

The Role of Self-Regulatory Approach in Iranian Learners' Lexical Segmentation: The case of authentic materials

Azam Roostaie Zanyani, Abadan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Abadan, Iran

a.roostaie64@gmail.com

Farzaneh Mir*, Assistant Professor, Department of Language Teaching, Abadan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Abadan, Iran

fmir2001@yahoo.com

Abstract

The present research investigated the effect of self-regulatory approach (with two components of self-checking and self-efficacy) on pre-intermediate Iranian learners' lexical segmentation in listening comprehension via authentic listening comprehension texts. To achieve this purpose, the investigators administered an Oxford Placement Test (2007) to ninety-eight students of two girls' private junior high schools in Abadan. The participants were in grade seven at pre-intermediate level. Ninety-two students were selected out of ninety-eight and after homogenizing the participants linguistically, they were divided into four groups. Twenty-three students of every 4 classes whose scores were nearly the same were considered as one group. There were one control group and three experimental groups. A teacher-made pretest which was piloted by the researchers was administered to all groups. Then, the experimental groups were instructed under an eight-sessions treatment which was self-regulated teaching via authentic and non-authentic texts. Finally, the participants took a posttest similar to the pretest on lexical segmentation in listening comprehension. Both pretest and posttest reliability were calculated with Cronbach Alpha. Statistical analyses were done through one-way ANOVA. The result of the study indicated that self-regulated approach teaching through authentic materials can improve learners' lexical segmentation of listening comprehension.

Key words: authentic materials, lexical segmentation, listening, self-regulation

Introduction

In self-regulated view, learning means an activity that learners do by their own rather than a reaction that happens as the result of the teaching. In terms of language learning, SR refers to how learners can manage and control their learning to make their language learning process easy (Zarei & Hatami, 2012). Such a learner is self-directed toward learning because s/he personally sets his/her goals and task-related strategies (Zimmerman, 2002). Different definitions and components of SR in learning and teaching are presented in second language acquisition. For example, Pintrich and Groot (1990) believe that SR is the important aspect of learning and it has three components as student's metacognitive strategy, student's management and control of his/her effort, and student's cognitive strategy. Zimmerman (2002) considers SR as a process which includes three phases namely forethought phase, performance phase, self-reflection phase.

Among various components of SR, two are assumed to play an influential role in the learner's classroom performance. These are Self-Checking (SC) and Self-Efficacy (SE) which are learner's beliefs about their ability to learn and learners' needs to monitor goal achievements, respectively (Zarei & Hatami, 2012; Hoyle, 2010). SE can lead to self-motivation (Zimmerman, 2002) and SC is a process through which the language learner monitors and evaluates himself in relation to goals.

In addition, listening in language classes is an essential activity since it provides input and input leads to understanding. This input-providing source possesses specific features that can distinguish it from other sources of linguistic information. These differences lie in the way speech is presented in spoken texts. The raw material of listening is connected speech. The connected speech is not clearly comprehensible to non-native speakers, particularly at early stages of language learning (Sehellekens, 2007). Therefore, the segmentation of connected speech into lexical units is needed for language learners to follow the text and understand its content. Lexical segmentation is the process of recognizing and identifying the boundaries between words in spoken natural languages. Paying attention to syllables which carry stress is helpful for learners in segmentation. Therefore, it is important for language learners to be able to recognize where words begin and end.

These connected speech with native-like rate mostly exist in such authentic materials as commercials and news. In English classes in which non-authentic materials are usually used, learners do not have direct contact with the native-rate form of language of the target language society and they may face too much difficulty in understanding native speakers' spoken language. Using authentic materials which contain natural language can provide learners with an opportunity to encounter in real language, hence requiring much effort in lexical segmentation on the learner's side.

Several studies have been done on the effect of self-regulatory approach and mastery of different language skills and components. Fatemi, Alishahi, Khorasani and Seifi (2014) did a research on the relationship between EFL learner's listening comprehension and their SR. The result indicated that teaching listening comprehension by a self-regulatory approach can enhance language achievements of the learners. Latifi, Tavakoli and Dabagh (2014) did a similar research but the result was somehow different. The result indicated that both high and low skilled participant of experimental group achieve a significant improvement after treatment.

Although these bodies of research have been conducted on the area of SR and language learning skills, little attention has been paid to the interaction between the material type (authentic or non-authentic) and SR teaching and this impact on skill improvement. And in Iran no research has been done in the area of lexical segmentation in listening through authentic materials via a SR method. So, this study will investigate the effect of self-regulatory approach (with two components of self-checking and self-efficacy) on EFL pre-intermediate learners' lexical segmentation in listening comprehension via authentic listening comprehension texts.

