeed in their studies in English-speaking universities in various fields of study. Robin and Gou (2006) define listening strategies comprising of metacognitive, cognitive, and socio-affective approaches to facilitate comprehension and to make learning more effective. Strategy-based instruction targets learners to become more responsible for their direction in learning and using the target language; it also aides in becoming more effective by allowing them to individualize the language learning experience (Cohen, 1996).

Graham, Santos, and Vanderpank (2011) suggest learners understand what they hear better if they are aware of the effective ways they are using strategies to deal with various tasks; this includes both the cognitive and the metacognitive work, which leads to listening improvement. Though valid, these studies were descriptive in nature and not intervening or empirical. Scholars suggest there might be optimal percentages that English language learners spend in learning the listening modality of English language acquisition. Of the four English language acquisition learning modalities, Feyten (1991) and Morley (2001) suggested in overall communication, the

optimal percentages include 9% of students' time should be spent on writing, 16% on reading, 30% on speaking, and the remaining 43% on listening.

Although many scholars agree (Cohen, 2000; Wang, 2013; Xiaofang, 2004) on the positive use of strategy-based instruction on ESL students' listening comprehension, there are critics of SBI. Wilson (2003), critic of SBI listening, introduced a new approach in teaching L2 listening based on the notion of bottom-up primacy, a learner-centered, task-based teaching, and named it *Discovery Listening* (DisL). Marzban (2012) compared the effect of explicit SBI and *Discovery Listening* on the Iranian EFL Listening comprehension, and found that no significant difference existed between the SBI and DisL methods, but DisL was more enjoyable in the learning process than the SBI model for the students. In summary, at present in the international educational community, and especially in China, the combination of the student listening strategies and teaching strategies with the SBI model needs further research with non-English-major undergraduates.

Research Method, Instruments & Procedures

The present study seeks to address the following research question:

“Is there any significant difference between SBI experimental class and non-SBI class on the listening comprehension proficiency by Chinese non-English-major undergraduates?” The participants in the study included 65 Chinese non-English-major undergraduates who were freshmen from two classes in Hubei University of Technology and Engineering College. One class is an SBI experiment class with 33 students, which is taught by an SBI-trained teacher. The other is a traditional class with 34 students, under the guidance of a teacher who hasn't accepted SBI training and teaches in the usual way. All of the student participants studied English as their second language. They were between the ages of 18-21 years. The two classes are regarded as homogeneous because they are in same major and similar English level according to their English marks in the Entrance Examination to College in 2016.

During a period of 12-week sessions, in addition to the routine educational program developed by the department, the SBI class members received their listening strategy training for 60 minutes twice a week. The instruments utilized in the study included the listening pretest and posttest in the very beginning and end of the 2nd semester (2016.2-2017.6), together with some interviews with the participants and the teachers. The teaching material was flexible and adjustable. The main part was the listening section of the textbook and the listening part of CET4, which included listening to sentences, short conversations, and long dialogues. In addition, some videos from the Internet were employed to increase students' interest. For the listening homework, it was very important for the students to practice listening. The degree to which the students accomplished varied greatly.

The Strategy Inventory for Language Learning, version 7.0 for ESL/EFL learners (SILL), was used, which allowed students to examine the frequency of strategy use and also improve them to have a strong sense of strategy. What's more, many practical case diagnoses of students' learning strategies were used, if possible, to make students understand more methodically how and why strategies play a role in English-language learning outcomes. That was to enhance the students' metacognitive and also the self-regulated learning ability.

The strategy instruction included five steps: preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion (Chamot, 1999) as seen in Table 4. These five steps represent a complete learning cycle. From the preparation stage to the expansion stage, the responsibility for the strategy use and

details was gradually shifted from teachers to learners.

