Modern English Education, Vol. 14, No. 4, Winter 2013

The Effects on English Listening Abilities via Dictogloss

Myong-Kwan Lee
Anyang University

Lee, Myong-Kwan. (2013). The effects on English listening abilities via dictogloss. *Modern English Education, 14*(4), 21-42.

The present study aims to examine the effects of dictogloss on English listening abilities. For the study, the research was implemented for fourteen weeks with eighty Korean university students. Out of these students, forty-two took listening classes using dictogloss as an experimental group and thirty-eight took listening classes traditionally as a control group. To examine the students' listening comprehension, a simulated TOEIC LC was used. Results of the study showed that there was no statistically significant difference between both groups in the TOEIC LC although the experimental group received a higher score than the control group. A detailed explanation of the results of each TOEIC part indicates that the experimental group showed more improvement than the control group in part 4 that consists of longer texts than the other parts. The result of part 4 showed statistically significant difference between both groups. This suggests that listening learning using dictogloss can be effective in improving students' listening comprehension. Moreover, the experimental group used the listening strategy more frequently than the control group, which revealed a significant difference. Especially, meta-cognitive strategy use made a significant difference between the two groups. The results indicate that dictogloss procedures help students facilitate their listening strategies usage. These findings indicate that listening classes using dictogloss have positive effects on listening abilities. Based on this study, some guidelines for effective listening classes were suggested.

**[dictogloss/listening/listening strategies/
딕토글로스/듣기/듣기전략]**

I. INTRODUCTION

Listening comprehension is one of the most important language skills. Listening skill is an indispensable part of communications as Feyten (1991) claims that more than 45%

of communication time is spent listening. Therefore, the ultimate objective of L2 listening course is to help learners develop their listening abilities to communicate effectively. Accordingly, a lot of research has been conducted to find out effective methods of improving learners' listening comprehension in the second language acquisition.

In a traditional listening classroom students listen to a tape, and then answer questions that test their understanding. A teacher, sometimes, translates the script into their first language. Also, the teacher explains some structures which are complex and difficult for students to understand. It seems that these listening activities tend to focus more on input than on output. Listening comprehension can be recognized as only an input process because it doesn't require a production of output during the process. That can be why listening activities in the second language learning are usually based on only input. However, many studies emphasized the importance of output, showing that output based instruction in L2 had a positive effect on learning (Izumi, 2002; Izumi & Bigelow, 2000; Swain & Lapkin, 1995), which indicates that output based instruction needs to be adapted for the L2 listening classroom.

Dictogloss is a task requiring output as well as input. Dictogloss, also, is a multiple skills and systems activity (Lim & Jacobs, 2001; Storch, 1998). To complete the dictogloss task, learners listen to a text and note the key words. The learners then reconstruct the text using their notes to make their own passage as group work. These procedures require students to practice listening, speaking, writing, and so on to produce their own output. In addition, the dictogloss procedures include a collaborative work. Some studies (Garrett, 1998; Johnson, Johnson & Stanne, 2000; Potthast, 1999; Ravenscroft, 1997; Rivera, 1996) found that collaborative learning activities had positive effects on learners' language acquisition. However, there are few methods of listening learning using collaborative activities compared with those of reading, writing and speaking learning. Therefore, it is necessary to conduct more research to find out effective activities for collaborative listening learning. In this sense, it is considered meaningful to investigate if listening activities using dictogloss are appropriate for the L2 listening classroom.

The purpose of this study is to examine the effects dictogloss has on English listening comprehension in the context of Korean universities. In fact, Wajnryb (1990) originally introduced dictogloss as a classroom activity, which was an alternative method of teaching grammar. Therefore, many empirical studies were done based on grammar. However, the primary stage of dictogloss activity is listening, so this study will take a different approach. Rather than focusing on grammar, the study will focus on listening through dictogloss. This study requires that a researcher focuses on listening comprehension and makes a close investigation of the effects on that. Therefore, this

study will look at the effects of English listening classes via dictogloss. Also, it will examine how dictogloss affects learners' listening strategies. The research questions are as follows:

1) How does dictogloss have an effect on English listening comprehension?
2) What differences does dictogloss make in using English listening strategies?

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

1. Dictogloss

Dictogloss is a language teaching technique in which the learners listen to a text and then reconstruct it in pairs or in a group. Wajnryb (1990) indicated that dictogloss consists of four stages in a classroom. The first stage is preparation; learners are organized into pairs or small groups where they do preparatory work related to the topic and vocabulary. The second stage is dictation; learners listen to a passage at a normal speed and note down important words. The third stage is reconstruction; learners reconstruct their own version of the passage with their notes as group work. The final stage is analysis with correction; their own texts are analyzed and corrected by the whole class. Therefore, unlike traditional dictation in which learners note exactly word for word what they listen to, dictogloss is a methodology that allows learners to reconstruct the text they listened to in order to convey its meaning and style on their own.

