

## **CHAPTER FOUR**

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

The chapter aims to present the in-depth analyses on the basis of the statistical data and subjects' responses to the personal profiles (Question 7) and the feedback questionnaire.

The first part provides the results Question 7 in the personal profiles to explore the most difficult listening test style as perceived by the subjects. The second part analyzes the data by Paired Sample T Test in SPSS to examine if the subjects improved their listening comprehension. The third section analyzes the raw data collected to check if the subjects who took notes performed better than those who did not. The fourth segment includes the comparisons between high and low proficiency groups in the experiment class for investigating which benefited more from note-taking by Independent Samples T Test. The final part focuses on the results of the feedback questionnaire to know how the subjects thought about the experiment. The significance level of the analyses is set at .05 throughout the entire study.

### **The Most Difficult Listening Test Style**

When the subjects were asked what the most difficult listening test style is, their answers are analyzed as follows. Table 4-1 shows that 88% and 86% of the respondents in the experiment class and the control class viewed the test style of selecting an optimal choice from a dialogue or a passage as the toughest. This could be due to the fact that global comprehension was more difficult to the subjects.

**Table 4-1 The Most Difficult Listening Test Style**

Style	Experiment		Control	
	T	TP	T	TP
Circling the word in the sentence heard	1	3%	2	6%
Selecting the matched sentence heard	1	3%	0	0
Selecting the matched picture to the sentence heard	2	6%	2	6%
Selecting an optimal choice from a dialogue or a passage	31	88%	30	86%

### Comparisons on the Pretest and the Posttest

In order to examine whether the subjects made progress after the experiment, the researcher used T-Test for Dependent Samples among all the subjects. As showed in Table 4-2, the whole experiment class made significant progress ( $p < 0.05$ ). Also, the mean scores of the posttest and the pretest are 84.86 and 60.86.

**Table 4-2 Comparison in Experiment Class**

	Mean	N	S.D.	T	df	Sig.
Pretest	60.86	35	29.14	-4.962	34	.000
Posttest	84.86	35	22.54			

Note. N = Number; S. D. = Standard Deviation; df = degrees of freedom; Sig. = Significance.

As showed in Table 4-3, it indicates that there was a significant improvement in the control class after the experiment. The p-value ( $p < 0.05$ ) shows the difference between the pretest and the posttest attains a significance level. Besides, the mean scores of the posttest and the pretest are 77.33 and 52.33.

**Table 4-3 Comparison in Control Class**

	Mean	N	S.D.	T	df	Sig.
Pretest	52.53	35	22.85	-5.664	29	.000
Posttest	77.33	35	23.03			

Concluded from Tables 4-2 to 4-3, the subjects made significant progress after

the experiment.

### **Comparisons Between the Experiment and the Control Classes**

The present study is to clarify if note-taking is helpful for improving learners' listening comprehension in the test styles of a dialogue or a passage. Thus, there are comparisons between the two classes.

As to the comparison of high proficiency groups in the two classes, Table 4-4 shows the two high proficiency groups were significantly different ( $p = .002 < .05$ ) in the scores of the pretest. After the experiment, the two high proficiency groups were not significantly different ( $p = .440 > .05$ ). It seems that the proficiency of the high ability groups became the same after the experiment. As for the mean scores are concerned, the high proficiency group in the experiment class made little progress ( $92.78 - 85.56 = 7.22$ ) while the high group in the control class made a lot of progress ( $88.75 - 69.41 = 19.34$ ). Thus, note-taking did not help the high proficiency subjects in the experiment class but hindered them from performing well. On the contrary, the high proficiency subjects in the control class did not take notes but still improved a lot in their listening ability.

**Table 4-4 Comparison of High Proficiency Groups**

T Test					
Mean	Experiment	Control	T	df	Sig.
Pretest	85.56	69.41	3.346	32.998	.002
Posttest	92.78	88.75	.782	30.934	.440

The two low proficiency groups, as presented in Table 4-5, showed no difference before and after the experiment because the significance levels are respectively .584 and .147, both are higher than .05. However, as for the mean scores are concerned, the low proficiency group in the experiment class made more progress ( $76.47 - 34.71 = 41.76$ ) than the low proficiency group in the control class ( $63.33 - 32.50 = 30.83$ ). Note-taking, clearly, benefited the low proficiency group in improving their listening comprehension.

