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Abstract

This study was an attempt to investigate the effects of the two forms of instruction, namely, FonF and Fonfs on developing listening and reading abilities and skills of Iraqi intermediate EFL learners. The research is by nature a two dimensional study which covers both a macro study on teaching professionalism and micro study of learning development. Before starting the treatment, in order to test the homogeneity of the students, a PET was piloted among 80 students being at the same language proficiency level of the main participants of this study and showed high reliability and validity indices. Subsequently, the listening and reading sections of IELTS test were administered to the selected participants of the study and then they were divided into three experimental and control groups receiving the treatments in one term of six weeks. The experimental groups were taught through the FonF and Fonfs teaching strategies and the conventional group enjoyed the routine classroom schedule and syllabus. The researchers employed independent samples t test and the results indicated significant difference among the mean rank of the experimental and control groups on the listening post-test (p = 0.049<0.05). Moreover, she used ANOVA and univariate analyses were used and the results indicated that there was a significant difference among the mean rank of the experimental groups on the use of FonF and Fonfs post-test. Therefore, the multiple comparisons exposed that teaching FonF was basically more operational for exercising reading skills and tasks in an EFL classroom than teaching Fonfs for developing listening skills. All in all, teaching either FonF or Fonfs can be to the benefit of Iranian EFL learners since the differences between the numerical values obtained have not been greatly different to reject the treatment effects of Fonfs.
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1. Introduction

1.1 The Problem

In square one, the inquirer depicts a picture of the far distance between the present understanding of form focused instruction and that of the past. The researcher's interest in the listening and reading skills led her to set out a study to investigate the effect of two types instruction, FonF and Fonfs, on the development of receptive skills, reading and listening, in Iraqi EFL learners. The eye-catching instructions under the title of Focus on Form and Focus on Forms has held many attentions thus far, but the crux of the matter is that, precious few studies in Iraq approach the area from the angel this present investigation aims at. In point of fact, this paper approaches the realm with a closer look on the effects each one of the instructions produced among students, as their receptive skills (Listening and Reading Comprehension) are concerned.

1.2 Significance of the Study

The findings of the current study might be beneficial for language learners, teachers, pedagogical institutions, research organizations, and material developers or syllabus designers as well as curriculum developers in the field TEF and TESL as it cast light on the possible contributions Focus on Forms vs. Focus on Form Instructions may have on the Receptive Skills of Reading and Listening which engulfs an experimental study of Iraqi Intermediate EFL Learners. As for language learners, they found out about the importance of FonF instruction and how it can possibly help them get more powerful in listening and reading comprehension.
As for EFL teachers, the results of the study provided them with possible insights into the nature of FonF teaching and learning of receptive skills. Moreover, the findings of this study can pave the way for providing EFL instructors with a clearer picture of the contributions of two types of Form-based language instructions which may expedite the improvement of receptive skills. Furthermore, the findings of the study had contributions for educators and material developers to help teachers develop their awareness regarding the types of Fonfs in teacher education programs and in the curriculum designed for the students, respectively.

1.3 Relevant Scholarship

ESL/EFL instructors as well as methodologists have practiced various language teaching practices and tasks in classroom settings that focused on developing bilateral interactive communication among ESL/EFL learners, in order to create opportunities for learners to use the learned language in in search of linguistic and psychological data, and to pay less heed to learning formulaic structural rules or learning dialogues via sole memorization and pattern practice drills (Brumfit, 1984; Howatt, 1984). As stated by Snow 1992, in content based instruction, “language learning possibly plays a less important role as compared to content learning” (Snow, Met, & Genesee, 1992.). Conversely, a number of scholars have perceived that good content teaching is not necessarily at all times effective (Swain, 1988), and in the meantime the plan of implementing content-based instruction, would presumable lead to the teaching of language form and then meaning.