Review of Literature

Self-Regulation (SR) refers to when an individual can govern and control himself without outside influence and assistance (Hoyle, 2010). Some students understand important concepts easily and seems motivated whereas some students struggled to understand. Theoretical base of SR emerges from psychology, metacognitive and social cognitive theories. Psychology is a science in which individual differences is viewed as one important topic. Metacognition in SR is defined as the awareness of one's own thinking and social cognition refers to social influences on individuals' developments of SR (Zimmerman, 2002).

The practical studies on SL may help language learning and teaching. Fatemi, Alishahi, Khorasani and Seifi (2014) conducted one study on the relationship between EFL learners' SR and their listening comprehension. They concluded that teaching listening comprehension through SR approach can increase language achievement of learners who can regulate their listening comprehension better. So, teachers should use SR approach to improve students' listening comprehension. Another research (Latifi, Tavakoli & Dabaghi, 2014) was also done on

listening comprehension in relation to SR approach. This study tried to investigate the effectiveness of an SR approach on the improvement of listening comprehension ability of EFL learners. They concluded that there was a significant difference between all groups, and that treatment was greatly efficient. So, training language learners through unedited movies cause to progress in compare to pedagogical movie.

Mareschal, Vandergrift, and W. Slater (2007) investigated the effects of a process-based, self-regulatory approach to second language listening instruction on language learners' metacognitive awareness. They provide detailed insights into the components of metacognitive, self-regulatory, and strategic knowledge, as well as individual listener characteristics, which influence L2 listeners' comprehension, and into the intricate interrelationships among these factors.

Shine (2015) did not work on one of the skills and SR like previous mentioned researches. This researcher worked on academic achievement of primary school students. He investigated the effect of self-regulated learning strategy and self-efficacy on academic achievement of learners. By analyzing the data gathered by using these scales, it was revealed that the relationship between variables were significant and it was unfolded that self-efficacy was the only significant predictor variable to academic achievement of primary school students while SR and cognitive strategy use were not being significant predictor like self-efficacy. Overall, this research has indicated that self-efficacy, SR and strategy use largely improve students' academic achievement. So, parents and teachers should increase children's' self-efficacy and self-regulated learning strategy by creating supportive environments.

Pintrich and De Groot (1990) explored the relationship between motivational orientation, self-regulated learning and classroom academic performance. The result indicated that both motivational and self-regulated learning components are very important in the classroom academic performance model which was investigated in this research. Students' participation in self-regulated learning was strongly related to students' self-efficacy beliefs. But these motivational beliefs are not sufficient for successful performance at the same time. Self-regulated learning components seemed to be more related and effective in performance.

The results of the following experimental study done on the area of SR was in opponent with the results of the previous mentioned studies. A study done by Zarei and Hatami (2012) investigated the relationship between Iranian EFL learners' self-regulated learning components and vocabulary knowledge and reading comprehension. To this end, 250 TEFL students were selected as participant. And two already stablished vocabulary and reading comprehension of TOEFL and the Persian version of SR Trait Questionnaire were administered. The data that was obtained through these instruments were analyzed via Pearson correlation procedure. And the findings showed mixed result. The findings indicated that the relationship between self-regulated components (planning, self-checking, effort, self-efficacy) and vocabulary knowledge were not significant but the relationship between these components and reading comprehension knowledge of learners were mixed. The relationship between self-checking, effort and reading comprehension were significant but the relationship between planning and self-efficacy were not significant.

The following researches were conducted in the area of authentic materials. Barekat and Nobakht (2014) investigated the effects of authentic and non-authentic materials in cultural awareness training on the listening comprehension ability of EFL learners. The analysis of the data indicated that the authenticity of materials and listening comprehension ability are tightly related and listening comprehension abilities has improved by authentic materials. The findings indicated that the listening ability of participants in the experimental group has improved more

than participants in control group. So, authentic materials in improving the listening comprehension ability of EFL learners.

Ghaderpanahi (2012) tried to explore the influence of authentic aural materials on listening ability of EFL learners. The comparison of the results of the pretest and posttest and the analysis of the interviews and questionnaires indicated that using authentic materials in the EFL classroom cause to improve EFL students' listening comprehension ability, in conclusion, this study approved that listening comprehension ability of EFL learner were improved after exposure to authentic materials in the classroom. So, for this reason the teachers should use authentic listening materials in the classroom.

Kilic and Ilter (2015) conducted a research to see whether authentic materials have a positive effect on developing the attitudes of 12th grade EFL students. Results showed that there was no significant difference between the means of two groups. And the mean of experimental group in posttest was higher than control group. So, those who were received authentic materials maintained positive attitudes toward listening English than those who were not received authentic materials. In conclusion, using authentic materials were effected learners' attitudes positively and were fostered students' attitudes in EFL classes.