Dictogloss is a task that combines input and output because learners must reflect on their own output through text reconstruction after listening (Malmqvist, 2005). Wajnryb (1990) proposed dictogloss as a procedure that encourages learners to reflect on their own output. A feature of dictogloss is a task that requires learners to product their output. Swain (1995) mentioned, "The activity of producing the target language may prompt second language learners to consciously recognize some of their linguistic problems; it may make them aware of something they need to find out about their L2" (p. 129). Izumi (2003) emphasized the importance of output in language learning, mentioning that output can, under certain conditions, promote language acquisition by helping learners try out their inter-language capabilities. Swain (1993, 1995) argued that output is important because it helps learners notice gaps in their inter-language thinking, reflect on their language use, and understand and language process more fully. That is why learner output has three functions: noticing, formulating and testing hypotheses, and metatalk. Noticing raises learner's awareness of a language item. The formulating and testing hypotheses refers to the function of L2 learners testing their inter-language to see what

works and what doesn't. Output gives them opportunities to confirm how their own inter-language differs from the target language. Metatalk is a function that allows learners get opportunities to talk about language through output. According to Swain (1998), metatalk "serves the function of deepening the students' awareness of forms and roles, and relationship of the forms and rules to the meaning they are trying to express" (p. 69). Swain suggested that an effective technique to facilitate learners' metatalk is dictogloss activities.

Since listening is an input skill, many listening activities can be based on input. However, considering features of output in second language learning, listening activities based on output as well as input can be effective for EFL learners to improve their target language. Therefore, dictogloss, which includes output-based instruction, needs to be applied to the EFL context. Dictogloss tasks require learners to comprehend the message and find out the distinction between the original text and their own production through their reconstruction procedure (Wajnrab, 1990). Also, dictogloss leads L2 learners to a level of processing in which inter language deficiencies may become more noticeable (Grove, 1999).

Dictogloss has received interest as a collaborative task, in which learners write down key words and phrases while listening to a text, and then reconstruct or summarize it with their group members. This is an effective way of combining individual and group activities (Vasiljevic, 2010). Individual activities such as listening and taking notes can prepare students to be actively involved in group activities. Furthermore, dictogloss procedures can provide opportunities to show more appropriate comparisons or examples that will facilitate students' learning, especially the development of the learners' communicative competence because students' speaking time within a dictogloss curriculum is significantly longer than in a traditional teacher-centered classroom. Therefore, it seems that dictogloss as a collaborative reconstruction task gives learners the opportunities to practice and use all modes of language; it helps them get engaged in authentic communication (Vasiljevic, 2010).

An important task of dictogloss is reconstruction as a collaborative work. Ellis (2003) emphasized that the aim of dictogloss is to reproduce the content of the text, but not to generate an exact replica of the text. That is, the most important task in dictogloss is to reconstruct the text collaboratively as a group. In the context of dictogloss learning, a cooperative work plays an important role. When learners work in a group, they engage in negotiations of meaning which facilitate L2 learning (Mackey & Gass, 2006). In addition, scaffolding can be provided by peers in group work, where the role of the expert is fluid (Ohta, 2001). Through a cooperative group work, students are given two responsibilities: to maximize their own learning and to maximize the learning of all other group members (Johnson & Johnson, 1999).

Dictogloss as a collaborative work gives an opportunity of a variety of interaction. Wills and Wills (1996) stated that the variety of interaction helps improve language development more than the actual linguistic forms used. According to Gardner (1999), learners focus on different information in the discourse due to differences in background and in learning ways. Nevertheless, this difference in perspectives helps members learn from each other and learn to appreciate the value of diversity. Through this interaction learners can perform better as individuals, which outstrip individual competence. According to Johnson and Johnson (1999), joint efforts to achieve mutual goals promote higher self-esteem, productivity and critical thinking. In this sense, dictogloss can give support to both less and more confident students because it helps both participate in the activity as part of a group as well as stimulate the learners' motivation. Wajnryb (1990) mentioned "Through active learner involvement students come to confront their own strengths and weaknesses in English language use. In so doing, they find out what they do not know, then they find out what they need to know" (p. 10). Therefore, it is important that instructors encourage less and more confident students to be active learners, and help both be in harmony for positive group work.

2. Learning through Dictogloss

A number of researchers have reported on the effectiveness of dictogloss. Wilson (2003) recommended a discovery listening approach to strike a balance between the focus on meaning and on form. He added that the much advocated top-down processing should not be adopted at the expense of bottom-up processing because ESL students need both types of processing when exposed to listening tasks. According to Wilson, adapting the dictogloss method – a text reconstruction technique – enables learners to target both sound and word recognition for a discovery approach.

Kowal and Swain (1997) have studied dictogloss as a procedure that encourages students to reflect on their own output. They have found evidence of noticing, hypothesis-testing, and metatalk when using the dictogloss technique with 8th grade French immersion students. The result revealed that students often focused on more than just the grammatical aspect being emphasized. During dictogloss task, also, students discussed orthographic and semantic issues as well as grammatical aspects. As a result, the procedure, including the pair work and whole class discussion, promoted student discussion regarding the links between meaning and form in relation to the composition process.

Dictogloss is conducted with listening tasks. However, Wajnryb (1990) originally introduced dictogloss as an alternative method of teaching grammar. Therefore, there has been some research about the effects of dictogloss on grammar and listening. D. H. Kang

(2009) examined the effects of dictogloss on both listening comprehension and grammar learning in the context of Korean high schools. The aforementioned study showed that dictogloss instruction was more beneficial than the traditional focus-on-forms of both listening and grammar learning. D. H. Kang's study revealed that students' motivational factors were positively correlated with dictogloss.

Y. H. Kim, M. R. Joo and J. Lee (2009) compared the improvement in TOEIC tests of the experimental group that participated in dictogloss tasks to that of the controlled group. The classes were for engineering college students. The study showed dictogloss was an effective learning activity for them. Specifically, the result indicated that there was a significant difference in TOEIC RC between two groups, but not TOEIC LC, which indicated that the dictogloss instruction was more effective on TOEIC RC than LC.