Those who start learning as young children, may be able to attain elaborate proficiency in a foreign or second language without any formal instruction. This product backs up the premise that Language learning is not required for acquiring a second language. Nevertheless, it is infrequent for learners in ESL/EFL classes to reach such a high level of language proficiency. Such a debacle to master EFL or ESL is due to functional changes that are coupled with age factor. Some other people point to the confinements in classroom settings. Accordingly, learners during infancy period, particularly children in classrooms in a cohort with the same vernacular seem to avail from EFL/ESL by means of limiting exposure to sounds, words, and phrases they learn to use more efficiently while communicating with their peers (Lightbown & Spada, 2006). Language acquisition does not definitely happen in a flash or happens as a result of short-lived and limited exposure to some form of language lessons, or a restricted corrective feedback from the part of their instructors. Language learning definitely calls for an evolutionary and dynamic process or development which changes continually, and in times to indicate that the language users have full and irreversible control of their language behavior. A number of scholars, namely, Krashen, 1982, 1994 and Truscott, 1996, 1999, researching this area, have theorized that when instruction is merely centered around the linguistic forms, this is only slightly constructive and it may possibly bring about some negative effect on language acquisition and learning. Krashen 1994 argues that explicit Form focused instruction modifies EFL/ESL language production, but not their underlying knowledge of grammar, which grows only via contact with language in natural interactive environments.

Scholars like Schwartz, 1993, Sharwood Smith, 2004, and Ellis 2005 propose that teaching can enable ESL learners and users to acquire metalinguistic knowledge, however such sort of knowledge is processed and stored in a separate manner from the language they have acquired through interactive language use and interactive communication. A portion of the experimental studies which examined various types of knowledge second language learners acquired during forms-based instruction shows that Form focused instruction can play a role in aiding learners in such classes to use their second language more fluently and accurately (e.g., Spada & Lightbown, 1993; Lyster, 2004) and indubitable the forms they use while producing language represent more advanced stages of language development (Doughty & Varela, 1998).

Efforts were made by such research studies to develop tasks that induce samples of unprompted speech. Norris and Ortega (2000), carrying a meta-analysis study, report the benefits of form-focused instruction, particularly the positive effects of overt control on second language learning. Though, most revisions included in the meta-analysis took advantage of discrete-point tests as a benchmark of teaching efficacy. Advances in language production might reflect learners’ ability to properly use linguistic elements they have picked up as whole language entities, unbroken chunks during intense practice of form or to use metalinguistic knowledge they have acquired in structure lessons to screen their language performance. Language performance under time pressure reveals that the underlying structure is not meaningfully affected. Though, learner’s ability to use language more accurately and fluently can lead to language learning in numerous ways. For instance, by creating guided or unanalyzed blocks of language, learners can create a kind of input-feedback loop for themselves that gives them samples of language that they can later integrate into their grammar systems when they are mature enough to develop (Lightbown, 1998; Sharwood Smith, 2004). The other benefit of such a program is that learners produces more accurate or improved language named as context-based usage. Unstructured words and/or controlled speech allow learners to communicate continuously, while improving their access to spoken input (Krashen, 1982). Furthermore, the
ability to use unstructured parts of speech can free up cognitive resources for treating exterior input (Ellis, 2005). Some theories of language acquisition assume a more direct connection between metalinguistic or formulaic knowledge and spontaneous language use. Skill theorists hypothesize that a language that is first learned as metalinguistic knowledge can become so well integrated and automated through repeated meaningful practice that the language user forgets the metalinguistic knowledge and forgets that he has learned it (DeKeyser, 2003). Based on the aforementioned concepts, this study is in line with a number of similar studies that focus on the two most commonly used types of language teaching under the banner of form-centered (FonF) and form-centered (Fonfs).

