



CHAPTER ONE

VIDEOTAPE VS. AUDIOTAPE FOR LISTENING COMPREHENSION: A CASE STUDY

1.1 Introduction

Traditional ESL instructors have generally assumed that the language laboratory reflects the theoretical orientation of Audiolingual theory, a structure-based approach which views foreign language learning as a process of mechanical habit formation (Richards and Rodgers, 1986). Dialogues and drills form the basics of its classroom practices. In this sense, “the ‘reigning technology,’ the audio cassette-based language laboratory, supported the objectives of behaviorist ALM (audio-lingual method) school and developed in tandem with this movement” (Lyman-Hager, 1992, p.7). It provides the perfect opportunity for drill work of basic structures. However, through this kind of training, students are frequently unable to understand the native speaker’s response, because, unlike natural language learners, they lack the contextualization needed for rapid comprehension and effective long-term learning (Krashen and Terrell 1988). “Along with the growing realization of the importance of language learning, there has come a pronounced dissatisfaction with the former means (drill and practice) used to achieve linguistic competence”

(Lyman-Hager, 1992, p. 7).

Inasmuch as video is capable of delivering messages via both sight and sound, “videotapes and videodiscs represent a significant advance in the materials available for language students” (Cline, 1991, p. 26). The immediacy and impact of video’s visual and auditory reinforcement far surpasses the all-aural effect of audio. As Gillespie (1991, p.9) points out, according to the experimental findings of Mehrabian (1972), approximately 55% of the attitudinal aspect of human communication is based on facial expression, with another 38% being based on paralinguistic features, leaving 8% to lexical and grammatical features of communication.

Further, language students can enrich their understanding through watching video. As Long and Richards indicate (1987, p.164), “Non-native speakers...may lack many culturally specific scripts; their individual scripts may differ in degree and content from target language scripts, and this poses additional problems for the non-native listener,” the use of video makes it easier for students to build up script and schema knowledge which may be called upon for comprehension of the target language in the future.

Lyman-Hager also observes,

No one who has passed the Piagetian ‘age of reason,’ say twelve years of age, is content for long to speak at the disconnected, uncontextualized sentence level, especially in the absence of visual stimuli. It is totally unnatural and downright perverse for us to require this of students.... If the new technologies can offer this, who are we pedagogues to stand in the way? (1992, p.9)

Swanson et al. further reiterates,

The language laboratory must abandon the primacy of the audio tape in favor of a combination of video and audio. Today’s students are visually oriented. Their attention wanders if they are not stimulated both visually and aurally. Teachers also recognize the importance of the visual component in processing language and

understanding the cultural context of language. ... The costs of both hardware and programs will be much greater than for audio capability alone; however, the energy and excitement of such multimedia presentations can revitalize the language laboratory environment. (1992, p.44)

Further, practitioners of Neuro-linguistic programming (NLP) point out that people use five systems to experience the world: visual, auditory, kinesthetic, olfactory, and gustatory. Gardner (1983) suggests that humans process a range of intelligences: Musical/Rhythmic, Verbal/Linguistic, Visual/Spatial, Bodily/Kinesthetic, Logical/Mathematical, Intrapersonal and Interpersonal. These concepts help us analyze different student responses to stimuli and environments. Revell and Norman (1997) claim that most people have one 'preferred primary system.' Levin et al., (1974) observed that approximately 25 percent of the learners performed better when using a particular mode for instruction. Since using video, information is presented in two different systems simultaneously; it stands to reason that more students have the chance to find their preferred primary system for learning.

However, some teachers have often questioned whether beginning students can be taught using videotapes. But in fact, adding visual information changes the degree of difficulty of any given materials because students can visually understand a language situation without necessarily knowing the words involved. As Krashen (1988) hypothesizes learners acquire language by understanding input that is one level higher than their current level of competence, showing videotapes to low level students can facilitate their learning since input can easily be made comprehensible to them. "This contextual inferencing is the secret to learning to understand a second language and to the eventual success of the student in the acquisition process" (Krashen, 1988, p.75).