Table 4
Strategy Instruction Framework: Teacher Responsibility

Preparation	Activate Background Knowledge
Presentation	Explain Attend Model Participate
Practice	Prompt Strategies Apply strategies with guidance Independently tailor strategies Give Feedback
Evaluation	Assess Strategies
Expansion	Support
	Transfer

Chamot, Barnhardt, El-Dianary, and Robbins (1999, p. 46; Gu, 2007)

From Table 4, it is assumed that the student responsibilities include attendance, participation, and transferring strategies to new tasks. The five steps were preparation, presentation, practice, evaluation, and expansion, a complete cycle. The model represented in Table 4 was formed into the procedures The structure of an SBI lesson (Table 5 and Table 6) was for each SBI session (Chamot et al., 1999).

Table 5
Teaching Schedule for SBI Class

Week	Content of class	In-class task	Homework
1st-2nd	SILL self-check and compare	Group discussion of SILL and make comparisons	self-strategy report, strategy paper reading
3rd-4th	Diagnosis of strategy use case and share	Group discussion and to diagnose the strategy report of the other group and have a try at giving the recipe	
5th-6th	Short sentences	Analyze and exercises	Extensive listening exercises and performing self-evaluation and the recipe
7th-8th	Short conversation	More exercises	
9th-10th	Long conversation	Analyze and exercises	
11th-12th	Long conversation	More exercises	

Table 6
Structure of an SBI lesson

Preparation 5 Mins
Presentation 10 Mins
Step 1: Explaining
Step 2: Modeling
Practice 30 Min
Evaluation 10 Mins
Expansion 5 Min (explaining homework and other English language lessons)

Results and Discussion

SPSS was conducted to compare the SBI experimental group and the Non-SBI group to explore whether the SBI teaching strategy is useful or not and how significant the SBI strategy was to the students. In this paper, the one-sample statistics and one-sample test, paired sample correlation, and paired samples test will be used. Statistics, like blood testing, will tell the truth more than the number itself.

As shown in Table 7, there are 33 students who attended the SBI pretest. The mean is 16.9697, the Std. Deviation is 4.4615, and the Std. Error Mean is 0.7767. There are 34 students that attended the non-SBI pretest; its mean is 16.4848, the Std. Deviation is 5.0195, and the Std. Error Mean is 0.8738.

Table 7
SBI and Non-SBI Pretest (one -sample statistics)

	N	Mean	SD	Std. Error Mean
SBI pretest	33	16.9697	4.4615	.7767
Non-SBI pretest	34	16.4848	5.0195	.8738

According to one-sample test in Table 8, the SBI pretest t is 21.850, df is 32, sig is .000, less than 0.05, while the Non-SBI pretest t is 19.289, the df is 33, sig is .000, less than 0.05 also, which means that the SBI group pretest and, the Non-SBI group pretest have significant difference among all the non-English majors in all the university. And in 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference, between Lower and Upper, there is no zero for both SBI pretest and Non-SBI pretest; it shows further that the two groups have significant difference in all university.

Table 8
SBI and Non-SBI Pretest (One –sample test)

	Test Value=0					
	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
SBI pretest	21.850	32	.000	16.96	15.3877	18.5517
Non-SBI pretest	19.289	33	.000	16.41	14.6807	18.1428

As shown in Table 9, 33 students attended the SBI posttest (the mean is 21.0909, the Std. Deviation is 5.5077, and the Std. Error Mean is 0.9588). There were 34 students who attended the Non-SBI posttest (the mean is 16.2059, the Std. Deviation is 5.3811, and the Std. Error Mean is 0.9229). The SBI posttest results are superior to the Non-SBI posttest.

Table 9
SBI and Non-SBI Posttest (One -sample statistics)

	N	Mean	SD	Std.Error Mean
SBI posttest	33	21.0909	5.5077	.9588
Non-SBI posttest	34	16.2059	5.3811	.9229

According to the one-sample test in Table 10, the SBI posttest t is 21.998, the df is 32, the sig is .000, less than 0.05, while the Non-SBI posttest t is 17.561, the df is 33, and the sig is .000, which is less than 0.05 also. Thus, the SBI group posttest and Non-SBI group posttest fared better than all others across the university. In the 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference between the Lower and the Upper, there is no zero for both the SBI posttest and the Non-SBI posttest. This further shows that the two groups are similar, but they are more significantly different than all others across the university.

