

## Chapter 4 Results

### 4.1 Overall Results of Listening Group and Reading Group

#### 4.1.1 Overall Results of Listening Group

The descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations, and number of subjects) of pre, immediate, and delayed test scores for Group L are reported in Table 4-1. A one-way repeated-measures ANOVA was conducted to evaluate the relationship between pretest, immediate test, and delayed test scores of Group L, with the factor being time of vocabulary assessment (before listening, immediately after listening, and two weeks later) and dependent variable being the scores on the pre, immediate, and delayed tests of Group L. The results of repeated-measures ANOVA indicate that the overall amount of vocabulary gained varied at the times vocabulary knowledge was assessed ( $F = 219.48$ ,  $p = .000$ ). The post hoc LSD tests report that pairwise distinctions were significant between Group L's overall scores (TW1~10) of pre and immediate tests ( $p < .001$ ) and pre and delayed tests ( $p < .001$ ) indicating a significant increase in the lexical knowledge gained from the pretest to the immediate test, and a small loss in the delayed test. In other words, on average the Group L's vocabulary knowledge of the target words moved on the VKS from an unfamiliar or recognition level (category I or II) to nearly the level (category III) where they could self-report the meanings of them.

Table 4-1. Means and Standard Deviations of the Pre, Immediate, and Delayed Test Scores of Group L

Target Word	Group L						Pre-Immediate	Pre-Delayed
	Pre		Immediate		Delayed		Mean	Mean
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	Difference	Difference
TW1	1.15	0.36	1.58	0.89	1.35	0.49	0.71**	0.21
TW2	1.56	0.61	2.89	1.09	2.17	0.90	1.32**	0.61**
TW3	1.65	0.54	2.32	0.94	2.05	0.85	0.68**	0.41*
TW4	1.47	0.56	3.24	1.30	2.26	0.99	1.77**	0.79**
TW5	2.41	0.66	3.97	1.17	3.20	1.17	1.56**	0.79**
TW6	2.09	0.57	2.59	1.16	2.20	0.77	0.50	0.12
TW7	2.35	0.77	3.44	1.40	2.94	1.20	1.09**	0.59*
TW8	1.76	0.43	2.76	1.16	2.06	0.55	1.00**	0.29
TW9	1.89	0.33	2.23	0.50	2.03	0.39	0.35**	0.15
TW10	1.74	0.79	2.88	1.32	2.15	0.96	1.41**	0.68**
TW1~10	1.78	0.69	2.81	1.25	2.24	0.98	1.04**	0.47**

Note. N = 34. The maximum possible VKS score is 5.0.

$p^* < .01$ .  $p^{**} < .001$ .

#### 4.1.2 Overall Results of Reading Group

As with the scores of Group R, pretest, immediate test, and delayed test scores were subjected to a one-way repeated-measures ANOVA to analyze the lexical gains in the three tests and also to calculate the significant levels between each test's scores, with the factor, again, being time and the dependent variable being the scores on the three tests of Group L. The means, standard deviations, and number of subjects of pre, immediate, and delayed test scores for Group R are presented in Table 4-2. Analysis of variance reveal a significant main effect for time among the three tests ( $F = 219.48$ ,  $p = .000$ ). Again, follow-up tests were conducted to evaluate pairwise differences among the means. The pairwise distinctions were significant between Group R's overall scores (TW1~10) of pre and immediate tests ( $p < .001$ ) and pre and delayed tests ( $p < .001$ ). This indicates that there was a significant lexical gain made by Group

R from the pretest to the immediate test, and that more than half the lexical knowledge gained was retained after two weeks' interval. To put it differently, based on the five vocabulary knowledge categories of VKS, the mean scores reveal that on average the participants started with an unfamiliar or recognition level (category I or II) of the TW knowledge in the pretest, progressing in the immediate test slightly beyond the level (category III) where appropriate synonym or L1 translation were provided.