In contrast with all previously mentioned researchers, Vossoughi and Morad (2010) investigated the possible significant difference between authentic listening materials and simplified version of listening materials in terms of listening comprehension of Iranian EFL learners. The result showed that the simplified listening materials were more effective because listeners of simplified materials scored significantly higher than the listeners of authentic materials. And also the results of obtained data of questionnaires showed that there was no significant difference between two groups in terms of motivation. In conclusion, the teachers should be quiet explicit with beginner learners, but should be natural and implicit as learners improved.

The above studies were carried out to exhibit the role of SR in learning a foreign or second language, especially in mastering language skills. Although the results obtained from different previous studies have shed some light on the area of self-regulated approach and its effects on language learning skills, they are controversial. And, there are many important things that can be effective in relation to self-regulatory approach and lexical segmentation of listening comprehension, such as the kind of materials which are used. In Iran few researches have generally been done on the effects of authentic materials on listening comprehension. Nevertheless, almost no research has been conducted on the area of SR in relation to authentic materials and lexical segmentation in listening comprehension. Therefore, this study will explore the role of SR factors on EFL intermediate learners' lexical segmentation in listening comprehension in the case of authentic materials.

Research questions

Regarding the stated problem, the objective and the significance of the study, the following questions and hypotheses were formed:

RQ1. Does a self-regulatory approach affect lexical segmentation in listening comprehension among Iranian pre-intermediate EFL learners?

RQ2. Does a self-regulatory approach affect the lexical segmentation in listening comprehension dealing with authentic materials?

RQ3. Is there any significant difference between self-efficacy and self-checking regarding the SR approach in lexical segmentation of listening comprehension?

Method

Participants

Due to the educational prohibitions of public schools, this quasi-experimental research required an available sampling. The research method of the study was experimental as it investigated the effects of one independent variable (SR approach) on one dependent variable namely lexical segmentation. The probable effects of the independent variable were also measured with a moderate variable which was the role of authentic materials. The participants were 14 to 15 years old and They were chosen from grade 7 since the formal language education in Iran starts from this grade. The students of private schools had already started learning English in elementary schools. So, the grade seven students of junior private high schools were considered as the pre-intermediate participants. The participants were 98 students of junior high school which were selected from the two private girls' junior high schools. Four available classes were selected from the two schools. The Oxford Quick Placement Test (OQPT,2007) that consisted of sixty multiple-choice items was administered in order to make the participants homogenized in terms of their proficiency level. The learners who met the band score at the pre-intermediate level (between 24 and 30) were selected (92 out of 98 students). Each group consisted of 23 participants. Each class was randomly considered as one participant group.

Materials

The authentic materials presented in the audio or visual modes including short headline reports, audio and video commercials, and short weather forecasts. The tasks were simple and relatively undemanding, and it is important to pre-teach key vocabulary so as to prevent the participants panic and make authentic materials much easier for a pre-intermediate level. The non-authentic materials were parallel with their authentic counterparts regarding the topic and the content because they needed to yield correct and real data. Both authentic and non-authentic videos and audios were suitable for kids and pre-intermediate level because the websites from which the videos and the audios were obtained had already determined the levels of the materials.

Instrumentation

The first instrument which used in order to linguistically homogenize the samples is The Oxford Quick Placement Test. The learners who met the band score at the pre-intermediate level (between 24 and 30) were selected as participants. Two tests of listening comprehension were given to the participants to compare their performance before and after the treatment. These listening tests included items to evaluate listening lexical segmentation. Items needed the participants to recognize the boundaries between the words and even the letters or the sounds among the utterances that they were listening to. All the dictation, completion and multiple-choice items required the participants to segment the letters and the words. Each test included 60 items, 20 multiple choices, 20 supplement as well as 20 dictation items, that included sentences in which some words had missing letters. All these items were accompanied with one authentic video and one non-authentic audio file to measure the participants' listening comprehension ability. Since these tests of listening were made by the researcher, based on the taught materials, they had to be piloted in advance.

The listening test was given to a group of students that were similar to the participants regarding proficiency level and age. The obtained data were analyzed by Cronbach Alpha to measure the reliability of the test since the items of the listening test were of different types. The obtained result was about 0.87 which showed that the test was reliable. And, the test face and content validity were obtained through consulting with three experts as the inter-raters. Two

checklists of self-checking and self-efficacy which were standard and were translated into Persian were given to the participants in order to evaluate their SR. The self-efficacy checklist was extracted from the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ, 1990) which contains 8 questions on participants' beliefs about their ability to learn. The self-checking checklist devised by Alberta Learning Organization (2013) which includes 7 items on learners' ability to monitor and check themselves was employed, too. In order to make the translated version of checklists reliable and valid, back translation method was used by the researcher.