Table 10
SBI and Non-SBI Posttest (One -sample test)

	Test Value=0					
	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
SBI posttest	21.998	32	.000	21.0909	19.1379	23.0439
Non-SBI posttest	17.561	33	.000	16.2059	14.3283	18.0834

As shown in Table 11, according to the paired samples statistics, the correlation between the SBI-pretest and the Non-SBI pretest is $-.128$, and the sig is $.479$. It is clear that the two statistics have no sequence relation. In Table 12, the mean of the SBI pretest and the Non-SBI pretest is $.4849$, the S.D is 7.1288 , the S.E. Mean is 1.2410 , the 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference is between the Lower -2.0429 , the Upper 3.0126 , and there is zero inside. The sig is 0.699 , more than 0.05 . It shows that there is no significant difference between the SBI pretest and the Non-SBI pretest. The non-SBI group and the SBI group were not significantly different, indicating the homogeneity of the two groups before the instructions were carried out. It is concluded that there is no significant difference between the SBI pretest and the Non-SBI pretest. They have homogeneity.

Table 11 shows the correlation between the SBI-posttest, and the Non-SBI posttest is -0.129 and the sig is $.473$. It is clear that the two statistics have no sequence relation. In Table 12, the mean of the SBI posttest and the Non-SBI posttest is $.4849$, the S.D is 8.2225 , the S.E. Mean is 1.4313 , and the 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference is between the Lower 1.8723 and the Upper 7.7035 ; there is no zero inside. The sig is 0.002 , less than 0.05 . It shows that there is significant difference between the SBI posttest and the Non-SBI posttest.

Table 11
Paired Samples Correlation

	N	Correlation	Sig.
SBI-pretest Non-SBI pretest	33	$-.128$	$.479$
SBI-pretest SBI-posttest	33	$.887$	$.000$
Non-SBI pretest Non-SBI posttest	34	$.962$	$.000$
SBI-posttest Non SBI- posttest	33	$-.129$	$.473$

As shown in Table 11, the correlation of the SBI-pretest and the SBI-posttest is 0.887 , and the Sig is 0.000 ; the correlation of the Non-SBI pretest and the Non-SBI posttest is 0.962 , and the sig is 0.000 . A high correlation and low Sig indicates that there is a sequential relation in the SBI group and the Non-SBI group themselves, respectively, indicating different results in different times to the same group.

In summary, after 12 weeks of teaching in different ways, the SBI group gained greater positive achievement than the Non-SBI group. The results indicate that SBI is useful in listening teaching and is beneficial to students in the university.

Table 12
Paired Samples Test

C	Paired Difference					t	df	Sig (2-tailed)
	Mean	SD	S.E. Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
SBI-pretest Non-SBI pretest	.4849	7.1288	1.2410	-2.0429	3.0126	.391	32	.699
SBI-pretest SBI-posttest	-4.1212	2.5831	.4497	-5.0371	-3.2053	-9.165	32	.000
Non-SBI pretest Non-SBI posttest	.2059	1.4930	.2561	-.3151	.7268	.804	33	.427
SBI-posttest Non SBI-posttest	4.7879	8.2225	1.4313	1.8723	7.7035	3.345	32	.002

In Table12, in the SBI-pretest and the SBI-posttest, the mean is -4.1212, the S.D is 2.5831, the S.E Mean is .4497. The 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference is between -5.0371 and -3.2053, and there is no zero inside, indicating that there is significant difference between the SBI pretest and the SBI posttest. T is -9.165, df is 33-1=32, Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.000, less than 0.05, which, also, proves the significant difference between the SBI pretest and the SBI posttest. All the students in the SBI group improved by the end of the semester. It is clear that the SBI group's diligence is rewarded with accomplishment in listening learning.