Table 4-2. Means and Standard Deviations of the Pre, Immediate, and Delayed Test Scores of Group R

Target Word	Group R						Pre-Immediate	Pre-Delayed
	Pre		Immediate		Delayed		Mean	Mean
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	Difference	Difference
TW1	1.23	0.43	2.40	0.81	1.70	0.47	1.17**	0.47**
TW2	1.93	0.58	3.17	0.91	2.50	0.68	1.23**	0.57*
TW3	1.83	0.53	2.83	0.87	2.33	0.48	1.00**	0.50**
TW4	1.47	0.73	3.33	1.12	2.67	1.06	1.87**	1.20**
TW5	2.83	0.87	3.73	1.11	3.20	0.92	0.90**	0.37*
TW6	1.83	0.75	2.77	1.01	2.27	0.87	0.93**	0.43*
TW7	2.17	0.65	3.67	1.24	2.90	1.06	1.50**	0.73**
TW8	1.60	0.50	2.77	0.63	2.37	0.72	1.67**	0.77**
TW9	2.03	0.49	3.70	1.20	3.07	1.11	1.67**	1.03**
TW10	1.60	0.67	3.10	1.06	2.77	1.04	1.50**	1.17**
TW1~10	1.85	0.75	3.15	1.09	2.58	0.96	1.29**	0.72**

Note. N = 34. The maximum possible VKS score is 5.0.

$p^* < .01$ .  $p^{**} < .001$ .

#### 4.2 Comparisons of Pre, Immediate, and Delayed Test Scores between Group L and Group R

The main aim of this study was to determine which of the two input sources, listening or reading, was more facilitative to learners' incidental vocabulary

knowledge development. To this end, the scores on the pre, immediate, and delayed test for Group L and Group R were subjected to the *t*-test for independent samples. Means, standard deviations, and *t*-test results are presented in Table 4-3. The independent-samples *t*-tests reveal that the two groups did not differ significantly in their initial lexical knowledge of the 10 TWs before the research task ( $t = -1.29$ ,  $p = .196$ ) but Group R significantly outperformed Group L at both immediate tests ( $t = -3.55$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and delayed test ( $t = -4.32$ ,  $p < .001$ ), indicating support for the alternative hypothesis that the incidental vocabulary gained and retained through written input is superior to that through spoken input.

Table 4-3. Results of Independent-Samples *t*-test Measuring the Pre, Immediate, and Delayed Test VKS Scores for Group L and Group R

	Group L		Group R		Mean		
	M	SD	M	SD	Difference	<i>t</i> -value	<i>P</i>
Pretest	1.78	0.69	1.85	0.75	-0.07	-1.29	.196
Immediate test	2.81	1.25	3.15	1.09	-0.34	-3.55	.000**
Delayed test	2.24	0.98	2.58	0.96	-0.34	-4.32	.000**

Note. The maximum possible VKS score is 5.0.

$p^* < .01$ .  $p^{**} < .001$ .

#### 4.2.1 Comparisons of the Gain and Retention Scores of the 10 TWs between Group L and Group R

While, overall, Group R scored significantly higher on both the immediate and post tests than Group L, the same pattern of significant differences was not obtained for every individual TW. VKS gain scores were computed for each TW by subtracting the pretest scores from the immediate test scores (see Table 4-4 for the results of independent-samples *t*-test measuring the VKS gain scores for Group L and Group R); VKS retention scores were computed for each TW by subtracting the pretest scores

from the post test scores (see Table 4-5 for the results of independent-samples *t*-test measuring the VKS retention scores for Group L and Group R). It is evident from Table 4-4 and 4-5 that out of the 10 TWs in Group R, only TW9's mean gain and retention scores were significantly higher ( $t = -6.01, p < .001$ ) than those in Group L. Interestingly, there were even two TWs (TW2 and TW5) in Group L with greater, though not significantly more, mean gain and retention scores.