The researchers presented a comparative study on the effects of FonF and Fonfs Instruction on the receptive skills of young secondary students, i.e. listening and reading. Focus on form refers to actual interaction, as in task-based teaching. Regarding this type, somewhere and somehow there is a break in the communication, and it is because of the form that is being misused; and what the teacher does when focusing on a form of communication is to stop observing the communication to draw students' attention to that feature and then move on to another form of communication. Long (1996) suggested that form-focused instruction is blessed with at least two advantages over purely meaning-focused instruction. First, it can increase the visibility of positive evidence, and second, it can often provide important evidence in the form of direct or indirect negative feedback. FonF can be of two types planned or unplanned. In the proposed FonF, the focus on a particular linguistic feature is predetermined to provide a context for its use (Ellis, Basturkmen, & Loewen, 2002). In contrast, unplanned FonF occurs when students' attention is drawn to language when a felt need arises, rather than in a predetermined way (Spada, 1997) and "randomly directed to particular language forms while performing unfocused tasks" (Shintani, 2012). In another argument, the movement of FonF stands where the teacher begins grammar. So his starting point is not meaning; on the contrary, such a point is the rule of a particular form. For lack of a better phrase, Focus on Forms is "a traditional way of structuring a curriculum." Since the aforementioned titles have emerged for these two types of learning, many researchers approach the field from different angles and perspectives and examine the impact of each on various related language factors, skills, and subskills. Along with this wave, this study brought FonF and Fonfs into Iraqi classrooms and examines who has more receptive skills among students. There are several internal and external factors that can affect student performance. In order for teachers to help students overcome problems related to improving speaking skills, it is necessary to identify these factors. Factors arising from performance conditions originate from time pressure. Students improved their speaking skills and performed better when they did not have a time limit. The first factor is related to performance conditions. Learners do speaking activities in different conditions. Performance conditions affect speech performance and these conditions include time pressure, planning, presentation quality, and amount of support (Nation and Newton, 2009). Plan students are relatively more successful in language skills, especially in speaking. How much support students receive from teachers or other support sources can be an important factor affecting speaking ability? Effectiveness and amount of support, as well as affective factors such as motivation, self-confidence, anxiety, listening and feedback during speaking, are very important during speaking.

1.4 Research Questions and Hypotheses

The researchers came up with four questions to crystallize the ongoing research theme:

(1) Is FonF instruction more effective than Fonfs instruction on listening comprehension ability?
(2) Is FonF instruction more effective than Fonfs instruction on Reading Comprehension ability?
(3) Will the listening ability of test-takers significantly change after the FonF and Fonfs treatment procedure?
(4) Will the reading ability of test-takers significantly change after the FonF and Fonfs treatment procedure?

To investigate the proposed research questions in this study, the researchers formulate the following two-tailed null hypotheses:

H01: Focus on form instruction is not reliably more effective than Fonfs instruction on Reading ability.
H02: Focus on form instruction is not reliably more effective than Fonfs instruction on Listening ability.
H03: Reading ability of test-takers will not significantly change after the FonF and Fonfs treatment procedure.
H04: Listening ability of test-takers will not significantly change after the FonF and Fonfs treatment procedure.

2. Method

2.1 Participants

The population for the study is held as all Iraqi young intermediate-level English language learners who live in Iraq. Simply put, a total of 80 Iraqi young intermediate-level English language learners, range in age between 18 and 25, were selected based on a convenient sampling technique since random sampling was not be possible. Passing
intermediate level in a private language school in Iraq, participants, including male and female, from two different schools, as intact groups, took all the required tests over the course of conducting research process which lasted for almost 3 and a half months. For confidentiality and ethical purposes, all participants inked the consent form so as to make sure that the data related to each individual learner was not be unveiled to public for any reason and their names were kept confidential for anonymity purposes. In this regard, needless to say, no one was forced to take part in the survey and an agreement paper was signed by all the participants.

The participants of the current study were Iraqi male and female intermediate learners studying in their intact classes. As stated, Non-random convenient sampling was used to select these participants because the researchers were able to select the participants randomly. To choose the participants of the study, the researchers talked to different intermediate classes in a language institute in Iraq and would win the approval of two classes.

One may go forward step by step, not knowing if the direction is wrong, until you hit a wall. Then we would have to change the direction. Data (observations) added some small candle-lights here and there, and a smart person may use this little light to find a better way through the room. But this way necessarily contained dark parts again (otherwise one would be caught by the candle-lights like mosquitos and never find a way through the room). And: many small lights can be a decent guide. The problem we trap into is to see and "p<0.05 - light" as some kind of bright shining floodlight and we don't recognize "p>0.05" as possible light sources at all. But that's not the fault of the tests (deemed invalid or whatever) but our fault to paint black-and-white pictures of a world coming in colors and grayscales and to interpret p-values "out of context".

2.2 Data Collection Tools (Instruments and Materials)
To arrive at the objectives set in this paper, a number of instruments including material, tests and questionnaires were used.