Instructors who have actually integrated the video as part of their lab program have achieved gratifying results. Terrell (1989) claims that

with the video technology readily available and relatively inexpensive, second language learners can be exposed to a wider range of listening contexts. To summarize his paper, he concludes,

Although video courses... require a large amount of advance preparation time, they are, for students without experience living in the target language culture, the only way to move students from an intermediate level to an advanced level in listening skills. (p.23)

Aoki also reports,

This approach of expecting students to deal with French spoken at a normal rate and the native speakers interacting with each other in their native environment provided our students with the aurally represented language and customs, paralinguistic information such as gestures and body language ... the students internalized many paralinguistic signals simply by watching the video. When asked to speak and converse in class, the students automatically incorporated the gestures and body language. (1992, pp. 4 & 5)

Lepke (1977) found that the French students at a junior college in Texas not only performed better, but also there was a substantial increase in enrollment in language courses when they could choose their preferred mode of presentation. Parry and Meredith (1984) gave a listening comprehension test to college students in Spanish courses and found that those who saw the videotapes performed significantly better than those only hearing the soundtrack dubbed onto audiotapes. They also suggest that if students do understand more of the videotaped version, they will feel greater success and incentive for developing their language skills.

Since there is substantial evidence to show that the use of videotapes is needed to achieve maximum success in language teaching, since the 1992-1993 academic year, the use of audio for the Lab Programs I & II at Soochow University has been replaced with video. Because the American Streamline series, the materials which were used for the lab course in the 1991-1992 academic year, did not have the same

range of materials on video as they did on audio, the faculty then decided to use the *Family Album, USA* videotapes, published by Maxwell Macmillan International Publishing Group. This video series presents continuous episodes depicting stories about a typical American family living in New York.

1.2 Survey of the Students

Unlike the system in many other countries, the lab program at universities in Taiwan is a self-contained course. At Soochow University, all students are required to take this course for two years to improve their English listening and speaking abilities. They receive credit for the course. In order to find out about the students' attitudes towards using solely the audio medium or the video medium and their comparison of the two media for language learning in the lab classroom, the author conducted a survey of this student population.

1.2.1 Subjects

A total of 2974 sophomores who completed the Lab Courses I & II using audiotapes and videotapes respectively were surveyed in April, 1993--8 months after the videotapes were put to use. There were 2030 daytime students from 22 departments and 944 nighttime students from 8 departments.

1.2.2 Survey

The printed survey¹ was developed in Chinese, consisting of two sections. Part 1 contained fifteen questions dealing with the students' attitude towards using video and audio in the lab. Students were asked to compare the use of video and audio in four major areas: preparing for classes and exams, in-class interaction, teaching techniques, and the

¹ See Appendix 1.1 for the English translation of the survey.

effectiveness for language training. For each question, students were told to select the answer that most suitably described their own view or belief. In Part II the students were asked to compare their experiences in using audio and video according to the categories given and then write their responses. This gave students a chance to express their individual opinions on the issues.

1.2.3 Data Analysis

The quantitative analysis of this study involved several statistical procedures using the SPSS/PC+ program: (1) descriptive statistics, including frequency, means and standard deviations, were computed to summarize the students' responses to the use of video and audio; (2) the chi-square statistic was used to examine and discern the relationship between students' choices of the answers for each question across the two variables: whether they were daytime or night time students and whether they were in slow classes or in good classes.

Based on the results of the analysis, three tables of analysis have been made. Table 1.1 breaks down the percentages of students who selected each answer for each question. Table 1.2 is a comparison of students' responses in slow classes and in good classes. Table 1.3 is a comparison of daytime and nighttime students' responses towards each question.

1.2.4 Students' Responses Towards Using Audio/Video

According to Table 1.1, students showed a significant preference towards using videotapes for training their listening and interactive skills for the lab course. For twelve out of the fifteen questions asked, students answered positively in regards to using video and the differentials between the students' choosing video and the students' choosing audio are substantial. A closer look at the students' answers to the questions addressing student modality preference will provide us a better picture of how they viewed the media used.

Items showing high preference for video

90.5% of the students indicated that they could better understand the cultural aspects of the target language when videotapes were used; 2.5% of the students felt audio was better in this regard with the remaining saying there was no difference between the two.

74% of the students said that it was easier for them to understand and handle the content of the lessons when using videotapes; 11.3% favored audio and 14.1% thought there was no difference.

70.5% of the students claimed that they concentrated better in class when using videotapes; 16.9% thought they did better with audio and 10.8% thought it didn't matter.