Dictogloss activities integrate the four language skills of listening, reading, speaking, and writing because the procedures require learners to use these four skills. M. Suhn (2011) explored the effects on improving the four skills of English usage-listening, speaking, reading and writing through dictogloss. The participants of the study were university freshmen students. This study analyzed the results of the participants' listening skill test and the other skill tests. The group trained with dictogloss presented more improvement in the listening skills test and the other skill tests than the group trained with spot dictation. This shows that dictogloss is an appropriate method for students to improve the four skills of English usage. Y. H. Oh (2011) investigated the effects of dictogloss on Korean high school students' writing and listening proficiency. The results showed that dictogloss had a positive effect on students' writing and listening proficiency. Furthermore, it helped these students improve their learning attitudes. Dictogloss is likely to encourage students to participate in their groups as part of the structure of the activity.

Dictogloss is a method of learning and it can have an effect on using learning strategies. D. Bae and B. Ahn (2012) examined the effects of dictogloss techniques they developed for Korean EFL beginning learners on English listening ability and learning strategies. The students improved their listening abilities through the fine-tuned dictogloss procedure. The result analyzed specifically presented that the lower group learners' improvement is bigger than that of the higher group. Also, this study showed the higher group learners developed their social learning strategies. Dictogloss activities, which include a collaborative work, seem to be a useful method that can facilitate students' learning and their learning strategies.

III. METHOD

1. Participants

The participants for the study were eighty students from a university in Gyeonggi province, Korea. These participants enrolled in a mandatory course, 'English Conversation'. The students were mainly sophomores and a few juniors and seniors. Classes of the English course are classified by students' English proficiency level. The students' English proficiency level is decided by their TOEIC scores. The students of the two groups for this study were at the intermediate level. They took a three-hour English class per week, which was divided into two sessions. A session per week was used for listening teaching. The students were divided into two groups, an experimental and a control group as baseline data for comparison. Both groups used the same method for class except for listening learning. An experimental group used dictogloss activities while a control group used traditional listening learning activities.

2. Materials

The textbook that they used had listening and speaking activities in a variety of topics. The listening materials in the textbook come up to what Vasiljevic (2010) proposed, for the selection of the listening materials for the dictogloss method. According to Vasiljevic, the dictogloss method is more suitable for transactional texts than dialogues or instructions. That is why transactional texts are easier to reconstruct than interactional passages; the primary purpose of transactional texts is to communicate information while the purpose of interactional passages is to maintain social relationships. The listening materials for this study were transactional texts.

3. Procedures

The research was implemented for fourteen weeks. The procedures of dictogloss in the study were conducted based on Wajnryb's (1990) findings. During pre-listening, both groups performed the same activities from the textbook. These groups did a variety of vocabulary activities to learn the important vocabulary from the text that they would listen to. Also, the researcher, as a teacher, asked some questions related to the main topic so that they can use their background knowledge as much as possible when they listen to texts.

After pre-listening activities, both groups used the different procedures. First, the experimental group took a dictation. The students of the experimental group listened to

the text at a normal speed and jotted down words. They were told to write down as many words or phrases as possible, but not to try to write the whole sentences. The researcher especially emphasized that they should focus on key words that would help them with the reconstruction of the text. The researcher played the audio three times for the students because the listening texts were too long for them to listen to, and they were not familiar with dictogloss.

Second, the students shared the notes they took as a group. For group work, they were put into groups of four or five. According to Wajnryb (1990), limiting the group size allows individuals to incorporate into the group effort. Each group was decided by the order listed in the class roster before the first time for dictogloss. There were not remarkable differences in English proficiency between the students because the class was made up of students who had an intermediate level in English proficiency as mentioned above. The researcher asked each group to choose a group leader who would lead and encourage every member to participate actively and collaboratively in the work.

Third, the students made their own version of the passage with their notes collaboratively. The researcher asked them to attempt to produce a coherent text, close in content and organization to the original version. She, however, encouraged them to produce the passage focusing on its contents, but not on sentence structures for the first draft. She emphasized that their passage did not have to be the same script as the original one.

Fourth, the students completed the passage through their correction and analysis. After the first draft, they were asked to review the passage. They corrected grammatical errors and analyzed their writing. After the students handed in the passage that they had completed, they had the time to look over the original script with their group members. At that time, the researcher encouraged the students to ask questions about the sentence structures of the script that they didn't understand. They used a seventy-five minute session to perform the first through fourth procedures of dictogloss.

Fifth, the students got the teacher's feedback on their own passage. The feedback included content and grammar correction. For feedback, said students handed in the passage that they completed to the researcher, a teacher, and she returned it at the next class after providing corrective feedback. Also, she gave students five minutes to look over the feedback and ask questions about it. In addition, she asked the students to copy the feedback paper so that every member could keep it. She explained briefly these procedures to the students of an experimental group whenever they performed dictogloss.

On the other hand, a control group took traditional listening classes. After pre-listening, the students in the control group listened to the text, and then answered the questions that tested their understanding. If the listening texts were too long or difficult for them to listen to, they were given opportunities to listen two or three times. The

researcher translated, sentence by sentence, the script into Korean and taught the sentence structure to them. In addition, she explained important vocabulary and any difficult pronunciation. Also, she explained to her students why the answers are what they were. These students spent a seventy-five minute session taking listening classes with these procedures.

4. Data Collection

A simulated TOEIC LC was administered as a pre-test, which was used to confirm whether there were significant differences between the two groups, an experimental and a control group. In order to look at the effects of dictogloss, the TOEIC LC test and the listening strategy questionnaire were administered one week before the students took the final exam of the spring semester, 2013. For this research, a total of 80 students were asked to take a listening comprehension test. On the same day just after taking the test, they were asked to recall and indicate to what extent they used listening strategies.