In Table 12, in the Non-SBI pretest and the Non-SBI posttest, the mean is 0.2059, the S.D is 1.4930, and the S.E Mean is 0.2561. The Confidence Interval of the Difference is between -0.3151 and 0.7268, and there is zero inside, indicating that there is no significant difference between the Non-SBI pretest and the Non-SBI posttest. T is 0.804, the df is 34-1=33, the Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.427 more than 0.05, which, also, proves there is no significant difference between the Non-SBI pretest and the Non-SBI posttest. All the students in the Non-SBI group did not show obvious improvement at the end of the semester.

From a comparison of the SBI and the Non-SBI group, it can be seen that the SBI group gained greater advancement in English learning than the Non-SBI group. Finally, based on the analysis of the statistics, it can be concluded that the degree of the progress that the SBI group made is much greater than the Non-SBI group. According to the results of the present study, in university listening teaching, SBI is a practical and very useful tool to improve student's listening level.

Many researchers have similar findings. Gu (2007) found that the "SBI users have made a significant contribution to the writing performance of the Experimental group" (p. 31); Cohen (1996) pointed out "Explicitly describing, discussing, and reinforcing strategies in the classroom can have a direct payoff on student outcomes" (p. 28).

After a face-to-face interview with the students, the research indicates that 80% of the students in the SBI group expressed excitement about what it meant for them that a sense of strategy control was empowering, which might lead to possible positive outcomes. One hundred percent of the students in the SBI group showed that the diagnosis of strategy use to individuals helped them to reflect their weakness in listening study and helped them find their way out by utilizing different

combination of strategies. Overall, the students felt more confident in metacognitive and were self-regulated in their English study, enhancing their overall learning ability in other subjects.

Twenty percent of the most excellent learners in the entire class felt that SBI played a huge role in their achieving more effective and efficient study. The metacognitive and cognitive strategies were a vital element of effective study, as confirmed by the findings of Thitipat (2012, p. 2) regarding the limitations of poor learners. Of the entire class, 20% of the poorer English learners felt that the advantages of SBI were limited because the listening section reflected the students' comprehensive language study ability. English language learning cannot be improved effectively when the students' English knowledge is greatly lacking in basic knowledge, such as vocabulary, reading, and comprehension.

Limitations

The limitations of this study arise from the following factors: first, the sample number is small in the statistical aspect; only 34 students are in the experimental group.

Second, the 12-week semester was not long enough to fully test the effectiveness of SBI. A longer semester would provide more opportunity to better to test effects of strategy-based instruction. It takes time for the students to turn the influence of the SBI knowledge into empowering energy in learning outcomes.

Third, the listening examination mark itself was unreasonable to some degree; it was not the only way to measure the development in English listening, (e.g. among four choices, some students deleted two wrong choices, such as A and B, and chose the better choice C, but not the best choice D. In fact, choices C and D both meant that the student understood the listening material and meant the student showed substantial development in listening. However, on the examination, only the best choice D was awarded points). In daily teaching practice, the authors found that the highest marks in listening were not equal to the more advanced listeners.

Fourth, as Marzban (2012) found, the SBI lesson was less enjoyable for some of the students, especially the freshmen. It allowed them to focus on the strategy of self-revaluation and read several papers about strategy case analysis; many found it not very interesting at the beginning. The experiment reflected the teacher's high standard of guiding and strong reinforcement of clarity and scholarship in designing the tests, explaining the tests, and interpreting the tests. In addition to these elements and qualifications, the teacher should have a heart of devotion and passion for teaching because this experiment would benefit only if the teachers exchanged ideas more efficiently and frequently with students by using electronic platforms, such as email, Model, Blackboard, Canvas, or other communication platforms in their spare time. The more attractive the teacher is, the more able the teacher is; the better organization the class is, the better the result will be; the more time the students devote to listening after class, the stronger the students' motivation is and the better the result is. No strategy is useless. The effectiveness of strategies depends largely on their use being at the right time and in the right place.