58.7% of the students indicated that using videotapes was better in helping them improve their speaking abilities; 13.6% thought audio; and 27% thought there was no difference.

Items showing moderate preference for video

44.9% thought using video was better in helping them to improve their listening abilities; 30.7% thought audio was better, and 23.9% claimed there was no difference.

23.7% thought they had to spend more time and effort preparing and reviewing lessons when using video; but 36.4% thought this for audio; and a substantial 39.5% thought there was no difference.

Items showing no difference

For only one question, the percentages for video and video are almost the same. 30.8% thought they had to spend more time and effort preparing for exams when using video; 30.5% thought this for audio; and a significant 38.4% thought there was no difference.

Items showing preference for audio

Some of the physical restrictions of video became apparent in this segment of the study.

18.3% thought the teacher was more able to operate the machines when

using videotapes; 32.8% felt this way when audiotapes were used; but almost half (48.4%) of the students thought there was no difference.

27.1% claimed that it was more convenient for them to prepare or review lessons at home when using video; 34.7% felt this way about audiotapes; and a significant 37.7% thought they were the same.

Choosing between the two media

When it came to the last crucial question of choosing between video and audio, students clearly demonstrated their preference for video. 56.3% felt they wanted videotapes to be used more; only 6.9% said they wanted audiotapes used more; 18.6% preferred to have video and audio used equally; 14.6% said they wanted videotapes used only; and 2.5% wanted audiotapes used only.

Comparison of slow classes and good classes

According to Table 1.2, the obtained chi-square value represented a significant difference ($p < 0.05$) in the percentages of answers across the variable: whether students were in slow classes or in good classes, in the following items: more chances to interact with the teacher and other students ($p = .02$), more chances for repeated practice in class ($p = .01$), the teacher's being more able to operate the machines ($p = .02$), and the choice of which medium to use ($p = .00$).

13.3% of the students in good classes chose to use video tapes only while 20.1% of those in slow classes felt this way. It's also interesting to note that when using video tapes, 53.4% of the students in good classes but only 45.3% in slow classes felt they had more chances to interact with the teacher and other students while 43.7% of the students in slow classes but only 38% in good classes felt they had more chance for repeated practice in class. This can be attributed to the fact that teachers vary their classroom practices in dealing with different level students.

Comparison of daytime/nighttime students

According to Table 1.3, the obtained chi-square value represented a

significant difference ($p < 0.05$) in the percentages for each answer across the variable: whether they were daytime or nighttime students, in the following items: having to spend more time and effort preparing and reviewing lessons ($p = .00$), more chances for repeated practice in class ($p = .00$), a better variety of classroom activities when certain media were used ($p = .04$), the teacher's having a better understanding of the students' abilities so as to adjust the pace to suit the needs of students ($p = .01$), the teacher's being more able to operate the machines ($p = .00$), and the choice of which medium to use ($p = .00$).

Daytime students showed more preference towards video. 16.1% of the daytime students chose video only and 57.4% of them wanted to have more video while 11.4% of nighttime students chose video only and 53.7% of them wanted to have more video. As nighttime students did not have as much study time as daytime students, they wanted more repeated practice in class and felt using video they spent more time and effort preparing and reviewing lessons.

1.3 Survey of the Teachers

In order to find out about the teachers' experiences in using video in the lab classroom, a survey on the teachers was conducted.

1.3.1 Subjects

Twenty teachers who had taught the lab program were given the questionnaire². Eighteen of them returned a completed copy of the survey. The teachers were all non-native English speakers, their ages ranging from 22 to 30. There were four males and fourteen females; five held a Master's degree in TESOL, one held a Master's degree in Literature and the rest held a bachelor's degree in English. Six of them had had no experience using traditional audiotapes because they started

² See Appendix 1.2: Survey on the teachers.

teaching in the 1992-1993 academic year.

1.3.2 Survey

The printed survey consisted of two sections. Part I contained six statements dealing with the teachers' attitude towards using video in the lab (e.g., whether it facilitates learning, whether students are motivated by the use of video, etc.). Most of these items were answerable by making a check to represent "true" and a "0" to represent "false". In Part II, the teachers were asked to list the major potential advantages and disadvantages of using video for teaching in the lab. There might be two sources of feedback: their own teaching experiences and their conversations with the students.