**Table 4-5 Comparison of Low Proficiency Groups**

		T Test			
Mean	Experiment	Control	T	df	Sig.
Pretest	34.71	32.50	.553	30.012	.584
Posttest	76.47	63.33	1.490	29.997	.147

Tables 4-4 and 4-5 show that note-taking brought about no change. It even hindered the high proficiency subjects from making significant progress. The explanations of the results could be as follows. (1) The researcher did not give the subjects in the experiment class enough time to review their notes. While taking notes, the subjects had to catch the main idea, to write it down, and to group the content. Therefore, they had little time to organize the content and as a result did not perform better than those who did not take notes. (2) The pause between two sentences was too short for the subjects to take notes. (3) A learning strategy does not fit every one. The subjects who took notes quickly could possibly do better than those who did

not. Also, a learning strategy instruction does not assure success. (4) Since the researcher also provided the subjects in the control class with listening to the same content four times, they could catch the main idea, group the content and organize the information to answer the test questions. Therefore, they could perform well.

### **Comparisons on Different Proficiency Groups in the Experiment Class**

To understand which proficiency groups benefited more from note-taking, the researcher analyzed Table 4-6 as follows.

Table 4-6 indicates the two different proficiency groups in the experiment class did improve their listening comprehension after the experiment. In the high proficiency group, the mean scores of the posttest and the pretest are 92.78 and 85.56. That is, the high proficiency group did make progress. In addition, the scores of Standard Deviation of the posttest and the pretest are 14.47 and 14.64. It implies that the proficiency of the high proficiency subjects became less diverse after the experiment.

In the low proficiency group, the mean scores of the posttest and the pretest are 76.47 and 34.71. Clearly, the low proficiency subjects performed better than before. With respect to Standard Deviation of the low proficiency group, the scores of the posttest and the pretest are 26.68 and 12.81. Obviously, the low proficiency subjects became much more diverse in their listening ability than before the research.

However, the progress of the high proficiency group did not attain a significance level ( $.108 > .05$ ). Nonetheless, the low proficiency group made significant progress ( $.0001 < .05$ ). It seems that note-taking could help low proficiency

learners more than high proficiency ones.

**Table 4-6 Comparison of Different Groups in Experiment Class**

	N	Mean	Std. D.	T	df	Sig.
Pretest High	18	85.56	14.64	-1.694	17	.108
Posttest High	18	92.78	14.47			
Pretest Low	17	34.71	12.81	-6.328	16	.000
Posttest Low	17	76.47	26.68			

### **Results of Feedback Questionnaire**

The section discusses the results of the feedback questionnaire from the subjects in this study to get some pedagogical implications in the future. The results are stated as follows.

When asked what the most useful way in a listening activity was, the subjects pointed out the teacher’s explanation after a listening test was the most useful. As showed in Table 4-7, in the experiment class, 54% of the respondents chose “teacher’s explanation of the content after a listening test” as the most useful way to improve their listening ability. Only 14% of them chose “to know different accents” as the most useful method to strengthen listening comprehension. It could possibly be that the respondents were familiar with the speaker’s accent on the tape since they entered junior high school and thus most of them did not see it as a problem. Furthermore, 67% (12 out of 18) of high proficiency subjects thought the teacher’s explanation most useful while 41% (7 out of 17) of low proficiency ones did.

In the control class, the subjects evaluated the teacher's explanation higher than those in the experiment class (54% in the experiment class and 66% in the control class). This could mean the control class could not retain their memory as long as the experiment class could in a listening test. Therefore, they depended on the teacher's explanation to review the content.

With regard to different proficiency groups, the percentile between the high and low proficiency groups does not make much difference. Noticeably, none of the participants in the low proficiency group in the control class thought "to know different accents" was the most useful. This implies that they did not consider accents a problem. Moreover, 68% (13 out of 19) of the low achievers in the control class chose "teacher's explanation of the content after a listening test". Obviously, most of the low achievers in the control class depended on the teacher's explanation. This could possibly be that low proficiency subjects need more instruction than high proficiency ones because of their poor English ability.



**Table 4-7 The Most Useful Way in a Listening Activity**

Class	Experiment				Control			
	High	Low	T	TP	High	Low	T	TP
To know different accents	1	4	5	14%	2	0	2	6%
To know the differences between spoken and written languages	5	5	10	29%	4	4	8	23%
Teacher's explanation of the content after a listening test	12	7	19	54%	10	13	23	66%

As for the least useful way in a listening activity, the subjected agreed that was to know different accents. Concluded from Table 4-8, 49% of the experiment class pointed out “to know different accents” as the least useful way to increase their listening competence. In the high proficiency group, no one thought the teacher’s explanation the least useful.