2.2.1 Preliminary English Test (PET)
To guarantee the homogeneity of groups owing to the issue that all learners were supposed to be at intermediate levels, Preliminary English Test (PET) was used. PET is the first level of Cambridge ESOL exam and a basic level qualification which approves that a student can use English to communicate in simple situations. The elementary level exam is based on language used in real life situations, consisting of the four language skills of reading, writing, listening and speaking. But for the purpose of this study, and due to the lack of time, only reading, writing and listening parts of the test were run among participants.

2.2.2 IELTS Listening TEST
International English Language Testing Speaking (TEST) sets the ground for assessing the English Skills of the applicants. Given that, in this study, the test used in the pretest and posttest phase so as to compare groups’ changes which is due to the pedagogical interventions. IELTS is assessed on a nine-band scale. The details of IELTS listening test was described fully in the main thesis.

2.2.3 IETLS Reading Test
The IELTS reading test, both general and academic, take 60 minutes. Candidates should complete 3 reading passages starting from an easy one and ending with a highly complex and longer one. The details of IELTS reading test was described fully in the main thesis.

2.3 Study Design
The present probe can be described as a “primary research”, building on original data, rather than a “secondary” investigation which is based on secondary sources including other researchers’ articles or books. The quan-qual paper was the hybrid probe, sticking to one of the many quasi-experimental research designs, namely the Pre-Test-Post-Test design. Non-Equivalent groups and convenient sampling were used in this classroom experiment, in which group behavior in probabilistic terms were compared under controlled conditions. Since pure randomization was not being feasible for the researchers, instead of true experimental design, the researchers took advantage of quasi-experimental design. More specifically, the study is considered as a quasi- experimental model (Pre-test and post-test) and because there are two experimental groups in the study it is a comparison group design as well.

2.4 Procedure
PET, initially, was piloted among 80 participants and, in the analysis phase mal and non-functioning items went under adjustment. In the next level, the proficiency test was handed to participants for forwarding the homogeneity purposes, ascertaining all the participants were roughly at the same level. Regarding the convenient sampling adopted by this study, four classes were selected with each having 20 students. For shaping up listening skills,
participants in class number A received Focus on Form instructions and Class Number B was offered Focus on Forms instructions. Regarding reading skill, Focus on Form instructions was presented to students in class number C, and Focus on Forms instructions was provided with participants in class number D. As for the listening pretest phrase, before the commencement of implementing the determined strategies, participants in class number A and B took the listening test of IELTS, and scored based on IELTS listening skill criteria as reflected in ESOL department of Cambridge website. Regarding reading pretest, an IELTS reading test were selected from the book titled IELTS for Success and given to participants in classes number C and D. Participants' reading performance were scored. After pretest phase, participants received instructions based on the class number they were in and the set objectives for each. Thereafter receiving treatments, the researchers evaluated participants' listening and reading scores in the post-test phase, following the same procedures forwarded in the pre-test level with different test items considering. It is worthwhile to note that the researchers herself taught four types of instructions to students in a bid to reduce the effect of intervening factors, slashing contamination as a result. The three-month time frame was set for conducting this study. This span of time covered two regular semesters in the study targeted language private schools, and each semester included 16 sessions. It should be mentioned that roughly six sessions were given over running different tests of the study and around 20 sessions was held for forwarding the research process.

2.5 Analysis Plan

SPSS version 21 was used, as regards the analysis part, to analyze the scores and gained data in the previous phases. As to the homogeneity level, through SPSS, Variance, Standard error of measurement, skewness, Z score and Mean of each group's score in PET was analyzed. Standard deviation (SD) was added and subtracted to and from the mean and the foresaid process offered researchers two points, letting her scratch out those who received higher and lower scores comparing those two points. Thereupon, touching the listening ability of the learners, the obtained scores from IELTS test at the pre-test phase were compared between students in class A and B. To do so at first, running the test of normality indicated the nature of outcome is parametric, so an Independent Samples t test was applied to show any significant score between the two classes. The reaped result of IELTS reading pre-test were also compared between students in class C and D. With respect to the nature of gained data, the outcome of normality test showed the population was non-parametric; as a result, Mann Whitney U Test was used to fulfill the comparison task. The same procedures were forwarded to evaluate students' receptive skills, thereafter treatment and in post test phase. As shown by normality test, the groups enjoy the same nature they had in pre-test phase. Concerning the reliability of each test of reading and listening, One-Way ANOVA was used for scores given by raters in listening and Kruskal-Wallis Test was applied for reading part. Selection of these analysis related tests was based on the parametric and non-parametric nature of population in each receptive skill related test. In the end, all the proposed questions were answered based on the results obtained on the course of probe, rejecting or proving the proposed hypothesis as well.