Table 4-4. Results of Independent-Samples *t*-test Measuring the VKS Gain Scores for Group L and Group R

Target Word	L Gain		R Gain		Mean Difference	<i>t</i> -value	<i>P</i>
	M	SD	M	SD			
TW1	0.71	0.84	1.17	0.75	-0.46	-2.31	.024
TW2	1.32	0.94	1.23	1.07	0.09	0.37	.722
TW3	0.68	0.89	1.00	0.91	-0.32	-1.45	.153
TW4	1.77	1.26	1.87	1.20	-0.10	-0.33	.742
TW5	1.56	0.99	0.90	1.06	0.67	2.57	.013
TW6	0.50	1.08	0.93	0.74	-0.43	-1.85	.069
TW7	1.09	1.14	1.50	1.14	-0.41	-1.45	.153
TW8	1.00	1.23	1.67	0.65	-0.17	-0.66	.509
TW9	0.35	0.49	1.67	1.09	-1.31	-6.01	.000**
TW10	1.41	1.02	1.50	1.14	-0.09	-0.33	.744
TW1~10	1.04	1.09	1.29	1.03	-3.03	-0.26	.003*

Note. The maximum possible VKS score is 5.0.

$p^* < .01$ .  $p^{**} < .001$ .

Table 4-5. Results of Independent-Samples *t*-test Measuring the VKS Retention Scores for Group L and Group R

Target Word	L Retention		R Retention		Mean		
	M	SD	M	SD	Difference	<i>t</i> -value	<i>P</i>
TW1	0.21	0.48	0.47	0.51	-0.26	-2.12	.038
TW2	0.61	0.78	0.57	0.82	0.05	0.26	.799
TW3	0.41	0.82	0.50	0.57	-0.09	-0.49	.624
TW4	0.79	0.95	1.20	1.19	-0.41	-1.52	.133
TW5	0.79	0.84	0.37	0.61	0.43	2.29	.026
TW6	0.12	0.59	0.43	0.63	-0.32	-2.07	.043
TW7	0.59	0.92	0.73	0.87	-0.15	-0.64	.522
TW8	0.29	0.76	0.77	0.82	-0.47	-2.40	.020
TW9	0.15	0.44	1.03	1.00	-0.89	-4.50	.000**
TW10	0.68	0.68	1.17	1.21	-0.49	-2.03	.047
TW1~10	0.47	0.78	0.72	0.89	-0.26	-3.92	.000**

Note. The maximum possible VKS score is 5.0.

$p^* < .01$ .  $p^{**} < .001$ .

### 4.3 The Relationship between Comprehension and Vocabulary Gain Scores

To determine whether text comprehension and the probability of incidental word knowledge learning were related and whether this would hold for both Group R and Group L, the correlations between the comprehension scores and the vocabulary gain scores were estimated by means of Pearson product-moment correlations for both groups separately. Table 4-6 presents Pearson correlations between comprehension scores and vocabulary gain scores of Group L and Group R. As can be seen, a positive significant correlation was found between the scores on the text comprehension and the scores on the vocabulary gain of Group L ( $r = .25$ ,  $p < .001$ ). This suggests an interrelating relationship between listening comprehension and L2 vocabulary gain, meaning in general as listening comprehension improved, so did the lexical gain, and vice versa. However, the comprehension scores and vocabulary gain scores for Group R were positive but non-significantly correlated ( $r = .08$ ,  $p = .267$ ). That is, reading

comprehension was not predictive of Group R’s success in acquiring vocabulary knowledge, and vice versa.

A similar correlating pattern was observed when considering the correlations between text comprehension scores and vocabulary retention scores for Group L, and Group R. The magnitude is significant and slightly higher for the correlation between L2 listening comprehension and vocabulary retention ( $r = .21, p < .01$ ) in comparison to that between L2 reading comprehension and vocabulary retention ( $r = .03, p = .801$ ), suggesting that L2 listening comprehension contributes more robustly to incidental vocabulary retention than does L2 reading comprehension. The results are shown in Table 4-7. Finally, on the whole, there is a decrease in the magnitude of the correlations from the one week interval. This indicates, over time, a weakening relationship between learner-based text comprehension variables and incidental vocabulary learning.