1) Listening Comprehension Test

The students took the simulated TOEIC listening comprehension test which has the same format as the actual TOEIC test. TOEIC LC has four different sections with a total of one hundred questions. The entire listening test lasts approximately forty-five minutes. The four sections consist of ten questions in part 1, thirty in part 2, thirty in part 3 and thirty in part 4. The question types of each part are as follows; 1) Part 1 is to select the one statement that best describes the picture, 2) Part 2 is to select the best response to the question or statement, 3) Part 3 is to select the best response to each question after hearing what the speakers say in each conversation (ten conversations, three questions each), 4) Part 4 is to select the best response to each question after hearing what each speaker says in each talk (ten talks, three questions each).

2) Listening Strategies

The questionnaire used in this study was adapted and modified from the one of H. J. Chung (2001), which was made suitable for Korean students. Chung made up fifty-two questions which were developed based on Oxford (1990). The listening strategy questions include cognitive, memorable, compensational, meta-cognitive, affective and social strategies. The questionnaire for this study consists of thirty-two questions related with this study from Chung's questionnaire (See Table 4). The other twenty questions were deleted because they weren't related with this study on listening classes through

dictogloss. The questionnaire consisting of thirty-two questions for this study was divided into six sections: thirteen cognitive strategies, seven memorable strategies, three compensational strategies, four meta-cognitive strategies, four affective strategies, and three social strategies. The questionnaire used a five-point Likert scale from one to five. The reliability of the listening strategy questionnaire was .862. The relatively high Cronbach's alpha on the questionnaire indicated the participants' responses were consistent across items of the scale in measuring strategy use. To be more precise, the Cronbach's alpha for the items in the cognitive, memorable, compensational, meta-cognitive, affective and social strategy were .676, .706, .566, .758, .778, and .715, respectively. The respondents were asked to choose one answer among a five-point Likert scale: 1) Never true of me, 2) Generally not true of me, 3) Somewhat true of me, 4) Generally true of me, 5) Always true of me.

5. Data Analysis

Data analysis was conducted to see whether there were significant differences in the listening comprehension and in using listening strategies of the experimental and the control groups. Firstly, both groups' scores of the entire section of TOEIC LC were examined in order to look at their listening comprehension improvement. Secondly, both group's scores of each part of TOEIC LC were analyzed to examine their listening comprehension in detail. Thirdly, both groups were given a questionnaire to uncover their using listening strategies, consisting of 6 types. This questionnaire was used to see how differently both groups use listening strategies. Fourthly, both groups' usage of each question of strategies was analyzed and compared to examine how differently they used listening strategies. All statistical analyses for tests and questionnaires were done using SPSS. Mean score, standard deviations and p-value were calculated for each task. An independent-samples t-test was conducted to see the differences between both groups.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Listening Comprehension

The pre-tests were conducted to see whether there was a difference between the experimental and the control group that was significant in statistics. Table 1 shows that there is no statistically significant difference between the two groups ($p=0.72$). The mean of the test scores of the experimental group was 36.90 while that of the control group

was 36.26. This indicates that the two groups have the same level of proficiency before classes for the study.

TABLE 1

Listening Comprehension Pre-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	*t*	p
experimental	42	36.90	8.25	0.36	0.72
control	38	36.26	7.89		

*$p<.05$

After a twelve-week listening class, the post-test for listening comprehension was conducted to see whether two groups have a different listening proficiency. As seen in Table 2, the mean score of the experimental group was 41.07 while that of the control group was 37.68. The experimental group had 3.39 points higher score than the other, but it's not statistically meaningful (p=0.06). Although it failed to reach significance at the level of p-value of .05 in statistics, the experimental group showed more improvement in their listening comprehension than the other. This improvement in listening comprehension, to some degree, supports the results of the previously mentioned studies (D. Bae & B. Ahn, 2012; D. H. Kang, 2009; Y. H. Kim, M. R. Joo & J. Lee, 2009; Y. H. Oh, 2011; M. Suhn, 2011), which found positive effects of dictogloss on listening comprehension. Said improvement of listening comprehension also implies that the dictogloss method might lead to effective results that show that students' listening improves if they take more classes that use dictogloss.

TABLE 2

Listening Comprehension Post-test

Group	N	Mean	SD	*t*	p
experimental	42	41.07	8.29	1.86	0.06
control	38	37.68	7.94		

*$p<.05$

This study made a close investigation of the students' listening proficiency. The questions of TOEIC LC consist of four types. The listening teaching and learning method might have an effect on question types that measure listening comprehension. The two groups' scores of each part of TOEIC LC were analyzed to see whether there were differences in the results depending on the question types.

TABLE 3
Listening Comprehension - TOEIC Parts

Part	Group	N	Mean	SD	*t*	p
Part 1	experimental	42	4.52	1.70	1.65	1.10
	control	38	3.89	1.71		
Part 2	experimental	42	12.29	3.05	-0.40	0.97
	control	38	12.32	3.60		
Part 3	experimental	42	13.29	2.94	1.82	0.73
	control	38	12.11	2.97		
Part 4	experimental	42	10.98	2.54	2.47	0.016*
	control	38	9.37	3.26		

*p<.05

Table 3 shows there is no significant difference in Parts 1, 2, and 3 between the two groups. In Part 3, the experimental group gained 1.18 points more than the other, but it's not meaningful. In Part 4, however, the mean score of the experimental group is 10.98 while that of the control group is 9.37. The result of Part 4 shows a significant difference in statistics between the two groups. It's a little difficult for students to answer the questions in Part 4 because it consists of longer texts than the other parts. It might not be easy to improve the students' abilities to answer questions about long texts for a short time. However, students who took classes using dictogloss were better at answering Part 4 than the other parts. Dictogloss procedures such as taking notes and reconstructing may have helped the students to grasp a long text. Therefore, it is assumed that the dictogloss task is effective at cultivating abilities to listen and understand a long text.