Procedure

After homogenizing the participants, the researcher divided them into four groups based on random sampling method. Twenty-three students of each 4 classes whose scores were nearly the same considered as one groups. There were one control group and three experimental groups. All tasks in all participant groups were the same. The treatment included the tasks which were on the basis of the Richards & Burns' (2012) book with the title of *Tips for teaching listening* containing pre-listening phase, listening phase and post listening phase. It is worth mentioning that in all these phases the researchers used both English and Persian as the medium of instruction.

Pre-listening Phase

The pre-listening phase contained the following features:

- 1- activating background knowledge by talking about the main theme of audio or video and asking students to talk about what they know about the materials (video and audio they would listen to).
- 2- providing the learners with the necessary and difficult vocabulary, specially in the case of authentic texts, and asking them to make English sentence with the words and predict the content of the video or the audio text. To make this prediction easy for them, the researcher asked them to do it with simple words or sentences in English. They were also allowed to make predictions through their first language as asking them to use English could have been a linguistic barrier to express their prediction.

Listening Phase

The listening phase contained graded tasks and addressed the student's difficulties and misunderstandings regarding recognizing words in the utterances. In the graded tasks, the participants were asked to do simple activities the first time the audio or video was played, and then the participants were asked to do more complex activities when the audio or video was played again. For example, the participants were asked to listen and list the four main directions (north, south, east, west). Then, provided with a map they were asked to listen again and write the weather conditions of each region with the geographic directions. The second step of the listening phase contained playing listening video/audio two times. In each phase, whenever the participants had any difficulty in understanding the text, the instructor would stop the recordings and ask the participants to discuss their different problems and misunderstanding in pairs, in Persian. Then, the investigator would ask the pairs to share their responses in groups and with the whole class.

Post-listening Phase

Finally, the post-listening phase started which encompassed the listening activities in which the content of listening texts was based on a variety of interesting follow-up activities. The

recording was again played for the participants while they were received a list of words which were used in the recording. And, the participants were asked to put check mark for the words which they recognized from the recording. Then, the participants were given a list of key words from the text and were asked either to create a simple dialogue, to write a short simple text using the words or to read for the whole class to practice the listening materials and to practice the lexical segmentation of what they had listened to in the video or the audio and in the spoken utterances of the other participants. Regarding self-regulatory approach and the authenticity of the materials, each experimental and the control groups followed the following stages:

Stage one: Experimental group one was under eight-sessions treatment which was self-regulated teaching through non-authentic texts. The self-regulated teaching aimed at making self-regulated learners in terms of self-efficacy and self-checking that to improve the participants' beliefs about their ability to learn in the case of self-efficacy and to help the participants to monitor goal achievements for self-checking. To achieve this goal, the researcher provided the participants with opportunities to observe someone else's successful performance that could help the learner to perform the same task. Observing other participants' successful performance could increase the participants' beliefs that they could master a similar activity. In the present study, when the participants were praised for their effort and hardworking by applauding them or by the use of persuasive words from the researcher, their SE would have increased (Rahimirad & Zaree, 2015). The other way to improve the participants' self-efficacy was to teach the participants how to set realistic goals when they would face problems which cause creating feeling of mastery, hence increasing self-efficacy. The researcher taught the participants to remove negative thoughts about their beliefs towards their ability to master by helping them to recognize the negative thoughts and replacing with positive one. In addition to these ways of teaching, an SE checklist was given to the participants in each session at the end of the class. A checklist was given to the participants to guide them in self-checking during each session of teaching. The self-checking was taught to the students by asking them to answer the checklist to evaluate the quality of their work in each session.

Stage two: Experimental group two received self-regulated teaching and authentic materials. This treatment was exactly the same as the first one with the use of self-efficacy and self-checking checklists at the end of every session, and with the use of persuading words and removing the participants' negative thoughts and attitudes, but the authentic materials were used. The key vocabulary was taught to the participants before starting the treatment in order to prevent the participants to get confused and to make authentic materials much easier for the participants to understand.

Stage three: The third experimental group which received non-self-regulated teaching and authentic materials were under 8 ordinary teaching sessions without using self-efficacy and self-checking checklists. This group were taught through the use of authentic videos and audio texts. The same listening tasks used in stage one and two were practice in this group.