3. Results

3.1 Participant Selection

To select the participants required in this study, the researchers used a sample of the general English Proficiency Test (PET). Prior to the actual administration, the test was piloted to make sure that it could be used confidently for this screening. The section below describes the details of these two consecutive processes of piloting and actual administration to ensure homogeneity in the three experimental groups prior to the treatment.

3.2 Descriptive Statistics of the PET Piloting

Following the piloting of the test, the mean and standard deviation of the raw scores and the reliability were calculated.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of the PET Piloting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot Scores</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>62.900</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>17.128</td>
<td>-.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of the PET in the pilot phase, the mean and standard deviation were found to be 62.90 and 5.39, respectively. Figure 1 shows the histogram of the pilot participants’ scores on the PET.
The test contained 65 multiple choice items. After calculating item facility, item discrimination and choice distribution, three items were found faulty and thus discarded. The KR-21 formula (cited in Hatch & Farhady, 1982) was employed for calculating the reliability of the test scores gained by the participants on the pilot PET and an acceptable reliability of 0.87 was obtained. The ratio of skewness, statistic over standard error (-0.172) was within the range of plus and minus 1.96.

### 3.3 Descriptive Statistics of the PET Administration

Next, to ensure the homogeneity of the participants, the piloted PET was administered for participants’ selection before the administration of any treatment.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of the PET Administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency Test</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70.00</td>
<td>92.00</td>
<td>75.864</td>
<td>4.984</td>
<td>24.843</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>0.267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (list wise)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of this administration with the mean being 75.864 and the standard deviation 4.984, respectively. Figure 2 below shows the histogram of the PET scores of the 81 students who took the PET from whom the main participants of the study were to be chosen.
It can be concluded that the data is normally distributed, since the ratio of skewness, the statistic over standard error (0.58) was within the range of plus and minus 1.96.

3.4 Test of Normality

Based on what was mentioned in previous parts, the issue of normality was taken into account prior to taking any other step. The assumption of normality which is delineated in this part can be reaped through Q-Q plots. In order to determine normality graphically, the researchers uses the output of following normal Q-Q Plot. The following three series of Q-Q plots prove that samples are drawn from a normal distribution.

Table 3. Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male or female</th>
<th>Valid N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Missing N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Total N</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PET English Test MALE</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Tests of Normality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male or female</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk Statistic</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PET English Test</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.200*</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.963</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

* This is a lower bound of the true significance.

b. PET English Test is constant when Male or female = 22.00. It has been omitted.
Figure 3. Q-Q plot of PET English Test for female candidates

Q-Q plot of the Figures 3 and 4 illustrate the sample used in both male and female students are drawn from a normal distribution. Regardless of slight departure from the diagonal line, the scores did not get that much far away from the line to be called non-parametric population.

Figure 4. Q-Q plot of PET English Test for male candidates

The side-by-side boxplots of Figure 5 show not that much variance among scores gained by the two groups of participants. Regarding the equal length of IQR (interquartile range), variance distribution in Male and female boxes, obviously enough, are of no skewed types, with standing their median lines in center. Such equity slightly less observed in female group’s Boxplot, although it is still normal. As for the length of IQR, female group has a shorter box (less variance) than that of male group; on the contrary, male group has the largest one (more variance) among others. It is worthwhile noting that the existing whiskers are not that much different among the three groups.
3.5 Testing the Hypotheses

To verify the null hypotheses of the study, the researchers set out to conduct paired-samples t test on the scores of both listening and reading of all the 80 students in four classes. The paired t tests were conducted to compare the listening scores for the two groups both in pretest and posttest and to verify the null hypothesis of the difference between The teaching of FonF and Fonfs on EFL learners’ listening and reading before and after the treatment. The following Tables indicate the paired sample statistics for the groups under investigation.