Conclusion

According to the SPSS statistics, this research showed significant difference between the SBI group and the non-SBI group in the listening ability within a 12-week semester. The present study provides evidence that SBI is a positive tool in teaching English, especially in the areas of listening and learning outcomes. In practice, the use of SBI shed significant light on higher efficiency listening in English studies. After the experiment, the SBI group had a higher awareness of strategy

use and was more active in independent controlling in strategy use, according to the interview and the teacher's observation and the students' self-evaluation. They employed more cognitive listening strategies and knew more than before about how to diagnose their weaknesses in listening study and finding solutions. All in all, integrating SBI into the classroom teaching with close guidance from teachers has been shown in this study to be a potentially feasible and effective way to develop expertise in the classroom. It provides a gradual and continual process that potentially helps teachers improve their instruction and helps the students boost independent performance in the long run.

References

- Alfred, G., & Byram, M. (2002). Becoming an intercultural mediator: A longitudinal study of residence abroad. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 23*(5), 339-352.
- Bai, B. (2015). The effects of strategy-based writing instruction in Singapore primary schools. *System, 53*, 96-106
- Brown, H.D. (1991). *Breaking the language barrier*. Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press.
- Chamot, A.U. (2005). Language learning strategy instruction: current issues and research. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 25*, 112-130
- Chamot, A.U., Barnhardt, S., El-Dinary, P.B., & Robbins, J. (1999). *The learning strategies handbook*. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Chen, G.M., & Starosta, W. J. (1998). A review of the concept of intercultural sensitivity. *Human Communication, 1*, 1-16.
- Chou, Mu-hsuan. (2015). Impacts of the test of English listening comprehension on student's English learning expectations in Taiwan. *Language, Culture and Curriculum, 28*(2), 191-208.
- Cohen, A. D. (1990). *Language learning: Insights for learners, instructors, and researchers*. New York, NY: Newbury House/Harper Collins.
- Cohen, A. D. (1998). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. London: Longman.
- Cohen, A. D. (2000). *Strategies in learning and using a second language*. Beijing, China: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
- Cohen, A. (1996). *The impact of strategies-based instruction on speaking a foreign language*. Research Report. University of Minnesota.
- Cohen, A. D., & Dörnyei, Z. (2002). Focus on the language learner: Motivation, styles, and strategies. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *An introduction to applied linguistics* (pp. 170-190). London, UK: Arnold.
- Cohen, A. D., & Macaro, E. (Eds.). (2007). *Language learner strategies: 30 years of research and practice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Craik, F.I.M., & Tulving, E. (1975). Depth of processing and the retention of words in episodic memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology, 104*, 268-294.
- Craik, F.I.M., & Lockhart, R.S. (1972). Levels of processing: a framework for memory research. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, 11*, 671-684.
- Deardorff, D. K. (2004). The identification and assessment of intercultural competence as a student outcome of internationalization at institutions of higher education in the United States. Doctoral dissertation. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University
- Dörnyei, Z. (2005). Language learning strategies and student self-regulation. In *The psychology*