2. Listening Strategies

1) Overall Total Strategy

The participants' overall use of listening strategy was examined to see if there was a difference in the use of listening strategy between the experimental and the control groups. In the use of listening strategy, the overall frequency mean of the experimental group was 3.16, while that of the control group was 2.90. As shown in Table 4, the result revealed there was a difference between the two groups that was significant in statistics (p=.027). The experimental group used more frequent listening strategies than the control group. This means that listening classes using dictogloss help to facilitate students' listening strategy usage.

2) Types of Listening Strategy

Table 4 shows the results of the types of listening strategies that the two groups used. Both groups of students showed a similar extent of use in cognitive, compensational, affective, and social strategy. The mean of cognitive strategy of the experimental group was 2.99 and that of the control group was 2.80. In the use of compensational strategy, the mean of the experimental group was 3.57 and that of the control group was 3.55. In the use of affective strategy, the experimental group's was 3.59 and the other's was 3.39. In the use of social strategy, the experimental group's was 2.37 and the other's was 2.35.

Even though the experimental group worked collaboratively during the listening activities, they didn't use any more social strategies than the control group. It is not assumed that dictogloss activities facilitate remarkable students' use of social strategy in such a short time. D. Bae and B. Ahn's study (2012) demonstrated that the higher group in English listening proficiency developed their social learning strategies more so than the lower group after dictogloss classes. The higher group noticeably developed their social learning strategies. D. Bae and B. Ahn's study demonstrated that the results of social learning strategy usage are dependent on the learners' listening abilities in the listening classes through dictogloss. Unlike their study, this study didn't compare the groups by learners' listening proficiency. In the results of this study, the social strategy usage of the experimental group didn't reveal a meaningful difference from that of the control group after listening classes. In addition, the results were not positive because the experimental group's mean score of the social strategy usage of was 2.37, which means the answer is near "generally not true of me". The results of this study can't be compared fully with that of D. Bae and B. Ahn' study because this study didn't compare the groups divided by learners' listening proficiency. However, the results of this study seem to be consistent with that of the lower group's results, rather than that of the higher group in D. Bae and B. Ahn' study.

In the usage of the memory strategy, the mean of the experimental group was 3.22 while that of the control group was 2.90. Although there was little difference (mean difference = 0.32) between the two groups, it was not statistically meaningful (p=.18). However, in the use of meta-cognitive strategy, there was a significant difference in statistics (p=.049). The mean of the experimental group was 3.48 while that of the control group was 2.88. The result of the meta-cognitive portion of the test reveals that dictogloss leads students to use the meta-cognitive strategy more frequently. Compared with the other strategies, the meta-cognitive strategy seems to be promoted more through dictogloss activities. The meta-cognitive strategy is planning, self-monitoring and self-evaluation of one's learning. Dictogloss activities, which require production as a

collaborative task, seem to help learners get more opportunities to practice planning, self-monitoring and practice a self-evaluation of their own learning.

TABLE 4

Results of Types of Listening Strategies

Type of strategy	Group	N	Mean	SD	*t*	*p*
Cognitive Strategy	experimental	42	2.99	0.35	1.37	0.18
	control	38	2.80	0.35		
Memory Strategy	experimental	42	3.22	0.57	1.18	0.26
	control	38	2.90	0.43		
Compensational Strategy	experimental	42	3.57	0.41	0.72	0.95
	control	38	3.55	0.18		
Meta-cognitive Strategy	experimental	42	3.48	0.26	2.47	0.049*
	control	38	2.88	0.41		
Affective Strategy	experimental	42	3.59	0.33	1.00	0.37
	control	38	3.39	0.09		
Social Strategy	experimental	42	2.37	0.26	0.05	0.96
	control	38	2.35	0.42		
Total	experimental	42	3.16	0.50	2.27	0.027*
	control	38	2.90	0.44		

*p<.05

3) Questions of Listening Strategies

The details of listening strategies were examined. Table 5 presents the results of the questions of listening strategies. As shown in Table 5, questions No. 1-13 belong to cognitive strategy, No. 14-20 to memory strategy, No. 21-23 to compensational strategy, No. 24-27 to meta-cognitive strategy, No. 28-31 to affective strategy, and No. 32-34 to social strategy. Out of thirty-four questions on the strategies, eight (No. 14, 15, 16, 24, 25, 26, 28, 30) showed statistically significant differences between the experimental and the control group.