Table 5. Paired Samples Statistics for FonF and Fonfs instructional impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>LISTENPRE</th>
<th>READPRE</th>
<th>LISTENPOST</th>
<th>READPOST</th>
<th>LISTENSPRE</th>
<th>LISTENPOST</th>
<th>READPRE</th>
<th>READPOST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.4625</td>
<td>4.0188</td>
<td>5.0250</td>
<td>4.9750</td>
<td>4.4625</td>
<td>5.0250</td>
<td>4.0188</td>
<td>4.9750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1.08434</td>
<td>.90513</td>
<td>.71112</td>
<td>.84905</td>
<td>1.08434</td>
<td>.71112</td>
<td>.90513</td>
<td>.84905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>.12123</td>
<td>.10120</td>
<td>.07951</td>
<td>.09493</td>
<td>.12123</td>
<td>.07951</td>
<td>.10120</td>
<td>.09493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By a glance at the mean scores of the listening and reading skills in both pre and posttests, we can figure out the following facts:

1. The mean score of the listening skill in posttest is higher than those of the same groups before any treatment of FonF and Fonfs concepts.
2. The mean score of the reading skill in posttest is higher than those of the same groups before any treatment of FonF and Fonfs concepts.
3. The highest mean score belongs to pairs 3 and 4 of both listening and reading posttests, and the lowest belong to pairs two of listening and reading in pretest.
The pairwise t-test analyses of the final results of the study are manifested in Table 6. As for pair 1, the index of t value is 3.227 in pretest between the listening and reading scores which is by nature the affirmative approval of the correlation analyses mentioned in Table 6, however we can observe a discrepancy between the t value of listening and writing posttest results in pair 2 and the correlation index of the same traits in the same context.

The main indices belong to pair 3 and 4 since they indicate the difference between the mean score of the listening and reading ability of the students before and after the treatment. As shown in the third row-column 8 of the Table, the t value of 3.750 with the degrees of freedom of 79 and the Sig. value of .000, the difference between the mean scores of the test-takers in listening skill before and after treatment is completely reliable. Therefore, the third null hypothesis which indicates that “The listening ability of test-takers was not significantly change after the FonF and Fonfs treatment procedure” is rejected.

As indicated in the fourth row-column 8 of the Table, the t value of 6.937 with the degrees of freedom of 79 and the Sig. value of .005, the difference between the mean scores of the test-takers in reading skill before and after treatment is completely reliable. Therefore, the fourth null hypothesis which indicates that “The reading ability of test-takers was not significantly change after the FonF and Fonfs treatment procedure” is strongly rejected. In the main part of data analysis, the inquirer attempts to reject the first two null hypotheses. Based on such a result we need to find out if this change is more due to the FonF treatment of Fonfs treatment procedure.

Using univariate analyses along with Tukey HSD for both pre and posttest scores the researchers came up with the following data and related interpretation. Table 7 indicate all the related calculations of pretest analyses.

Table 7. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable: Listening and Reading scores in pretest</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.398</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests the null hypothesis that the error variance of the dependent variable is equal across groups.

Table 7 Leven’s test of equality of error variances indicate that the scores in pretests are equally distributed and the students’ scores are quite homogenous. From this Table we can see that we have homogeneity of variances of the dependent variable across groups. We know this as the Sig. value is greater than 0.05, which is the level we set for alpha. If the Sig. value had been less than 0.05 then we would have concluded that the variance across groups was significantly different (unequal). The following plot (Figure 6) is not of sufficient quality to present in our reports but provides a good graphical illustration of your results. In addition, we can get an idea of whether there is an interaction effect by inspecting whether the lines are parallel or not.
Figure 6. Pretest Marginal Means of Listening and Reading Scores

From this plot we can see how our results from the previous Table might make sense. Since the lines are not parallel then there is the possibility that an interaction takes place.