The respondents in the control class also pointed out “to know different accents” as the least useful. However, 23% of the respondents thought “the teacher’s explanation” the least useful way because they said they still could not understand the content after the teacher’s explanation.

**Table 4-8 The Least Useful Way for a Listening Activity**

Class	Experiment				Control			
	High	Low	T	TP	High	Low	T	TP
To know different accents	10	7	17	49%	9	7	16	46%
To know the differences between spoken and written languages	7	5	12	34%	3	6	9	26%
Teacher's explanation of the content after a listening test	0	4	4	11%	4	4	8	23%

To understand what aspect the subjects improved most, the researcher designed this question to get the information. Reflected from Table 4-9, the subjects in the experiment class indicated that their first three improved aspects were to listen without distraction, to acquire a habit of writing down key words, and to remember the content easily. As Frase (1970) claimed, learners concentrate on listening for writing down key words. Because the subjects paid attention to note-taking, they listened without distraction and remembered the content easily. As for the high proficiency group, their first three improved aspects were to listen without distraction, to remember the content easily, to catch the main idea, and to acquire a habit of writing down key words. In terms of the low proficiency group, their first three improved aspects were to catch the main idea, to remember the content easily, and to acquire a habit of writing down key words.

Observed from the table, in both high and low proficiency groups, the subjects chose “to listen without distraction” as their first improved aspect. As for the differences between two proficiency groups, the high proficiency group ranked “to build up a habit of predicting the coming message” lowest but the low proficiency group ranked it fifth. Furthermore, in addition to “to build up a habit of predicting the coming message”, the high proficiency group also ranked “to identify different accents from the instructor” lowest. However, the low proficiency group ranked “to comprehend the content” lowest. The reasons for the results could be that the subjects concentrated on taking notes and thus were not distracted. With regard to the difference, the high proficiency group did not think it a problem for them to identify different accents and thus did not rank it as high as the other items. Nevertheless, the low proficiency group did not know what it was to predict the coming message before the experiment. After the experiment, they improved a lot in predicting the coming message and ranked it high. In terms of comprehending the content, the low proficiency subjects still found it difficult because of their linguistic ability.

**Table 4-9 The First Three Improved Aspects in Experiment Class**

Aspects	Mean	Rank	High Mean	High Rank	Low Mean	Low Rank
To improve his/her listening ability	2	5	2	5	2	5
To listen without distraction	2.67	1	2.75	1	2.6	1
To remember the content easily	2.28	3	2.25	2	2.33	4
To catch the main idea	2.24	4	2.17	3	2.4	3
To acquire a habit of writing down key words	2.33	2	2.17	3	2.5	2
To build up a habit of predicting the coming message	1.5	9	1	10	2	5
To comprehend the content	1.78	8	1.88	8	1	11
To know the differences between spoken and written languages	1.9	6	2	5	1.75	7
To identify different accents from the instructor	1.4	10	1	10	1.67	9
To be able to follow the speed of the speakers	1.85	7	2	5	1.71	8
To ignore noise easily	1.3	11	1.25	9	1.33	10

Note. Three subjects in the low proficiency group did not answer this question.

As seen in Table 4-10, the subjects in the control class pointed out their first

three improved aspects were to catch the main idea, to comprehend the content, and to be able to follow the speed of the speaker. The responses imply that the subjects still could learn to catch the main idea when an instructor provided them with sufficient practice by letting them listen to the same content four times. Since they could catch the key point, group the content and utilize the information, they could comprehend the content and follow the speed of the speaker. In the high proficiency group, the subjects improved most in catching the main idea, comprehending the idea, and following the speed of the speaker. Noticeably, no one chose “to improve his/her listening ability” as their first three improved aspects. As for the low proficiency group, the subjects indicated that their first three improved aspects were to catch the main idea, to remember the content easily and to acquire a habit of writing down key words. Apparently, no one chose “to build up a habit of predicting the coming message” and “to comprehend the content” as their first three improved aspects.