TABLE 5

Results of the Questions of Listening Strategy

No. (Strategy Type) Question	Group	Mean	SD	*t*	*p*
1. (C) I listen again if I don't understand the text.	experimental	3.40	0.94	1.03	0.308
	control	3.18	0.98		
2. (C) I look up the word I don't know while I'm listening.	experimental	3.67	0.87	1.87	0.066
	control	3.24	1.15		
3. (C) I take a note of the content that I think that is	experimental	3.26	0.83	1.96	0.054

important while I am listening.	control	2.82	1.16		
4. I translate words and sentences into Korean to grasp the overall meaning.	experimental	3.07	1.05	-0.35	0.73
	control	3.16	1.20		
5. (C) I try not to translate the text into Korean.	experimental	3.07	0.97	0.64	0.52
	control	2.92	1.12		
6. (C) I make summaries of information that I listen to.	experimental	2.52	1.02	0.57	0.57
	control	2.39	1.00		
7. (C) I try to guess what I will hear next based on what I have heard.	experimental	2.60	1.11	0.72	0.47
	control	2.42	1.06		
8. (C) I just ignore the sounds that I can't hear clearly.	experimental	3.17	0.99	-0.30	0.76
	control	3.24	1.10		
9. (C) I listen to the stressed words.	experimental	2.74	1.04	0.45	0.66
	control	2.63	1.10		
10. (C) I listen carefully to the way native English speakers pronounce words/sentences.	experimental	2.90	1.21	1.28	0.20
	control	2.58	1.06		
11. (C) I try to read English texts or dialogues out loud like native speakers.	experimental	3.02	1.20	0.09	0.93
	control	3.00	1.19		
12. (C) I study English grammar to improve my listening comprehension.	experimental	2.93	0.97	1.95	0.055
	control	2.53	0.86		
13. (C) I practice dictation English texts.	experimental	2.45	1.04	0.91	0.36
	control	2.24	1.08		
14. (M) I think of relationships between what I already know and new words or expressions I hear.	experimental	3.57	0.89	2.28	0.03*
	control	3.03	1.24		
15. (M) I remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used.	experimental	3.83	0.79	2.98	0.004*
	control	3.16	1.17		
16. (M) I try to remember many English words or phrases to improve my listening comprehension.	experimental	3.38	0.94	2.21	0.03*
	control	2.89	1.03		
17. (M) I use a glossary to remember new English words.	experimental	2.26	0.99	0.34	0.73
	control	2.18	1.04		
18. (M) I remember to practice new English words or phrases through the sentences or conversations in the texts.	experimental	2.71	1.02	0.80	0.43
	control	2.53	1.08		
19. (M) I try to understand the text using my experiences or background knowledge in my memory.	experimental	3.10	1.05	0.27	0.79
	control	3.03	1.26		
20. (M) I try to focus on key words while I am listening.	experimental	3.69	0.75	1.06	0.29
	control	3.50	0.86		
21. (Comp) I try to find some clues from the context, especially when I can't guess the meaning by hearing certain words or sentences.	experimental	4.05	0.76	1.68	0.098
	control	3.76	0.75		
22. (Comp) I don't linger on what I can't understand or hear but instead move to the next thing quickly.	experimental	3.33	1.07	-0.60	0.55
	control	3.47	1.01		
23. (Comp) I try to guess the overall meaning instead of interpreting every word or expression.	experimental	3.33	0.98	-0.40	0.69
	control	3.42	0.98		
24. (MC) I check my listening comprehension while I am listening.	experimental	3.43	0.77	4.23	.000*
	control	2.74	0.69		
25. (MC) I find my weakness in English listening, and try to overcome this weakness.	experimental	3.33	0.72	4.07	.000*
	control	2.63	0.82		
26. (MC) I check up on how much improvement I	experimental	3.31	0.72	3.81	.000*

have made in listening proficiency.	control	2.66	0.81		
27. (MC) I pay attention to the subject of the content while I am listening.	experimental	3.86	0.68	1.91	.060
	control	3.50	0.95		
28. (A) I try to relax and force myself to focus on what I am listening to.	experimental	3.90	0.82	2.54	0.013*
	control	3.39	0.97		
29. (A) I try not to feel nervous as I listen to English.	experimental	3.61	1.10	1.34	0.18
	control	3.29	1.09		
30. (A) I give myself a treat or motivate myself to listen well.	experimental	3.24	1.08	2.39	0.019*
	control	2.68	0.99		
31. (A) I give myself confidence to listen well.	experimental	3.48	1.06	0.95	0.34
	control	3.26	0.92		
32.(S) I practice English listening with other students for improving my listening proficiency.	experimental	2.10	1.12	0.85	0.40
	control	1.89	0.98		
33. (S) I ask for help from other people to improve my listening proficiency.	experimental	2.62	1.10	-0.67	0.50
	control	2.45	1.18		
34. (S) I try to learn about the culture of English speakers to improve my listening proficiency.	experimental	2.38	1.38	-1.13	0.26
	control	2.71	1.21		

*p<.05

Questions No. 14, 15 and 16 are included in memory strategy. For the strategy usage of thinking of the relationship between what I already know and new words or expression I hear (no. 14), the mean score of the experimental group was 3.57 and that of the control group was 3.03. The difference between these scores is statistically meaningful (p=.03*). The experimental group's mean score of No. 15 was 3.83 and the other's was 3.16, the difference of which is statistically meaningful (p=.004*). This means that dictogloss helps students to remember a new English word by making a mental picture of a situation in which the word might be used. The experimental group's mean score of No. 16 (trying to remember many English words or phrases) was 3.38 and the other's was 2.89. Once again, the difference is statistically meaningful (p=.03*). These findings imply that dictogloss encourages students to try to memorize new words and expressions using their mental images.

There was a remarkable difference between the two groups in questions No. 24, 25 and 26, which are included in meta-cognitive strategy. Question No. 24 is about checking listening comprehension while listening. The experimental group's mean score of the question was 3.43 while the control group's was 2.74. The difference is statistically significant (p=.000*). Question No. 25 is about finding and trying to overcome his or her weakness in English listening. The experimental group's mean score of the question was 3.33 while the other's was 2.63. Again, the difference is statistically significant (p=.000*). Question No. 26 is about checking on improvement in listening proficiency. The experimental group's mean score of the question was 3.31 while the other's was 2.66, the difference of which is statistically meaningful (p=.000*). The questions' purposes are to see whether a student checks or manages his or her learning.