3.6 Posttest Analyses

After the treatment of both FonF and Fonfs in the four classes, the researchers put the data obtained into SPSS, to find out which of the variables could be more effective in improving the reading and listening skills.

Table 8. Between-Subjects Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups of FonF and Fonfs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 FonF Listening</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 Fonfs Listening</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00 FonF Reading</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00 Fonfs Reading</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00 FEMALE</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male or female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00 MALE</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.00 22.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 indicates the differences between the four groups of test-takers who were instructed with FonF listening and Fonfs listening as well as FonF reading and Fonfs reading treatment.

In the final Table, Tukey HSD, Table 9 of multiple comparisons, the secret of the interaction between the independent and dependent variables were revealed.
Table 9. Multiple Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Groups of FonF and FonFs</th>
<th>(J) Groups of FonF and FonFs</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FonF Listening</td>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>-.9508</td>
<td>.29783</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.9344</td>
<td>.6328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonF Listening</td>
<td>FonF Reading</td>
<td>-.9678*</td>
<td>.30498</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.1.7702</td>
<td>-.1.655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonF Listening</td>
<td>FonFs Listening</td>
<td>.9508</td>
<td>.29783</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>-.6328</td>
<td>.9344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonF Reading</td>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>-.8170*</td>
<td>.29358</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-1.5894</td>
<td>-.0447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>FonFs Listening</td>
<td>1.7392</td>
<td>.28287</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.0050</td>
<td>1.4834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonF Reading</td>
<td>FonFs Listening</td>
<td>.9678*</td>
<td>.30498</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.1655</td>
<td>1.7702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>1.5562*</td>
<td>.29039</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.7922</td>
<td>2.3202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>-.8170*</td>
<td>.29358</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.0447</td>
<td>1.5894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonFs Listening</td>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>1.5562*</td>
<td>.29039</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-1.3637</td>
<td>.1869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>-.8170*</td>
<td>.29358</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.4834</td>
<td>.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>FonFs Reading</td>
<td>1.5562*</td>
<td>.29039</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.7922</td>
<td>2.3202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on observed means.

The error term is Mean Square (Error) = .860.

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Table 9 shows the Tukey post-hoc test results for the different levels of education as shown above. We can see from the above Table that there is some repetition of the results but, regardless of which row we choose to read from, we are interested in the differences between (1) FonF Listening and FonFs Listening, (2) FonF Listening and FonF Reading, (3) FonF Listening and FonFs Reading, (4) FonFs Listening and FonFs Reading, and (5) FonFs Listening and FonF Reading. From the results we can see that there is a significant difference between all five different combinations of FonF and FonFs instruction of listening and reading (P < .0005). As indicated in the Table, FonF Listening and FonFs Listening show a value of (-.958) and the Sig. value of .017, proving that the FonFs Listening was more effective than FonF Listening. For the second set, FonF Listening and FonF Reading, the indices are consecutively (-.9678) by the Sig. value of 0.12 indicating that the treatment of FonF Reading was more effective than FonF Listening in general.

The implementation of FonF in dealing with reading skill in EFL/ESL classes is more consistent and effective than listening. As the values for FonF Listening and FonFs Reading show (.9884, Sig. value .019) teaching FonF for listening was more effective than teaching FonFs for reading. The 4th comparison, i.e., FonFs Listening and FonFs Reading, as the obtained values point out, mean difference of 1.739 and Sig. value of .000, teaching FonFs has been more effective in developing listening rather than reading. And finally the last comparison, FonFs Listening and FonF Reading, (-.817) and Sig. value of .014 indicate that teaching FonF for reading was more effective than teaching FonFs for listening. Based on the five sets of comparisons made, we can reject both null hypotheses and we can also assume two more hypotheses holding the differences between the two other dimensions of comparison of FonF and FonFs in teaching listening and reading skills.