Stage four: The control group was not under the treatment. This group received ordinary teaching through non-authentic materials. The participants of this group did not receive self-efficacy and self-checking checklists at every session. They received ordinary teaching without teaching the procedure aiming at increasing the participants' self-efficacy and self-checking. The same listening tasks used in stage one, two and three were practice in this group.

After the eight treatment sessions, the searcher administered the posttest similar to the pre-test in order to determine the effectiveness of the self-regulated teaching on listening comprehension in the case of lexical segmentation through authentic and non-authentic texts.

Data Analysis

The data collected through the pre and the posttest were analyzed and interpreted in order to test the research questions and hypotheses as well as to reach the objectives of the study. In order to compare the four groups' performance in the pre and the posttest (between group differences), the researcher used One-Way ANOVA since the study involved one independent variable (SR with two levels of SC and SE), one moderate variable (authentic/ non-authentic material) and one dependent variable lexical segmentation through authentic texts (listening comprehension). The Independent sample *t*-test were also used to compare the performance of two self-regulated groups which received self-checking and self-efficacy checklists to see which component of SR (SE / SC) was more effective than the other. And, the Cronbach Alpha was used to measure the reliability of the pre and the posttest.

Result

Table 1. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Posttest						Posttest of Aut, N.SR	
		Pretest of cont	Posttest of cont	N.Aut.S R	N.Aut.S R	Pretest of Aut.SR	Posttest of Aut.SR		
N		23	23	23	23	23	23	23	
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	14.4565	33.1522	17.5217	39.7174	14.7174	43.6087	14.1739	38.0000
	Std. Deviation	6.31541	11.28196	6.58636	7.36519	7.44041	5.79568	8.81451	7.88699
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.151	.138	.084	.068	.152	.105	.124	.149
	Positive	.151	.110	.084	.063	.083	.105	.124	.149
	Negative	-.145	-.138	-.079	-.068	-.152	-.093	-.081	-.129
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.725	.725	.402	.324	.731	.505	.594	.712
Asymp. Sig. (2-		.670	.670	.997	1.000	.660	.961	.872	.691

Note: cont = control
Aut= Authentic
N.SR= Non Self-Regulated

N.Aut= Non authentic
SR= Self-Regulated

Table 1 shows that the mean index of the control group pretest was about 14.45, the mean score of group one pretest used non-authentic materials and self-regulated approach to teaching approach was about 17.52, the mean score of group two pretest that had authentic materials and self-regulated teaching approach was about 14.71 and the third group which used authentic

materials and non-self-regulated teaching approach had the pretest mean score 14.17. The posttest mean scores of each group were 33.15, 39.71, 43.60 and 38, respectively. So, Table1 indicates that the distribution of the scores is normal.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics (All Groups' Pre-test)

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Control group	23	14.4565	6.31541	1.31685	11.7255	17.1875	5.50	29.00
N.Aut.SR group	23	17.5217	6.58636	1.37335	14.6736	20.3699	4.00	30.50
Aut.SR group	23	14.7174	7.44041	1.55143	11.4999	17.9349	2.00	25.00
Aut. N.SR group	23	14.1739	8.81451	1.83795	10.3622	17.9856	1.00	41.00
Total	92	15.2174	7.35690	.76701	13.6938	16.7410	1.00	41.00

Table 2 provides the descriptive statistics of the participants' listening pre-tests in terms of the number of participants (N), mean scores, standard deviations (SD), and the standard errors of mean (SE). It shows the minimum and the maximum scores of the participants in each group and in total. Furthermore, the mean score of the control, first, second and the third experimental groups were 14.45, 17.52, 14.71 and 14.17, respectively. Since, the mean scores cannot show the significant difference between the groups, A One-Way ANOVA was conducted to determine between-groups pretest difference. The result is displayed in Table3.

Table 3. One-Way ANOVA between-groups (pretest)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	166.239	3	55.413	1.025	.386
Within Groups	4759.038	88	54.080		
Total	4925.277	91			

Critical F with df, 3/88=2.72/ $P \leq 0.05$ /two-tailed

Table 3 indicates there was no significant difference between all groups in the pretest. The critical F at 0.05 two-tailed level of significance with 3/88 degree of freedom is 2.72, but the observed F is 1.02. Since the observed F is less than the critical F, the difference between groups is not significant.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics (Experimental Groups' Post-test)

N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound		

					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Control group	23	33.1522	11.28196	2.35245	28.2735	38.0309	4.00	47.00
N.Aut.SR group	23	39.7174	7.36519	1.53575	36.5324	42.9023	24.50	52.50
Aut.SR group	23	43.6087	5.79568	1.20848	41.1025	46.1149	30.00	53.50
Aut. N.SR group	23	38.0000	7.88699	1.64455	34.5894	41.4106	26.50	50.00
Total	92	38.6196	9.01628	.94001	36.7523	40.4868	4.00	53.50

Table 4 provides the descriptive statistics of the participants' listening posttests in terms of the number of participants (N) which is 23, mean scores, standard deviations (SD), and the standard errors of mean (SE). The minimum and the maximum scores of the participants in each group and in total are shown in Table 4. Furthermore, the mean score in the control, first, second and the third experimental groups were 33.15, 39.71, 43.60 and 38, respectively. Since, the mean scores cannot show the significant difference between the groups, A One-Way ANOVA was conducted to determine between-groups posttest difference. The result is displayed in Table 5.