1.3.3 Results

Generally speaking, the results were compellingly positive towards using video. All of the eighteen teachers felt that using video to teach facilitated language acquisition better than using traditional audiotapes, and all but one would prefer to use video if they had a choice. Sixteen out of the eighteen teachers felt that students were strongly motivated to learn through watching video, and the remaining two felt their students were a little bit more motivated. Fifteen out of eighteen teachers thought the students' level of participation was significantly higher if video was used with one saying it was slightly higher.

The teachers didn't respond as positively to the final two items as they did to the previous ones. Eight out of eighteen felt using video was more difficult than using traditional tapes in the lab classroom. One felt it was a bit more difficult. One said that if you were familiar with the machine, it wouldn't be a problem. In regards to the time spent on preparation, ten out of eighteen felt that they had to spend more time preparing a lesson when using video. Two felt they had to spend a bit more time and one said she wasn't sure.

The advantages to using video in the lab classroom

Most teachers thought that with the lights being turned off for video-playing on the big screen, students didn't become tired as easily as they had in the past when audiotapes were used. They seemed to be able to concentrate more on the course materials and get more actively involved in the classroom activities. Even if they did fall asleep while the video was playing, they were immediately awakened when the lights were turned on. Another advantage was that the shy, quiet students were less inhibited about imitating without being encouraged by the teacher. Also, students didn't rely so much on the text material for comprehension because it was difficult to read in the dark. Furthermore, it was easier to help students become aware of some of the cross cultural differences through watching video. They soon assimilated the non-verbal behavior and with the provided visual context, could make inferences, which helped foster understanding of the target language. Even further, using video, there were a lot more things a teacher could do to make the class more interesting, such as silent-viewing, jig-saw viewing, as well as generating interaction by stopping the machine and asking students about what was on the screen. Finally, it was a lot easier to introduce new vocabulary and authentic speech through the use of video. Students were obviously willing to take more risks. However, because of the booth seating arrangement in our lab, it was difficult to put students into different sizes of groups.

The disadvantages to using video in the lab classroom

With the lights being constantly turned on and off for supplementary activities, it was difficult to sequence them and students soon got irritated. Also students occasionally acted silly in the dark. Another common complaint was that students felt they were watching things rather than listening, i.e., that comprehension came from visual processing instead of audio processing. They didn't think their listening would improve by watching video. Even further, some students felt when using video, they had too many things to attend to at the same time:

the visual processing, the language, the facial expressions, the body language, not to mention the tone of voice, the rhythm, the stress, and the intonation pattern. In other words, there were too many factors coming into play which made it difficult either for the teacher or the students to focus on one particular linguistic aspect. They also complained that they had to spend more time previewing and viewing a lesson. Lastly, some students felt that watching video provided entertainment but somehow disregarded the role of the traditional lab-- the drill and practice of basic structures.

The advice for teacher using video in the lab classroom

It takes a thorough detailed step-by-step lesson plan to run a successful class if video is used in the lab, because the video cassette machine simply does not respond as quickly as the audio cassette. It is more time consuming and complicated to locate specific segments on videotapes.

1.4 The Exercise

In order to find out what students claimed was really true, we conducted an exercise³. The author made fifteen listening comprehension questions based on Episode 18, Act 1, Scene 1 of Family Album, USA, and told the teachers not to teach anything prior to the quiz. 468 sophomores from five different departments participated in the experiment. All of the subjects were daytime students except the students from the English department. For each department, we had one section of students just listen to the tape while the other section listened and watched, and then compared their scores. The reason we administered the audio and video experiment respectively among students in the same department was because of their approximately equal level of abilities. As the teacher of

³ See Appendix 1.3 for the exercise.

the English department class didn't have the time to work on two different sections, he had one section of students divided into halves. Half of the students turned their chairs so that they couldn't see the screen.

It is obvious that the students who could see and watch the video did a slightly better job than the students who could only listen. According to Table 1.4, out of the fifteen questions given, the 255 students who watched videotapes had an average of 10.53 questions answered correctly with a standard deviation of 1.735, whereas the 213 students who listened to audiotapes had an average of 9.67 answered correctly with a standard deviation of 2.155. All the students who listened and watched outdid the students who only listened except the students from the Law department. It was probably because of the substantial difference in the numbers of students in the two sections from the Law department: 61 students from the Comparative Law Section participated whereas only 30 students from the Civil Law Section did. Overall, the difference was not as great as had been expected, because according to some of the teachers, the students who had to listen could look at the questions while they were listening. The major difference was offset as a result of this. In one instance however, the Business Mathematics B students, who listened only, were not given the questions beforehand and thus scored much lower (8.5) than their counterparts (10.245), who both listened and watched. Because of this discrepancy, further tests in this area need to be conducted.