It is noteworthy that while the Group R’s text comprehension was only weakly related to lexical gain and the correlation was lower than that in Group L, the comprehension scores for Group R were significantly greater than those for Group L ( $t = -3.58, p < .001$ ) (see table 4-8).

Table 4-6. Correlations between Comprehension Scores and Vocabulary Gain Scores of Group L and Group R

Comprehension Scores	Group L		Group R	
	Gain	<i>P</i>	Gain	<i>P</i>
Text1~6	.25**	.000	.08	.267

Note.  $p^* < .01$ .  $p^{**} < .001$ .

Table 4-7. Correlations between Comprehension Scores and Vocabulary Retention Scores of Group L and Group R

Comprehension Scores	Group L		Group R	
	Retention	<i>P</i>	Retention	<i>P</i>
Text1~6	.21*	.003	.03	.801

Note.  $p^* < .01$ .  $p^{**} < .001$ .

Table 4-8. Results of Independent-Samples *t*-test Measuring the Comprehension Scores for Group L and Group R

Target Word	Group L		Group R		Mean		
	M	SD	M	SD	Difference	<i>t</i> -value	<i>P</i>
Text1~6	2.61	0.64	2.81	0.44	-0.20	-3.58	.000

Note. The maximum possible comprehension score is 3.0.

$p^* < .01$ .  $p^{**} < .001$ .

#### 4.4 Vocabulary Acquisition and Learner Proficiency Level

The third research question was guided by the assumption that EFL learners' proficiency in English has an effect on incidental vocabulary acquisition and retention. In order to investigate this research hypothesis, the four groups of participants, that is, Group L higher (GLH), Group L lower (GLL), Group R higher (GRH), and Group R lower (GRL) achievers, were compared on the VKS gain and retention scores (see Table 4-9 and Table 4-10 for gain and retention comparisons respectively).

Examination of the two sets of results measured by one-way ANOVA indicates that GLH showed significantly higher lexical gain ( $p < .001$ ) and retention ( $p < .001$ ) scores than GLL, whereas no significant differences were found between the VKS gain ( $p = .059$ ) and retention ( $p = .204$ ) scores for GRH and GRL, which revealed that incidental vocabulary acquisition and retention varied across the two proficiency levels for Group L, but not for Group R. It is worth noting that no significant differences in gain ( $p = .777$ ) and retention ( $p = .473$ ) were found between GLH and GRH, indicating that the higher achievers in Group L performed statistically as well



as those in Group R. However, GRL outperformed GLL with significant differences in both gain ( $p < .01$ ) and retention ( $p < .01$ ). Another noteworthy point shown by the results is that despite the nonsignificant differences in scores between GLH and GRL, Group L's higher-ability learners acquired and retained more of the target lexical knowledge than Group R's lower-ability ones.

Table 4-9 Results of One-Way ANOVA Comparing VKS Mean Gain Scores of Group L Higher, Group L Lower, Group R Higher, and Group R Lower.

		Mean Difference	SD	<i>P</i>
Group L Higher	Group L Lower	0.80	0.14	.000**
	Group R Higher	0.04	0.14	.777
	Group R Lower	0.32	0.14	.027
Group L Lower	Group L Higher	-0.80	0.14	.000**
	Group R Higher	-0.76	0.14	.000**
	Group R Lower	-0.48	0.14	.001*
Group R Higher	Group L Higher	-0.04	0.14	.777
	Group L Lower	0.76	0.14	.000**
	Group R Lower	0.28	0.15	.059
Group R Lower	Group L Higher	-0.32	0.14	.027
	Group L Lower	0.48	0.14	.001**
	Group R Higher	-0.28	0.15	.059

Note.  $p^* < .01$ ,  $p^{**} < .001$ .

Table 4-10 Results of One-Way ANOVA Comparing VKS Mean Retention Scores of Group L Higher, Group L Lower, Group R Higher, and Group R Lower.