Table 5. One-Way ANOVA between groups (posttest)

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1296.576	3	432.192	6.234	.001
Within Groups	6101.109	88	69.331		
Total	7397.685	91			

Critical F with df, 3/88=2.72 / $P \leq 0.05$ / two-tailed

Table 5 shows that the observed F is 6.23 at 0.05 two-tailed level of significance with the 3/88 degree of freedom. The critical F at 0.05 two-tailed level of significance is 2.72. This is less than the observed F (6.23). So, the difference between groups is highly significant. The significant difference shows that the treatment was effective. Table 4.5 showed that there is a significant difference, but does not show that which group was more significant than the others. In order to see the amount of improvement of each group, the researcher conducted a Post-hoc Scheffe test. The following table (Post-hoc Scheffe test) was obtained by analyzing the data. Table 6 displays the result of Post-hoc Scheffe test.

Table 6. Post-hoc Scheffe test, multiple comparisons (post-test)

(I)	(J)	Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Control group	N.Aut.SR group	-6.56522	2.45535	.075	-13.5639	.4334

		Aut.SR group	-	2.45535	.001	-17.4552	-3.4579
				10.45652			
		Aut. group	N.SR	-4.84783	2.45535	.280	-11.8465
							2.1508
N.Aut.SR group		Control group		6.56522	2.45535	.075	-.4334
		Aut. group	SR	-3.89130	2.45535	.477	-10.8900
							3.1073
		Aut. group	N.SR	1.71739	2.45535	.921	-5.2813
							8.7160
Aut. SR group		Control group		10.45652	2.45535	.001	3.4579
							17.4552
		N.Aut. group	SR	3.89130	2.45535	.477	-3.1073
							10.8900
		Aut. group	N.SR	5.60870	2.45535	.165	-1.3900
							12.6073
Aut. N.SR group		Control group		4.84783	2.45535	.280	-2.1508
		Non.Aut group	SR	-1.71739	2.45535	.921	-8.7160
							5.2813
		Aut. group	SR	-5.60870	2.45535	.165	-12.6073
							1.3900

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 6 shows that the treatment in all groups was effective and the participants improved their lexical segmentation in listening comprehension. However, the experimental group's difference which received authentic materials and self-regulated teaching was more significant than of the others' in comparison with the control group. The other groups did not show significant difference with the control group. As Table 6 shows, the most significant group is the one which received authentic materials and self-regulated teaching. The result of the next group's performance which used non-authentic materials and self-regulated teaching approach was also significant. Then, the group which used authentic materials and non-self-regulated teaching approach was significant and the less significant group was the control group (non-self-regulated with non-authentic).

Table 7. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test (checklists of two self-regulated group)

		Self-Checking Aut.	Self-Checking Non-Aut.	Self-Efficacy Aut.	Self-Efficacy-Non-Aut.
N		23	23	23	23
Normal Parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	12.0000	15.1896	33.6630	34.6957
	Std. Deviation	6.78233	.81231	4.73659	3.85899

Most	Extreme Absolute	.074	.080	.182	.126
Differences	Positive	.074	.080	.076	.107
	Negative	-.074	-.060	-.182	-.126
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.354	.383	.874	.603
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		1.000	.999	.429	.860

a. Test distribution is Normal.

b. Calculated from data.

Table 7 indicates that the distribution of the scores is normal. The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test was used since the total numbers of each group participants were 23 persons. In the case of having less than 30 participants in each group, One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test should be used to calculate the normality of the test.

The former tables indicated that the group receiving self-regulated teaching with non-authentic materials showed the most significant difference between the pre-test and the posttest. So, it can justify that the treatment was effective. In order to see which component of the SR approach (self-checking and self-efficacy) was effective, the researcher employed an Independent Samples *t*-test for groups which received self-regulated teaching to see which component of SR that the teaching approach was based on was significant. The results of the descriptive statistics are shown in the next table.

