

Chapter Four

Results

This chapter contains three major sections: first, the number of those who passed the simulation test of GEPT Elementary Level in the control and experimental groups will be presented descriptively; second, the mean scores of control and experimental groups in pre-study, including the section of grammar, vocabulary & phrases, transitions, and overall performance, will be compared by Test of Homogeneity of Variance, so as to make sure that their difference in these four parts is not significant before the study. Then, One-Way ANOVA will be employed to compare their pre-and post-study performance in cloze test. Finally, the outcome of the post-study questionnaire would be presented with a tabulation to indicate participants' attitudes after the study.

4.1 Results of GEPT and GEPT Simulation Test Elementary Level

Before students were engaged in the pre-test, the data for those who passed the GEPT Elementary Level in their junior high and the simulation test of GEPT Elementary level would be excluded from the study. The simulation test consists of four tests, inclusive of listening, reading, writing, and speaking tests. Only when one passed the four tests would his/her data be excluded from the study. The result is presented in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2.

Table 4.1: The Number of Students Passing the Four Sections in the Simulation Test

Group	<u>Listening & Reading</u>		<u>Writing</u>		<u>Speaking</u>		Number of passing simu
	Fail	Pass	Fail	Pass	Fail	Pass	
CG	3	31	17	14	10	4	4
ER	5	32	19	13	8	5	5
IR	4	32	17	15	12	3	3
Total	12	95	53	42	30	12	12

Note. Simu= The simulation test of GEPT Elementary Level; CG=Control Group, ER=Extensive Reading in The Experimental Group, IR=Intensive Reading in The Experimental Group.

Table 4.1 points out the number of students passing the listening, reading, writing, and speaking sections in the GEPT simulation test Elementary Level. Firstly, 31 students in the control group and 64 students in the experimental groups passed the listening and reading sections. Secondly, 42 students (14 for the control group; 28 for the experimental groups) in total passed the writing section. Finally, the overall number of students who passed the speaking section is 12 (4 for the control group; 8 for the experimental groups). So, the total number of students passing the GEPT simulation test Elementary Level was 12.

Table 4.2: Results of GEPT and GEPT Simulation Test Elementary Level

Group	Total number of students	Number of passing GEPT	Number of passing simu	Passing rate	Total participants
CG	37	3	4	18%	30
ER	39	2	5	17%	32
IR	38	2	3	13%	33
Total	114	7	12	16%	95

Table 4.2 shows the number of students who passed GEPT Elementary Level and the GEPT simulation test Elementary Level. The original number of students was 37, 39, and 38 in control and experimental groups. After the simulation test was administered, the results indicated that the total number of passing GEPT and the simulation test was 7 (3 for GEPT; 4 for the simulation test), 7 (2 for GEPT; 5 for the simulation test), and 5 (2 for GEPT; 3 for the simulation test) in the control and experimental groups, which claimed about 18%, 17%, and 13 % of the students in these three classes. Ninety-five students failed the GEPT simulation test Elementary Level, so they were grouped as the participants of the study. The passing rate in these 114 students was 16%, which meant more than four-fifths students have not achieved a junior high school graduate's English proficiency.

4.2 Mean Scores before and after the Study

4.2.1 Mean Scores before the Study

To guarantee that the participants in control and experimental groups were homogeneous in their English proficiency before the study, Test of Homogeneity of Variance was administered. The results of cloze test in terms of participants' performance in grammar, vocabulary & phrases, transitions, and overall performance are displayed from Table 4.3 to Table 4.6.

Table 4.3: Results of Test of Homogeneity of Variance for Grammar Section

Group	N	Mean	Std.	Levene Statistics	Sig.
CG	30	10.26	3.89		
ER	32	11.68	3.55	0.904	0.408
IR	33	11.66	3.56		

Note. N= Number of the Participants; CG=Control Group, ER=Extensive Reading in The Experimental Group, IR=Intensive Reading in The Experimental Group.

Table 4.4: Results of Test of Homogeneity of Variance for Vocabulary & Phrases

Section

Group	N	Mean	Std.	Levene Statistics	Sig.
CG	30	12.23	5.46		
ER	32	13.50	4.31	2.625	0.078
IR	33	12.18	4.93		

Table 4.5: Results of Test of Homogeneity of Variance for Transitions Section

Group	N	Mean	Std.	Levene Statistics	Sig.
CG	30	7.53	2.58		
ER	32	7.25	2.79	2.378	0.098
IR	33	7.45	2.03		

Table 4.6: Results of Test of Homogeneity of Variance for Overall Performance**Section**

Group	N	Mean	Std.	Levene Statistics	Sig.
CG	30	30.03	9.83		
ER	32	32.46	8.75	2.484	0.089
IR	33	31.30	7.11		

In Table 4.3, firstly, the full score for the section of grammar was 21, and the mean scores for the control and experimental groups were 10.26, 11.68, and 11.66 respectively. Levene Statistics for grammar scores was 0.904 ($p=0.408 > 0.05$), which failed to achieve the significant level. Therefore, the control and experimental groups were homogeneous in terms of grammar ability before the study.