- of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition* (pp.162-196). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Elham B., & Roohani, R. (2014). The impact of strategy-based instruction on L2 learners' persuasive writing. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 235. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042814025038>
- Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Evans, V. (2007). *A glossary of cognitive linguistics*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fantini, A., & Tirmizi, A. (2006). Exploring and assessing intercultural competence. World Learning Publications. Paper 1. Retrieved from http://digitalcollections.sit.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1001&context=worldlearning_publications
- Feyten, C. M. (1991). The power of listening ability: An overlooked dimension in language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal*, 75, 173–180.
- Graham, S., & Vanderpank. (2011). Exploring the relationship between listening development and strategy use. *Language Teaching Research*, 15(4), 435-456.
- Gu, Y. (2007). Strategy-based instruction. In T. Yashima & T. Nabei (Eds.), *Proceedings of the International Symposium on English Education in Japan: Exploring New Frontiers* (pp.21-28). Osaka: Yubunsha.
- Hong, L. (2011). SBI on undergraduates' English reading teaching practice. *Journal of Hexi University*, 6, 108-112.
- Hugenberg, L. W., LaCivita, R. M., & Lubanovic, A. M. (1996). International business and training: Preparing for the global economy'. *The Journal of Business Communication*, 33(2), 205-222.
- Magnus, W. (2003). Discovery listening-improving perceptual processing. *ELT Journal*, 57(4), 335-343.
- Marzban, A. (2012). Discovery listening and explicit strategy-based-instruction models' effect on the Iranian intermediate EFL listening comprehension. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 46, 5435-5439.
- McDonough, S. H. (1995). *Strategy and skill in learning a foreign language*. London: UK: Edward Arnold.
- Mendelsohn, S. H. (1994). *Learning to listen: A strategy-based approach for the second-language learner*. San Diego, CA: Dominic Press.
- Ministry of Education. People's Republic of China. (n. d.). Ministry of Education. Retrieved from http://www.moe.edu.cn/publicfiles/business/htmlfiles/moe/moe_2792/
- Morley, J. (2001). Aural comprehension instruction: Principles and practices. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd ed) (pp. 69-85). Beijing, China: Foreign Language and Research Press.
- Nunan, D. (1997). Listening in language learning. *The Language Teacher*, 23(9), 47-51.
- Nobuko O. (2004). Listening comprehension research: a brief review of the past thirty years. *Dialogue*, 3, 53-66.
- O'Malley, M. J., Chamot, A. U., & Küpper, L. (1989). Listening comprehension strategies in second language acquisition. *Applied Linguistics*, 10(4), 418-437. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/applin/10.4.418>
- O'Malley, J. M., & Chamot, A.U. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*.

- Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Oxford, R. L. (2001). Language learning styles and strategies. In M. Celce-Murcia(Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (3rd. pp. 359-366). Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Qingquan N. (2014). The review of learning strategies in recent 40 years. *The Journal of the Foreign Language University of Sichuan Province*, 6, 136.
- Qiufang W., & Wang, L. (2004). The empirical research about learning strategies in recent 20 years in China. *Foreign Language and Literatures*, 1, 39-45.
- Qixin, H. (2000). *English language education in China*. Beijing, China: Foreign Language and Research Press.
- Robin, W., & Gou, N. (2006). *An investigation of factors influencing English listening comprehension and possible measures for improvement*. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/05pap/guo05088.pdf>.
- Rubin, J. (1987). Described, learning strategies are strategies that contribute to the development of the language system that construct and affect learning directly. *Oxford, 1990*, 18-22.
- Rubin, J., & I. Thompson. (1994). *How to be a more successful language learner*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Shu, D.F. (2013). 关于我国外语教学规划与布局的思考[J]. [The Plan and Arrangement about Foreign Language Teaching in China]. *外语教学与研究 [Foreign Language Teaching and Research]* 5, 432. Beijing, China.
- Taba, H. (1962). *Curriculum development: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Harcourt Brace and World.
- Thitipat, W. (2012). An investigation of English listening strategies used by Thai undergraduate students in public universities in the South. Unpublished M.A dissertation, Prince of Songkla University. Thailand.
- Wang, B. (2013). *The research on the relationship between English learning process and the outcome in China*. Changchun, China: Northeast Normal University Press.
- Weidong, D. (2001). The construction of the streamline ELT system in China. *Foreign Language Teaching and Research*, 33(5), 322-327.
- Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner Strategies for Learner Autonomy*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Wen, Q., & Johnson, R.K. (1997). L2 learner variables and English achievement: A study of tertiary-level English majors in China. *Applied Linguistics*, 18, 27-48.
- Xiaofang G. (2004). The impact of SBI on Chinese undergraduates' oral English class. *Foreign Language world*. No.6 (General Serial No.104)15-21. Beijing, China.
- Yildirim, R. (2015). Strategy-based English language instruction: the impact on the language proficiency of young gifted learners. *Education*, 2, 97-114. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03004279.2012.759606>.
- Yunlin S. (2008). A study of English learning strategies employed by senior middle school students in Wuhan City. Unpublished MA dissertation, Hubei University of Technology. Wuhan, China.
- Yurong Z. (2011). The review of learning strategies research in recent 10 years in China. *Foreign Language World*, 3, 82-96.