It stands to reason that the students who watched videotapes did better because they had access to additional visual information such as body language and facial expressions, and also because it is believed that visual information is processed faster than pure audio information. This also confirms Basil's findings (1992) that "memory measures showed a modality-specific effect. Visual information was remembered whether or not that information was important semantically, and whether or not subjects were instructed to focus on that channel."

However, it should also be noted that certain audio cassettes are

designed knowing that visual information is absent and may compensate in their structure and content, and thus using the soundtrack of a video tape exclusively may produce a different effect altogether, making this type of experiment somewhat subjective. This should be kept in mind when conducting similar experiments.

1.5 Implications & Conclusion

The data suggest that a majority of teachers and students in the language lab program at Soochow University show preference towards video. Most teachers think they can present examples of language in use more effectively using video than audio. One teacher described, "The combination of variety, interest and entertainment students can derive from videotapes helps develop great motivation in them." Most students would prefer to have video used for the lab course because they are accustomed to learning things through visual information processing. They also think that using video better enhances the acquisition of both listening and speaking abilities. The experiment demonstrated to some degree the credibility of this view. After this study was done, some other research along this line also yielded similar results. Yao (1994) suggested that teachers use multimedia teaching materials to motivate students and introduce them to different cultures. Yang (1996) surveyed 149 students at Chung Shan University and most students preferred the use of video to audio.

However, some students whose preferred primary system is auditory feel that visual information interferes with their ability to understand verbal information. Several theorists have recognized this tendency; e.g., Gunter (1980). They find that information processing capacities are taxed by adding visual information. In Basil's study (1992, p.1), he also indicates "Auditory information, however, was better remembered when viewers were focused on the audio channel. Auditory information and auditory-based messages appear to demand greater

resources than visual information and visual-based messages.”

It is interesting to note that although most students felt positive about using videotapes, when it came to the crucial question of making a choice, 56.3% of the students expressed that they would prefer video more while only 14.6% wanted video only. This indicates that if we have the same range of materials on video as we do on audio, we can continue to use audio in the lab classroom with audio confined to a limited role. By doing so, teachers can take care of the needs of learners whose preferred primary system is auditory. After an extensive viewing on video to help establish the contextual frame, audiotapes can be used for intensive listening. (Allan, 1985, p. 65) Students can then concentrate solely on the audio portion for drilled practice on the tone of voice, the rhythm, the stress, and the intonation pattern. In this way, the use of video for global comprehension (Communicative Approach) is integrated with the use of audio for further emphasis of particular linguistic aspects (Audiolingual).

Based on the results of this study, many teachers have incorporated the use of audiotapes with the video program for the lab course. They dub the soundtrack of the video program onto audiotapes. This allows them to quickly locate specific segments for instruction. It is also easier for students to copy parts of the audiotapes to take home for review and practice. With regards to the problem of lights being constantly turned on and off, special lighting for video viewing has been installed in the lab classroom so that teachers can better sequence classroom activities without worrying about the light.

Table 1.1
All Students' Responses to the Survey on Using Audio/Video

Question	video	audio	no difference	didn't answer		
1. more time and effort preparing and reviewing lessons	23.7	36.4	39.5	0.4		
2. concentrate better in class	70.5	16.9	10.8	1.8		
3. more chances to interact	49.4	13.0	36.1	1.5		
4. more chance for repeated practice in class	41.0	28.3	29.1	1.6		
5. more time and effort preparing for exams	30.8	30.5	38.4	0.3		
6. easier to understand and handle content of lessons	74.0	11.3	14.1	0.7		
7. better variety of classroom activities	85.2	5.7	7.7	1.4		
8. teacher can adjust the pace to suit student needs	37.7	17.2	43.7	1.3		
9. more flexibility of teacher's lesson planning	51.3	18.9	29.2	0.6		
10. teacher is more able to operate machines	18.3	32.8	48.4	0.4		
11. better understand the cultural aspects of the language	90.5	2.5	6.3	0.7		
12. easier to prepare or review lessons at home	27.1	34.7	37.7	0.5		
13. can help improve my listening ability	44.9	30.7	23.9	0.5		
14. can help improve my speaking ability	58.7	13.6	27.0	0.7		
15. I want the teacher to use	video only 14.6	audio only 2.5	both equally 18.6	video more 56.3	Audio more 6.9	Didn't answer 1.0

N: 2974 subjects. Note: Table cell is the percentage of students who chose each answer.