Students compare the notes they took with their group members, and they make a passage with them through their correction and feedback during dictogloss. The students also may try to reflect on their own output during dictogloss as Wajnryb (1990) mentioned; dictogloss encourages learners to do such a thing. The procedures of dictogloss encourage students to check or manage their listening by themselves, which can result in active learner involvement. Therefore, students can find out what they do not know, and then they find out what they need to know through the dictogloss procedures as Wajnryb (1990) stated. It is likely that a collaborative work of dictogloss is effective to facilitate the use of meta-cognitive strategies.

Questions No. 28 and 30 are included in affective strategy. No. 28 is the strategy of trying to relax and force oneself to focus on what he or she is listening to. The mean score of the experimental group was 3.90 and that of the control group 3.39. The difference is significant in terms of statistics (p=.013*). No. 30 is the strategy of giving oneself a treat to motivate oneself to listen well. The mean score of the experimental group was 3.24 and that of the control group 2.68. The difference in scores is significant (p=.019*). Dictogloss requires a student's output as well as input. Students may try to concentrate more on their listening to produce output. Students also seem to motivate themselves to make a good production. Moreover, a collaborative work of dictogloss seems to stimulate students' motivation. That, in a way, supports the findings of Johnson and Johnson (1999) that joint efforts to achieve mutual goals promoted higher self-esteem, productivity and critical thinking. It's critical to keep motivating oneself for L2 learning. Self-motivation for listening can be promoted through dictogloss activities.

What is remarkable are questions No. 3 and 12 of cognitive strategy. The difference between the two groups in question No. 3 and 12 is not statistically significant at the .05 level although there was a difference in mean in descriptive statistics. The results, however, are statistically supported at the .10 level (p=.054 of No.3, p=.055 of No. 12). Question No. 3 is a strategy of noting the content that is important while listening. The experimental group took notes while listening. This is the first procedure of dictogloss, which plays a basic role in making their own text. The result was expected to show a meaningful difference at the .05 level, but it didn't. The experimental group, of course, answered between somewhat true of me and generally true of me (mean=3.26), while the control group answered near somewhat true of me (mean=2.82). This indicates that using dictogloss can facilitate more of a note taking strategy while listening.

Question No. 12 is a strategy of studying English grammar to improve listening comprehension. The experimental group answered near somewhat true of me (mean=2.93), while the control group answered between generally not true of me and somewhat true of me (mean=2.53). The experimental group had time to correct grammatical errors to complete their own text. In addition, the experimental group

received feedback, including grammar correction from the teacher. It seems that the activities helped the students to study English grammar in order to improve their listening comprehension. It is hard to say whether or not dictogloss leads students to focus on the grammar. However, these students seemed to think that they need to study grammar to improve their listening.

V. CONCLUSION

This study attempted to measure how dictogloss affects English listening abilities in the context of Korean universities. Dictogloss tasks have an output process and a collaborative work. In addition, dictogloss requires students to use integrated skills. It was expected that dictogloss including the distinct features would affect students' English listening abilities. Therefore, this study had two research questions: 1) how does dictogloss have an effect on English listening comprehension? 2) what differences does dictogloss make in using English listening strategies?

For the study, the dictogloss procedure was conducted based on Wajnryb's (1990) findings. Because dictogloss procedure includes group work, students were put into a group of four or five before the class using dictogloss. Dictogloss procedure is as follows. First, the students listened to the text at a normal speed and jotted down words. Second, the students compared and shared the notes they took as group work. Third, these students made their own version of the passage with their notes. Fourth, said students completed the passage through their correction and analysis. Then, these students got the teacher's feedback on the passage.

The students' listening comprehension and listening strategy usage were analyzed to see the effects on listening abilities through dictogloss. To examine the students' listening comprehension, a simulated TOEIC LC was used. The findings revealed that the students who took dictogloss classes received higher scores in their listening comprehension than the students who took traditional listening classes. However, the results of this study didn't show a significant difference in statistics. The students' scores of each TOEIC Part were analyzed for a closer investigation. Only in Part 4 was there a significant difference between the two groups, which demonstrates that dictogloss helps students become familiar with long texts.

The findings from the listening strategy questionnaire revealed a statistically significant difference in the overall total between the two groups. The students who took dictogloss classes used the listening strategies more frequently than the others. The difference in the teaching and learning method made a difference in the students' strategy usage. That is, listening learning using dictogloss facilitated the students'

listening strategy usage more than traditional methods would have. An analysis of each type of listening strategies showed that only meta-cognitive strategy made a significant difference between the two groups. This means that dictogloss procedures encourage students to check or manage their learning. Moreover, Dictogloss procedures help students find and try to overcome their weaknesses in English listening. Therefore, dictogloss is effective at facilitating students' meta-cognitive strategy. In addition, the results of each listening strategy question demonstrated that dictogloss helped the students try to memorize new expressions using their mental images and to motivate themselves for listening.

This study investigated how dictogloss affected Korean university students' English listening abilities. Listening classes using dictogloss had a positive effect on the students' English listening comprehension. Also, the classes facilitated their listening strategy usage which can affect listening abilities. Research suggests that the dictogloss procedures which include an output process, a collaborative work and integrated skills, contributed to promoting the students' listening abilities. In conclusion, these findings suggest that dictogloss is worth adapting in an English listening class with Korean university students.