The following plot is not of sufficient quality to present in my reports but provides a good graphical illustration of my results. In addition, we can get an idea of whether there is an interaction effect by inspecting whether the lines are parallel or not. From this plot we can see how our results from the previous Table might make sense. If the lines are not parallel then there is the possibility of an interaction taking place, so here we have the possible interactions between the teaching of FonF and FonFs.
4. Discussion

The results of data analysis revealed that there was a significant difference among the listening performance and reading performances of the students in different classes where FonF and Fonfs were the treated by the researchers. This study supports prior researches indicating that the use of FonF and Fonfs both can lead to changes in learners' skills performance, i.e., reading and listening. As the data obtained in the analyses above, the use of FonF in teaching is a bit more effective than teaching Fonfs in EFL/ESL classes. For the cross skill comparison and analyses, the researchers found that the teaching FonF was in general more effective for developing reading than teaching Fonfs for teaching listening. By and large, teaching either FonF or Fonfs can be to the benefit of both EFL and ESL learners since the differences between the numerical values obtained have not been greatly different to reject the treatment effects of Fonfs.

In conclusion, based on the all above mentioned explanations; participants in both experimental groups significantly outperformed control group on their listening and reading performance benefiting FonF and Fonfs instruction. Therefore, the obvious conclusion is that within a classroom setting the devised treatment i.e. FonF and Fonfs strategies, could make the broad-base impact needed to bring about major changes in students’ learning and help the participants to perform better and improve their listening and reading skills. Here the researchers concluded that if students learn these strategies, they can avail from more practical skills to use while listening and reading.

5. Conclusions and Findings

Before starting the treatment, in order to test the homogeneity of the students, a PET was piloted among 80 students being at the same language proficiency level of the main participants of this study and showed an acceptable reliability index indicated in chapter four. Subsequently, the listening and reading sections of IELTS test were administered to the selected participants of the study and then they were divided into three experimental and control groups receiving the treatments in one term of six weeks. It is worth mentioning that the listening and reading scores of the proficiency test were based on the fixed scores provided by the test designer organization. The experimental groups were taught through the FonF and Fonfs teaching strategies. Following the treatment, the students in all groups took parallel IELTS listening and reading tests as a posttest in which listening and reading scores again rated by three raters, were considered separately. Independent Samples t test were used and it indicated that, at the p-value of 0.05 level of significance, there was a significant difference among the mean rank of the experimental and control groups on the listening posttest (p = 0.049<0.05). Also, ANOVA and univariate analyses were used and the results indicated that, at the 0.05 level of significance, there was a significant difference among the mean rank of the experimental groups on the use of FonF and Fonfs posttest (p = 0.049<0.05). Therefore, the multiple comparisons exposed that teaching FonF was basically more operational for exercising reading skills and tasks in an EFL classroom than teaching Fonfs for developing listening skills. All in all, teaching either FonF or Fonfs can be to the benefit of Iranian EFL learners since the differences between the numerical
values obtained have not been greatly different to reject the treatment effects of Fonfs. The researchers vividly observed that FonF and Fonfs teaching strategies instructions in an EFL context can enhance students’ eagerness and participation in the learning process. Also she found that the learners’ enthusiastic involvement in listening tasks which usually seemed to be one of the skills that the students did not like to participate in. Furthermore, these strategies and techniques in groups prompted an emphasis on the process of learning and not just the final listening and reading. This study also revealed the importance of FonF and Fonfs teaching strategies in the listening and reading abilities and demonstrated a more successful cooperation and communication among learners. Accordingly, FonF and Fonfs instruction are recommended to be a part of the pedagogical curriculum to help students empower themselves in the act and process of listening and reading since both activate the students’ structural abilities as well as the communicative one.

The present study has explored the effectiveness of the change from teacher centered instruction to student-centered learning. Based on the previous discussions, currently, students are at the center of the whole process of English learning and teaching, and the teacher’s role has changed. According to the constructivist point of view, it is the learner who actively participates in the process of problem-solving and critical thinking using FonF and Fonfs strategies as two parallel and effective learning activities, which they find relevant and engaging. Using either FonF or Fonfs can be to the benefit of the learners but the choice was made by the teachers who figured out the difference and used a more befitting one based on the classroom context. Further research studies could continue to investigate how FonF and Fonfs strategies could provide effective learner-centered learning. However, this study is not generalized to all levels of EFL listening learning and teaching since the aim of this study is to investigate the process of implementing these strategies on Intermediate EFL learners and how it can benefit students’ learning to improve their L2 listening and reading skills.
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