Table 1.2
The Students' Responses to the Survey on Using Audio/Video:
Good Classes vs. Slow Classes

Q	video		audio		no difference		didn't answer		Sig.				
	good	slow	good	slow	good	slow	good	slow					
1	24.7	24.8	31.1	37.6	44.0	37.2	0.2	0.4	0.05				
2	67.7	73.0	18.6	16.1	11.2	9.4	2.5	1.4	0.27				
3	53.4	45.3	12.3	15.4	32.5	38.2	1.8	1.2	0.02 *				
4	38.0	43.7	31.7	22.8	29.2	32.1	1.2	1.4	0.01 *				
5	35.0	30.9	26.4	31.3	38.6	37.6	0.0	0.2	0.18				
6	71.4	73.0	10.0	10.4	18.2	16.3	0.4	0.2	0.72				
7	84.9	83.9	6.1	5.5	7.6	9.3	1.4	1.4	0.62				
8	34.4	39.6	17.0	14.8	47.7	44.7	0.8	1.0	0.21				
9	49.5	47.2	19.8	20.1	30.5	32.5	0.2	0.2	0.74				
10	14.5	19.1	40.9	32.9	44.2	47.6	0.4	0.4	0.02 *				
11	93.5	90.7	2.2	1.6	3.9	7.3	0.4	0.4	0.05				
12	24.1	27.0	36.8	32.3	38.7	40.2	0.4	0.6	0.29				
13	40.1	44.9	34.2	29.5	25.2	25.2	0.4	0.4	0.21				
14	59.1	58.7	14.1	13.6	25.8	27.0	1.0	0.8	0.91				
15	video only		audio only		both equally		video more		audio more		not answer		Sig.
	good	slow	good	slow	good	slow	good	slow	good	slow	good	slow	
	13.3	20.1	2.5	2.6	20.9	14.0	56.4	54.9	6.3	7.9	0.6	0.6	

Note: A total of 511 students from good classes: Japanese, English, German, Sociology and Political Science.

A total of 508 students from slow classes: Chemistry, Chinese, History, Microbiology, Psychology, Physics, Business Mathematics, and Economics.

Table cell is the percentage of students who chose each answer.

The figures marked with a * represented a significant difference in students' choices of the answers across the variable: whether they were in slow classes or in good classes.

Table 1.3
The Students' Responses to the Survey on Using Audio/Video:
Daytime vs. Nighttime Students

Q	video		audio		no difference		didn't answer		Sig.				
	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night	Day	Night					
1	23.1	25.1	34.8	39.7	41.8	34.6	0.3	0.5	0.00 *				
2	71.2	69.0	16.4	18.0	11.0	10.5	1.4	2.5	0.45				
3	49.5	49.2	12.5	14.2	36.7	34.9	1.3	1.8	0.37				
4	41.1	40.7	26.8	31.7	30.7	25.4	1.4	2.2	0.00 *				
5	31.1	30.2	29.8	32.0	38.9	37.3	0.2	0.5	0.45				
6	74.3	73.3	10.4	13.0	14.8	12.6	0.5	1.1	0.05				
7	86.3	82.9	5.0	7.2	7.8	7.5	1.0	2.3	0.04 *				
8	38.2	36.7	15.9	20.1	44.9	41.3	1.1	1.9	0.01 *				
9	50.6	52.9	19.0	18.9	30.0	27.3	0.4	1.0	0.32				
10	17.6	19.9	34.8	28.5	47.1	51.2	0.4	0.4	0.00 *				
11	91.0	89.5	2.3	2.9	6.2	6.7	0.5	1.0	0.55				
12	26.7	28.0	34.0	36.1	38.8	35.3	0.5	0.6	0.19				
13	45.1	44.5	30.2	31.8	24.2	23.2	0.5	0.5	0.65				
14	59.9	56.1	12.8	15.4	26.6	27.8	0.7	0.7	0.08				
15	video only	audio only	both equally		video more		audio more		didn't answer	Sig.			
	day	night	day	night	day	night	day	night	day	night			
	16.1	11.4	2.4	2.8	16.8	22.5	57.4	53.7	6.2	8.5	1.0	1.2	0.00*

Note: There were 2030 daytime students from 22 departments and 944 nighttime students from 8 departments.