This study has several limitations. The sample size for the study is the main limitation to be pointed out. The number of participants needs to be increased in order to obtain more reliability. Also, the participants of the study belong to the intermediate level of English proficiency. The results of the study do depend on students' English proficiency. In addition, the effects of dictogloss can depend on the other factors that affect learning. Therefore, more research considering these factors needs to be conducted to reveal the specific effects of dictogloss. Furthermore, it is hoped that more research would find out the methods of effective listening learning for Korean English learners.

REFERENCES

Bae, Daekweon, & Ahn, B.yeongkil (2012). The effect of dictogloss techniques for EFL beginning learners on English listening ability and learning strategies. *Secondary English Education, 5*(2), 120-144.

Chung, Hye-Jin. (2001). *A study of listening strategy use and listening ability improvement for Korean learners of English.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Hanyang University, Seoul.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Feyten, C. (1991). The power of listening ability: an overlooked dimension in language acquisition. *The Modern Language Journal, 75* (2), 173-180.

Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed: Multiple intelligences for the 21st century.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Garrett, K. J. (1998). Cooperative learning in social work research courses: Helping students help one another. *Journal of Social Work Education, 34,* 237-246.

Grove, C. (1999). Focusing on form in the communicative classroom: An output-centered model of instruction for oral skills development. *Hispania, 82,* 817-829.

Izumi, S. (2002). Output, input enhancement, and the noticing hypothesis: An experimental study on ESL relativization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 24,* 541-577.

Izumi, S. (2003). Comprehension and production processes in second language learning: In search of the psycholinguistic rationale of the output hypothesis. *Applied Linguistics, 24*(2), 168-196.

Izumi, S., & Bigelow, M. (2000). Does output promote noticing and second language acquisition? *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(2), 239-278.

Johnson, D. W., & Johnson, R. T. (1999). What makes cooperative learning work. In D. Kluge, S. McGuire, D. Johnson & R. Johnson (Eds.), *Cooperative Learning* (pp. 23-36). Japan: JALT Applied Materials.

Johnson, D. W., Johnson, R. T., & Stanne, M. B. (2000). *Cooperative learning methods: A meta-analysis.* University of Minnesota, Minneapolis: Cooperative Learning Center.

Kang, Dongho. (2009). The role of dictogloss on both listening and grammar. *English Language Teaching, 21*(1), 1-23.

Kim, Yeon Hee, Joo, Mee Ran, & Lee, Jun. (2009). A study on improving English ability of engineering college student through dictogloss. *Journal of Engineering Education Research, 12*(1), 24-30.

Kowal, M., & Swain, M. (1997). From semantic to syntactic processing: How can we promote it in the immersion classroom? In R. Johnson & M. Swain (Eds.), *Immersion education: International Perspectives* (pp. 284-309). NY: Cambridge University Press.

Lim, W. L., & Jacobs, G. M. (2001). *An analysis of students' dyadic interaction on a dictogloss task.* Retrieved May 5, 2009, from the World Wide Web http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_&ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED456649&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED456649

Mackey, A., & Gass, S. (2006). Introduction. *Studies in Second Language Acqusition, 28*, 169-178.

Malmqvist, A. (2005). How does group discussion in reconstruction tasks affect written language output? *Language Awareness, 14*(2-3), 128-141.

Oh, Yeong Ho. (2011). The effects of dictogloss using cooperative learning on the improvement of English writing abilities. *Modern English Education, 12*(4), 237-257.

Ohta, A. S. (2001). *Second language processes in the classroom: Learning Japanese.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know.* New York: Heinle & Heinle.

Potthast, M. J. (1999). Outcomes of using small-group cooperative learning experience in introductory statistics courses. *College Student Journal, 33*, 34-42.

Ravenscroft, S. P. (1997). In support of cooperative learning. *Accounting Education, 12,*187-190.

Rivera, D. P. (1996). Using cooperative learning to teach mathematics to students with learning disabilities. *Forum, 21,* 29-33.

Storch, N. (1998). A classroom-based study: Insights from a collaborative reconstruction task. *ELT Journal, 52*(4): 291-300.

Suhn, Myung-jin. (2011). A study on improving English listening skills through dictogloss practice. *Studies in Linguistics, 20,* 111-127.

Swain, M. (1993). The output hypothesis: Just speaking and writing aren't enough. *Canadian Modern Language Review, 50,* 158-164.

Swain, M. (1995). Three functions of output in second language learning. In G. Cook & B. Seidlhofer (Eds.) *Principle and practice in applied linguistics* (pp. 125-144). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M. (1998). Focus on form through conscious reflection. In C. Doughty & J. Williams. (Eds.), *Focus on form in classroom second language acquisition* (pp. 64-81). NY: Cambridge University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16*(3), 371-391.

Vasiljevic, Z. (2010). Dictogloss as an interactive method of teaching listening comprehension to L2 learners. *English Language Teaching, 3*(1), 41-52.

Wajnryb, R. (1990). *Grammar dictation.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilson, M. (2003). Discovery listening – improving perceptual processing. *ELT Journal, 57*(4), 335-343.

Willis, J., & Willis, D. (1996). *Challenge and change in language teaching.* London: Heinemann.

Examples in: English
Applicable Languages: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Lee, Myong-Kwan
Division of Liberal Arts
Anyang University
708-113, Anyang 5-dong, Manan-gu,
Anyang-si, Gyeonggi-do, 430-714, Korea
Tel: (031) 467-0828
Email: mklee@anynag.ac.kr

Received 15 September 2013
Revised 4 November 2013
Accepted 16 November 2013