Table 8. *Descriptive statistic (checklists of two self-regulated group)*

VAR00001	N	Mean	Std.	
			Deviation	Std. Error Mean
SC-Non-Aut	23	12.0000	6.78233	1.41421
SC- Aut	23	15.1896	.81231	.16938
SE- Non-Aut	23	15.1896	.81231	.16938
SE- Aut	23	34.6957	3.85899	.80465

Table 8 indicates the number of participants in the two groups which had eight sessions of self-regulatory treatment with the self-efficacy and the self-checking components. The obtained data of the self-checking and the self-efficacy of each group were compared by Independent Samples *t*-test in Table 9. However, Table 8 presents the descriptive statistic of the Independent Samples *t*-test regarding the number of participants, each group mean scores and the standard deviations. The means show that the self-efficacy of the group which received self-regulatory teaching with authentic materials was more than of the group which received self-regulated teaching with non-authentic materials and more than their self-checking. Furthermore, the table shows that the means of the self-efficacy of each group is more than the means of this responses to the self-checking items of the checklist.

Table 9. *Independent Samples t-Test (checklists of two self-regulated group)*

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
		F	T	df	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
SCG1	Equal variances assumed	50.431	-2.239	44	-3.18957	1.42432	-6.06009	-.31904
SC-G2	Equal variances not assumed		-2.239	22.631	-3.18957	1.42432	-6.13866	-.24047
SE-G1	Equal variances assumed	47.419	-23.722	44	-19.50609	.82229	21.16330	17.84887
SEG2	Equal variances not assumed		-23.722	23.946	-19.50609	.82229	21.20341	17.80876

Critical t with $df = 44 = 2.00 / P \leq 0.05 /$ two-tailed

Note: G1=Non.Aut. SR

G2=Aut.SR

Table 9 shows the observed t is more than the critical t (2.00) with $df=44$. Therefore, the difference between the groups is significant at ($p < 0.05$). Regarding the critical t (2.00), the significance of difference between the two groups that received self-regulated way of teaching in terms of self-efficacy is more than the difference between them in terms of self-checking. The means of the descriptive statistics of Tables 8 and 9 show the self-efficacy of the group which received authentic materials and self-regulated teaching are more than the group which received non-authentic materials and self-regulated teaching.

Discussion

The statistical analysis of the present study shows that self-regulated instruction can improve learners' lexical segmentation of listening comprehension among pre-intermediate EFL learners. Since the two experimental groups receiving the self-regulated teaching showed higher mean scores than the group which received non self-regulated teaching as well as the control group. The two experimental groups receiving the self-regulated instruction with mean scores of 43.6 and 39.7, respectively, showed higher mean scores than the group which received non self-regulated teaching with mean scores of 38. The possible explanation of such a result is that self-

regulated instruction can be considered as a tool to equip learners to be autonomous and to improve their performance. The findings of the present study were in line with the results of Fatemi, Alishahi, Khorasani, and Seifi's study (2014) who concluded that the participants with high level of self-regulation obtained high listening scores. They stated that self-regulatory approach could increase language achievement of the learners who will learn to govern and control their learning and their listening comprehension process. They added that learners with high level of self-regulation could find appropriate solution while doing a task in a language learning study. They stated that teachers should use self-regulated instruction in order to improve their learners' listening comprehension abilities.

The analysis of data shows that group two which received self-regulatory approach to teaching along with authentic materials outperformed among two other experimental groups. Group one which received non-authentic materials and self-regulated teaching showed higher mean scores than group three which received authentic materials and non-self-regulated teaching. So, it can be assumed that the authentic materials along with self-regulated teaching can positively affect learners' lexical segmentation of listening comprehension, authentic material in isolation cannot be effective. The results of this study is somehow in the same line with Barekat and Nobakht's conclusion (2014) that authentic materials are more effective than non-authentic materials in improving listening comprehension ability of EFL learners but different in the case that their study did not use a self-regulated teaching. By considering the results of the control and group three, the present study is in line with the following studies such as Ghaderpanahi (2012) who concluded that listening comprehension ability of EFL learners have improved through exposure to authentic materials in class. He mentioned that authentic aural materials should be used at all levels of language instruction and listening comprehension training because the goal of listening is to prepare learners for real life listening outside the classroom.

The results revealed that there are more significant differences between these two groups in terms of self-efficacy than self-checking. The mean score showed that the self-efficacy of group two which received self-regulated teaching with authentic materials was more than group one mean score which received self-regulated teaching with non-authentic materials and also more than their self-checking. The result of this study is in the same line with Shaine (2015) who concluded that self-efficacy is a significant factor that can increase primary school students' achievement. He stated that self-efficacy could be increased through the use of right instruction strategies. He noted the learners who were confident of their performance showed better achievement in learning. As Rahimirad and Zare-ee (2015) mentioned, having high self-efficacy in all language skills including listening comprehension can help learners to increase their achievement and listening comprehension.