Table cell is the percentage of students who chose each answer.

The figures marked with a * represented a significant difference in students' choices of the answers across the variable —whether they were daytime or nighttime students.

Table 1.4
The Comparison of Students' Performances on a Listening
Comprehension Exercise

Watch videotapes				
Section	Ss No.	Sum	Mean	SD
International	61	635	10.4	1.845
Trade A				
Business	53	543	10.245	1.938
Mathematics A				
Computer	54	550	10.2	1.542
Science B				
English	26	287	11.038	1.777
Comparative	61	650	10.7	1.573
Law				
Total	255	2685	10.53	1.735
Listen to audiotapes				
Section	Ss No.	Sum	Mean	SD
International	49	431	8.8	2.59
Trade B				
Business	46	392	8.5	1.834
Mathematics B				
Computer	61	604	9.9	2.105
Science A				
English	27	284	10.518	2.155
Civil Law	30	327	10.9	2.09
Total	213	2059	9.67	2.155

Appendix 1.1

The English Translation of the Student Survey on Using Audio/Video

This survey is to find out about your experience in the Lab Courses I & II in using audiotapes and videotapes respectively. The results will be used to determine future curriculum to further enhance students' listening and speaking abilities. It is sincerely hoped that you will answer the questions carefully according to your own personal experience.

Part I: For each question, select the answer that most suitably describes your own situation.

1. I have to spend more time and effort preparing and reviewing lessons when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
2. I concentrate better in class when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
3. I have more chances to interact with the teacher and other students when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
4. I have more chance for repeated practice in class when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
5. I have to spend more time and effort preparing for exams when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
6. It's easier for me to understand and handle the content of the lessons when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
7. There is a better variety of classroom activities when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
8. The teacher has a better understanding of the students' abilities so as to adjust the pace to suit the needs of students when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
9. There is more flexibility in the teacher's lesson planning when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
10. The teacher is more able to operate the machines when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
11. I can better understand the cultural aspects of the target language (American English) when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
12. It is more convenient (easier) for me to prepare or review lessons at home when using _____
a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference

13. Generally speaking, using _____
 a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
 is better in helping me improve my listening ability.
14. Generally speaking, using _____
 a. videotapes b. audiotapes c. there is no difference
 is better in helping me improve my speaking ability.
15. If I had the choice, I would like the teacher to use _____
 a. videotapes only b. audiotapes only c. both equally
 d. videotapes more e. audiotapes more.

Part II: If there is anything you need to add on to the above, please state your experiences according to the categories given below.

Item	When I took:	
	Lab Course I	Lab Course II
1. Use of machines		
2. Level of difficulty of the materials used		
3. Pre-class preparation at home		
4. Classroom environment		
5. Teacher's method of teaching		
6. Teacher-student interaction		
7. Teacher's evaluation of students		
8. Opportunities to use English outside the classroom		
9. Content of Exams		
10. Frequency of use of media center		
11. Others		

Appendix 1.2**The Teacher Survey on Using Audio/Video**

Part I: Please answer the questions by making a check in the appropriate column according to the following rating scale:

True 2 False 0

Statements	True	False
1. Using videotapes to teach facilitates language acquisition better than using audiotapes.		
2. Students are more motivated to learn through watching video.		
3. Using video is more difficult than using audio in the lab classroom.		
4. Using video, you have to spend more time preparing a lesson.		
5. Students' level of participation is higher if you use the video rather than play audiotapes.		
6. With all the pros and cons, would you still prefer to use video if you had a choice?		

Part II: Please list in the space given below major advantages and disadvantages of using video for teaching in the lab. There might be two sources of the feedback: your own teaching experiences and your conversations with the students.