Besides the first three improved aspects in the control class, the table also shows two features. First, in each proficiency group, the subjects chose “to catch the main idea” as their first improved aspect. Secondly, the high proficiency subjects viewed “to comprehend the content” as the second most improved aspect. However, low proficiency subjects pointed it out as the least improved aspects. The results could be explained by the fact that the instructor gave the subjects sufficient practice by letting them listen to the same content for several times, and hence both high and low proficiency subjects were able to catch the main idea. Besides, high proficiency subjects were better than low proficiency subjects in listening comprehension. Thus they could completely comprehend the whole message but low proficiency subjects

could not.

**Table 4-10 The First Three Improved Aspects in Control Class**

Aspects	Mean	Rank	High Mean	High Rank	Low Mean	Low Rank
To improve his/her listening ability	1.33	11	0	11	1.33	9
To listen without distraction	2	6	2	4	2	4
To remember the content easily	2.2	4	2	4	2.33	2
To catch the main idea	2.64	1	2.67	1	2.6	1
To acquire a habit of writing down key words	2.1	5	2	4	2.17	3
To build up a habit of predicting the coming message	1.5	9	1.5	8	0	10
To comprehend the content	2.5	2	2.5	2	0	10
To know the differences between spoken and written languages	1.75	7	2	4	1.5	8
To identify different accents from the instructor	1.6	8	1.4	9	1.8	6
To be able to follow the speed of the speakers	2.3	3	2.43	3	2	4
To ignore noise easily	1.44	10	1.33	10	1.67	7

Note: Two subjects in the high proficiency group and eight subjects in the low

proficiency group did not answer the question.

With regard to the comparisons between the two classes as showed in Tables 4-9 and 4-10, there are two similarities: both of the experiment and control classes ranked “to build up a habit of predicting the coming message” and “to ignore noise easily” the two least improved aspects. In addition, there are three differences between the experiment class and the control class: (1) the experiment class ranked “to listen without distraction” their first improved aspect while the control class ranked “to catch the main idea” their first improved aspect; (2) the experiment class ranked “to improve his/her listening ability” fifth but the control class ranked it last, and (3) the experiment class ranked “to comprehend the content” eighth but the control class ranked it second. Obviously, the results indicate that the experiment class could concentrate on listening because they had to take notes. The control class could catch the main idea through listening to the same content several times. Besides, the results also indicated the subjects had difficulty in predicting the coming message and in ignoring noise. Also, the experiment class ranked “to improve his/her listening ability” higher than “to comprehend the content”. Nevertheless, the control class improved in comprehending the content more than in improving one’s ability.

In terms of different proficiency groups between the two classes, there are also some noticeable features. As far as high proficiency groups are concerned in Tables 4-9 and 4-10, the similarity between them is that they ranked “to identify different accents from the instructor” and “to ignore noise easily” the least two improved aspects. Besides, as the experiment class differs from the control class in three features, the high proficiency group in the experiment class also differs from that in

the control class in the same three features. The explanation of the similarities between the high proficiency groups could mean that high proficiency subjects had no problems in identifying different accents from the instructor and in ignoring noise. Therefore, they did not rank them high.

Besides high proficiency groups, low proficiency groups in the two classes also have two features. With regard to the similarity, both of the low proficiency groups ranked “to comprehend the content” the least improved aspect. Moreover, there is one difference between both of the low proficiency groups. The low proficiency subjects in the experiment class ranked “to build up a habit of predicting the coming message” fifth but the low proficiency subjects in the control class ranked it the least improved aspect. The results showed that low proficiency subjects still had difficulty in comprehending the whole message because of their poor listening ability. After all, listening comprehension requires not only meaning construction, but also linguistics knowledge. Additionally, low proficiency subjects in the experiment class improved in predicting the coming message with note-taking because it facilitates learners to link new and old schema.

Since this study aims to know if note-taking could help learners improve their listening ability in the test styles of a dialogue or a passage, the response to “to acquire a habit of writing down key words” has to be discussed. Based on the mean scores in Tables 4-9 and 4-10, the aspect was ranked highest in the low proficiency subjects in the experiment class followed by the low proficiency ones in the control class, the high proficiency ones in the experiment class and the high proficiency ones in the control class. It seems that since tape learning offers no non-spoken language or



redundant signals, low proficiency subjects could not help but take notes to overcome the above problems and to overcome the limit of short memory span. However, for high proficiency subjects, they could get help from semantics, syntax or schema and thus they did not value note-taking as highly as low proficiency subjects did.