Secondly, when it comes to participants' performance in the section of vocabulary & phrases (see Table 4.4), the total score was 22, and the three groups got 12.23, 13.50, and 12.18 averagely. Levene Statistics for this part was 2.625 ($p= 0.078 > 0.05$), meaning that their performance in this section were not significantly different.

Thirdly, in the section of transitions (see Table 4.5), the overall score was 12, and the average scores for these three groups were 7.53, 7.25, and 7.45. Based on Levene, the statistics was 2.378, which did not achieve the significant level ($p=0.098 > 0.05$). Thus, the three groups were homogeneous when speaking of their ability in transitions.

Finally, when the overall performance of each group was compared (see Table 4.6), the experimental group for extensive reading got the highest scores (32.46), the experimental group for intensive reading got the second highest (31.30), and the control group got the lowest (30.03). However, the difference in total scores was not significant according to the Levene Statistics 2.484 ($p= 0.089 > 0.05$).

Based on the results of Test of Homogeneity of Variance, the control and experimental groups were claimed to be homogenous in the section of grammar, vocabulary & phrases, transitions, and overall performance.

4.2.2 Mean Scores after the Study

In response to research question 1, One-Way ANOVA would be employed to compare the mean scores of post-study in the control group, the experimental group for extensive reading activity, and the experimental group for intensive reading activity, in the section of grammar, vocabulary & phrases, transitions, and overall performance. The results are presented from Table 4.7 to Table 4.10.

Table 4.7: Results of One-Way ANOVA for Grammar Section

Group	N	Mean	Std.
CG	30	10.83	3.09
ER	32	12.93	3.30
IR	33	13.09	3.14

Note. N= Number of the Participants; CG=Control Group, ER=Extensive Reading in The Experimental Group, IR=Intensive Reading in The Experimental Group.

	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	98.115	2	49.058	4.839	0.010
Within Groups	932.769	92	10.139		

* p< .05 ** p< .01

Post Hoc Test (LSD)

Group	MD	SD	Sig.
CG-ER	-2.10*	0.809	0.011
CG-IR	-2.25*	0.803	0.006

* p< .05 ** p< .01

After the 3-month experiment, the mean scores for the control group and experimental groups were 10.83, 12.93 and 13.09 respectively in the grammar section and the p-value (0.010) indicated that there was significant difference between these three groups (see Table 4.7). The results of Post Hoc Test showed that the experimental groups outperformed the control group by 2.10 and 2.25, and the mean difference reached the significant level ($p= 0.011 < 0.05$; $p= 0.006 < 0.05$).

Table 4.8: Results of One-Way ANOVA for Vocabulary & Phrases Section

Group	N	Mean	Std.
CG	30	12.80	3.17
ER	32	14.56	3.50
IR	33	16.00	3.41

	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	161.072	2	80.536	7.065	0.001
Within Groups	1048.675	92	11.399		

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Post Hoc Test (LSD)

Group	MD	SD	Sig.
CG-ER	-1.76*	0.858	0.043
CG-IR	-3.20*	0.851	0.000

* p< .05 ** p< .01

In the vocabulary & phrases section (see Table 4.8), experimental groups also got better scores than the control group: 16.00 for the intensive reading group, 14.56 for the extensive reading group, and 12.80 for the control group. The results of Post Hoc Test revealed that the difference of mean scores between these three groups in the vocabulary & phrases section reached the significant level ($p=0.043<0.05$; $p=0.000<0.05$).

Table 4.9: Results of One-Way ANOVA for Transitions Section

Group	N	Mean	Std.
CG	30	7.70	2.54
ER	32	8.46	2.03
IR	33	8.00	1.63

	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	9.352	2	4.676	1.069	0.347
Within Groups	402.269	92	4.372		

* p< .05 ** p< .01

Again, Table 4.9 showed that although the experimental groups got higher scores in transitions section than the control group (8.46: 8.00: 7.70), the difference was not significant at the level of 0.05 ($p=0.347>0.05$).

Table 4.10: Results of One-Way ANOVA for Overall Performance Section

Group	N	Mean	Std.
CG	30	31.33	6.79
ER	32	36.28	7.17
IR	33	37.00	6.69

	SS	DF	MS	F	Sig.
Between Groups	587.770	2	293.885	6.185	0.003
Within Groups	4371.135	92	47.512		

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Post Hoc Test (LSD)

Group	MD	SD	Sig.
CG-ER	-4.94*	1.75	0.006
CG-IR	-5.66*	1.73	0.002

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Finally, when compared to the control group in overall performance (see Table 4.10), the experimental groups outperformed the control group by 5.66 and 4.94 (37.00:36.28:31.33). The results of the Post Hoc Test showed that the difference between the control group and the experimental groups was at the significant level ($p=0.006<0.05$; $p=0.002<0.05$).

As indicated by the results obtained from One-Way ANOVA, the experimental groups got higher scores than the control group in these four sections after the study. Except for the part of transitions, the improvement of the experimental groups in the post-test was significant when compared to that of the control group.