Appendix 1.3

Listening Comprehension Exercise, Episode 18, Act 1, Scene 1

I. True or false

1. If Boswell is elected, the schools will have less money.
2. Boswell wants to eliminate the school cultural programs.
3. Boswell wants to increase the school sports programs.
4. Philip agrees with his patients that taxes are too high.
5. Robbie, Marilyn, and Richard want Ellen to run for office.
6. Ellen will need some money to run for election.
7. Philip agrees to pay a little money for Ellen's campaign.
8. Philip wants to run for office with Ellen.
9. Boswell has no opponent in the election.
10. Ellen seemed upset when she talked about Boswell's running for the school board.
11. Based on this conversation, parents can have a voice in the school's curriculum in America.
12. Based on this conversation, people can freely choose to run for school boards in America.

II. Choose the correct answer.

1. When Philip first heard about Ellen's idea of running for the school board, he said, "Well, you've got my vote." What does he really mean?
a. He really supports Ellen. b. He's joking. c. He's going to vote for Ellen.
2. Philip: I think you can make a difference, Ellen. What does Philip mean?
a. She can tell things apart. b. She will be an effective member on the school board. c. She will change things completely.
3. Ellen: Oh, not if I can stop him! What does she imply?
a. She's going to bribe Boswell. b. She's going to invent a scandal about Boswell. c. She's going to run against him.

References

- 楊泰雄 (Yang, T.) 1996 八十五年度教育部顧問室人文社會科學教育改進計畫—外文系英語聽力課程研究成果報告，國立中山大學外國語文學系。
- 姚崇昆 (Yao, C. K.) 1994 大學「英聽課程」之教學研究—國立中興大學案例，行政院國家科學委員會專題研究，計畫編號：NSC83-0301-H005-008。
- Allan, M. (1985). Integrating video into the language programme. *Teaching English with video*, 48-65. Longman Group Limited.
- Aoki, P. (1992). Using technology in future foreign language education. *Designing the learning center of the future, language laboratories: Today and tomorrow*, 3-8. Instructional Design International, Inc.
- Basil, M. D. (1992). *Attention to and memory for audio and video information in television scenes*. Paper presented at the 42nd Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association.
- Cline, W. J. (1991). Interactive video: One monitor or two? *IALL Journal of Language Learning Technologies*, 24(3), 25-35.
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic Books.
- Gillespie, J. (1991). Videodiscs as database. *IALL Journal of Language Learning Technologies*, 24(3), 9-14.
- Gunter, B. (1980). Remembering televised news: Effects of visual format on information-gain. *Journal of Educational Television and Other Media* 6, 8-11.

- Kelty, J. (1991). *Family Album, USA: Classroom Video Course*. Maxwell Macmillan Int'l Publishing Group.
- Krashen S. D. & Terrell, T. D. (1988). Second language acquisition theory. *The Natural Approach: Language acquisition in the classroom*, 23-38. Prentice Hall International English Language Teaching.
- Lepke, H. (1977). Discovering student learning styles through cognitive style mapping. *Personalizing foreign language instruction: Learning styles and teacher options*, ed. R. Shulz. National Textbook Co., Skokie, IL.
- Levin, J., P. Divine-Hawkins, S. Kerst, and J. Guttman. (1974). Individual differences in learning from pictures and words: The development and application of an instrument. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 66 (3), 296-303.
- Long M. H. & Richards, J. C. (1987). Listening comprehension: Approach, design, procedure. *Methodology in TESOL: A book of readings*, 161-176. Newbury House Publishers.
- Lyman-Hager, M. A. (1992). Toward a new pedagogy. *IALL Journal of Language Learning Technologies*, 25(2), 7-14.
- Parry, T. S. & Meredith, R. A. (1984). Videotape vs. audiotape for listening comprehension tests: An experiment. *ERIC Digest*. ED254107 ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics Washington DC.
- Revell, J. & Norman, S. (1997). *In your hands: NLP in ELT*. Saffire Press.

- Richards, J. C. & Rodgers, T. S. (1986). The Audiolingual Method, Communicative Language Teaching. *Approaches and methods in language teaching: A description and analysis*, 44-86. Cambridge Language Teaching Library.
- Swanson, C. (1992). Technological advances in the language laboratory. *Designing the learning center of the future, language laboratories: Today and tomorrow*, 43-44. Instructional Design International, Inc.
- Terrell, T. D. (1989). Comprehensible input for intermediate foreign language students via video. Reprinted in *IALL Journal of Language Learning Technologies*, 26(2), spring 1993, 17-23.