Conclusion

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the effects of a self-regulatory approach through authentic materials on lexical segmentation in listening comprehension. To this end, three experimental groups and one control group were selected. One of the experimental groups which received authentic materials and self-regulated teaching outperformed the others in the posttest and showed higher mean score compared with the other groups. So, authentic materials and self-regulated teaching can be the reasons of priority of this experimental group. The result of the research showed that self-regulated approach positively affected lexical segmentation of listening comprehension as Fatemi, Alishahi, Khorasani and Seifi (2014) stated. They mentioned that self-regulatory approach can increase learners' listening comprehension process. Latifi, Tavakoli and Dabaghi (2014) concluded that teaching listening comprehension

through a self-regulated approach increases learners' language achievement. Between the two components of SR which were investigated in the present study, self-efficacy was more effective than self-checking. As Rahimi and Abedi (2014) mentioned self-efficacy is positively related to metacognitive awareness of listening strategies and SR.

The posttest mean scores of the experimental groups and the control group showed that the authentic materials do not remarkably affect the lexical segmentation of listening comprehension of the participants since the mean scores of experimental group two that received self-regulatory teaching with non-authentic materials was the highest among other groups. Then, the mean scores of experimental group one that received self-regulatory teaching with non-authentic materials was high and finally experimental group three which received non-self-regulatory teaching with authentic materials showed the lowest mean score in comparison with that of the control group. By comparing experimental groups with control group it could be concluded that authentic materials along with self-regulated teaching can be effective.

In short, the results of the study verified that self-regulated approach to teaching through authentic materials can improve learners' lexical segmentation in listening comprehension.

References

- Amirian, M. R., Mallahi, O. & Zaghi, D. (2015). The relationship between Iranian EFL learners' self-regulatory vocabulary strategy use and Their Vocabulary Size. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 3(2), 29-46.
- Barekat, B. & Nobakht, H. (2014). The effect of authentic and inauthentic materials in cultural awareness training on EFL learners' listening comprehension ability. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 4 (5), 1058-1065.
- Eissa, M.A., (2009). The effectiveness of a program based on self-regulated strategy development on the writing skills of writing-disabled secondary school student. *electronic journal of research in educational psychology*, 7(1), 5-24.
- Fatemi, M. A., Alishahi, M., khorasani, M. & Seifi, M. (2014). The relationship between EFL learners' self-regulation and their listening comprehension. *Australian international academic centre*, 5(4), 198-201.
- Ghaderpanahi, L. (2012). Using authentic aural materials to develop listening comprehension in EFL classroom. *English language teaching*, 5(6), 146-459.
- Hoyle, R.H. (2010). *Handbook of personality and SR*. United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishing Ltd
- Kilic, Z.V. & Ilter, B.G. (2015). The effect of authentic materials on 12th grade students' attitudes in EFL classes. *International Association of Research in Foreign Language Education and Applied Linguistics ELT Research Journal*, 4 (1), 2-15
- Latifi, M., Tavakoli & M. Dabaghi, A. (2014). The effects of a self-regulatory approach on the listening comprehension achievement of EFL learners. *International journal of research studies in education*, 3(3), 67-78.
- Mareschal, C., Vandergrift, L. & W. Slater, G. (2007). *Student Perceptions of a Self-regulatory Approach to Second Language Listening Comprehension Development*. Unpublished doctoral Dissertation, University of Ottawa, Canada.
- Pintrich, P.R. & De Groot, E.V. (1990). Motivational and self-regulated learning components of classroom academic performance, *Journal of educational psychology*, 82(1), 33-40.

Rahimirad, M & Zare-ee, A. (2015). Metacognitive strategy instruction as a means to improve listening self-efficacy among Iranian undergraduate learners of English, *Iranian Journal of instruction*, 8(1),117-132.

Schellekens, P. (2007) *The oxford ESOL handbook*. Oxford University Press.

Shaine, M. H. (2015) The effect of self-regulated learning strategies and self-efficacy on academic achievement of primary school students, *psychology and behavioral science*, 4 (3), 107-115.

Vossoughi, H. & Morad, A.H. (2010). A Comparative Study of Authentic Listening Materials and Their Simplified Versions on the Listening Comprehension and Motivation of Iranian EFL Learners, *The Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 3(2), 208-222

Zarei, A. A. & Hatami, G. (2012) On the relationship between self-regulated learning components and reading comprehension. *Theory and practice in language studies*, 2(9),1939-1944.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2002) Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview, *Theory into practice*, 41(2), 64-71.