4.3 Participants' Attitudes toward Cloze Test and Reading Activity

Post-study questionnaire was given to participants to survey their attitudes toward cloze test and reading activities. The results are displayed in a tabulation.

Table 4.11: Post-study Questionnaire for Experimental Group in Extensive Reading Activity (N= 39)

	Yes	Maybe	No
1. This reading activity is helpful to my general English ability.	38 (98%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
2. This reading activity is helpful to my reading ability.	38 (98%)	0 (0%)	1 (2%)
3. This reading activity is helpful to the use of grammar.	28 (71%)	0 (0%)	11 (29%)

4. This reading activity is helpful to the use of vocabulary & phrases.	Yes 36 (93%)	Maybe 0 (0%)	No 3 (7%)
5. This reading activity is helpful to the use of transitions.	Yes 38 (98%)	Maybe 0 (0%)	No 1 (2%)
6. How do you feel about the content of the story book?	Interesting 38 (98 %)	Medium 0 (0%)	Boring 1(2%)
7. How do you feel about the level of the story book?	Difficult 38 (98%)	Medium 0 (0%)	Too Easy 1(2%)
8. How do you feel about the time for reading activity?	Too Long 11 (28%)	OK 23 (58%)	Too Short 5 (14%)
9. Do you like to read the same book with the class or alone?	The Same Book 6 (15%)	Read Alone 8 (21%)	Either is OK 25 (64%)
10. Do you read other English materials besides the story books?	Yes 12 (31%)	No 27 (69%)	
11. Do you hope to read more English story books or articles in English class?	Yes 39 (100%)	Either is OK 0 (0%)	No 0 (0%)
12. What do you gain from this reading activity? Any suggestion?	Read with more patience when faced with a lengthy article.English songs, movies...etc.		

Table 4.12: Post-study Questionnaire for Experimental Group in Intensive Reading**Activity (N= 38)**

1. This reading activity is helpful to my general English ability.	Yes 37 (98%)	Maybe 0 (0%)	No 1 (2%)
2. This reading activity is helpful to my reading ability.	Yes 38 (100%)	Maybe 0 (0%)	No 0 (0%)
3. This reading activity is helpful to the use of grammar.	Yes 38 (100%)	Maybe 0 (0%)	No 0 (0%)
4. This reading activity is helpful to the use of vocabulary & phrases.	Yes 38 (100%)	Maybe 0 (0%)	No 0 (0%)
5. This reading activity is helpful to the use of transitions.	Yes 37 (98%)	Maybe 0 (0%)	No 1 (2%)
6. Which topic do you like?	Environment 6 (16%) Technology 6 (16%) Chinese custom 10 (26%) Adventures 8 (21%) No Special Preference 8 (21%)		
7. How do you feel about the level of the article?	Difficult 3 (8%)	Medium 35 (92%)	Too Easy 0 (0%)
8. How do you feel about the reading load?	Too Much 5 (13%)	Medium 30 (79%)	Too Little 3 (8%)
9. Do you like to read the story book or the article?	The Story Book 14(37%)	The Article 19 (50%)	Either is OK 5 (13%)

10. Do you read other English materials besides the articles?	Yes 17 (45 %)	No 21 (55%)	
11. Do you hope to read more English story books or articles in English class?	Yes 13 (34%)	Either is OK 21(55%)	No 4(11%)
12. What do you gain from this reading activity? Any suggestion?	Lots of information and vocabulary. Vocabulary building activity...etc.		

Both extensive and intensive reading group showed positive attitudes toward the reading activity as indicated by the results of questions 1-5 in Table 4.11 and Table 4.12. Most participants in the extensive group regarded the content and level of the story books as acceptable (question 6-7 in Table 4.11), just as did the participants in the intensive reading group (question 7 in Table 4.12). As to the preference for either the story book or articles in the intensive reading group (question 9 in Table 4.12), those who preferred the story book were attracted to its interesting plots while those in favor of article enjoyed reading the articles due to their being diversified in topics, shorter than the story books, related to the present news, and full of many useful words and grammar rules. When asked if they were engaged in other English reading activities besides the in-class reading (question 10 in Table 4.11 and Table 4.12), some participants in both groups indicated that they would read other story books or English newspapers at their leisure. Finally, as shown in the question 11 of Table 4.11 and Table 4.12, participants in both groups were willing to have more outside reading. Also, from this reading activity, they realized that

English ability has to be built up step by step, and they learned to read with more patience, even when faced with a lengthy article. Some participants even suggested that English movie watching, English songs, vocabulary building activity, and listening practices could be included and integrated in classroom teaching. (question 12 in Table 4.11 and Table 4.12).

To sum up, a response to research question 2 in the post-study questionnaire revealed that most participants not only had positive attitudes toward the reading activity, either extensive or intensive, but they also benefited from it in their cloze test performance. Most importantly, interest in further English reading and activity was aroused in the wake of the 3-month reading activity.