		Mean Difference	SD	<i>P</i>
Group L Higher	Group L Lower	0.45	0.11	.000**
	Group R Higher	-0.08	0.11	.473
	Group R Lower	0.07	0.12	.560
Group L Lower	Group L Higher	-0.45	0.11	.000**
	Group R Higher	-0.54	0.12	.000**
	Group R Lower	-0.39	0.12	.001*
Group R Higher	Group L Higher	0.08	0.12	.473
	Group L Lower	0.54	0.12	.000**
	Group R Lower	0.15	0.12	.204
Group R Lower	Group L Higher	-0.07	0.12	.560
	Group L Lower	0.39	0.12	.001*
	Group R Higher	-0.15	0.12	.204

Note.  $p^* < .01$ .  $p^{**} < .001$ .

#### 4.5 Vocabulary Acquisition and Effects of Frequency

Another aim of this study was to explore to what extent frequency of occurrence of a word in a text affected incidental acquisition of that word. Two separate linear regression analyses were conducted, one for Group L and the other for Group R, to evaluate how well the frequency of each word would predict the VKS scores the participants obtained when listening to or reading the texts. As can be seen in Table 4-11, frequency served as a fairly poor predictor of scores on incidental vocabulary gain, accounting for merely 1.1 per cent of the variance in Group L ( $p = .059$ ) and 0.3 per cent of the variance in Group R ( $p = .366$ ). In other words, the linear relationship between word frequency and incidental vocabulary gain was fairly weak and statistically non-significant. Neither in the case of the retention VKS scores was frequency an accurate predictor, with only 1.2 per cent of the variance in Group L ( $p = .043$ ) and 1.8 per cent of the variance in Group R ( $p = .021$ ) accounted for by it. The frequency count for each word tested from the texts is reported in Table 4-12.

Table 4-11: Correlations between Frequency and Vocabulary Gain and Retention Scores of Group L and Group R

Dependent variable	Predictor variable	Multiple R	R Square	F	Significance F
Group L vocabulary gain	Frequency	.103	.011	3.59	.059
Group L vocabulary retention	Frequency	.110	.012	4.15	.043
Group R vocabulary gain	Frequency	.052	.003	0.82	.366
Group R vocabulary retention	Frequency	.133	.018	5.40	.021

Note.  $p^* < .01$ ,  $p^{**} < .001$ .

Table 4-12. Target Words by Frequency and Average VKS Scores of them.

Target Words	Frequency in Text	Average VKS Scores of Group L		Average VKS Scores of Group R	
		Gain	Retention	Gain	Retention
TW1 (deteriorate)	2	0.71	0.21	1.17	0.49
TW2 (noticeable)	2	1.32	0.62	1.23	0.57
TW3 (aid)	6	0.68	0.41	1.00	0.50
TW4 (disobedient)	4	1.76	0.79	1.87	1.20
TW5 (behave)	2	1.56	0.79	0.90	0.37
TW6 (assistance)	1	0.50	0.12	0.93	0.43
TW7 (witness)	1	1.09	0.59	1.50	0.73
TW8 (reckless)	2	1.00	0.29	1.17	0.77
TW9 (bully)	2	0.35	0.15	1.67	1.03
TW10 (grumpy)	6	1.41	0.68	1.50	1.17

#### 4.6 Participants' Response to the Questionnaires

Following the posttest, two questionnaires investigating attitudes and feedback on the two learning methods were administered to the Group L and Group R respectively. The students were asked for their level of agreement with each statement

on a 5-point scale: strongly agree (1), agree (2), neither agree or disagree (3), disagree (4), strongly disagree (5). Presented here are the results concerning each item in the questionnaires, beginning with Item 1 in a tabular form. With Item 1, the participants were asked to express whether they considered listening to or reading short narratives as an effective way to enhance their overall listening proficiency. The results received for this item are illustrated in the table below:

Table 4-13. Group L and Group R's Beliefs towards the Effectiveness of the Two Learning Methods on Enhancing General Language Proficiency.

Item 1					
Group L	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. I think listening to stories regularly helped improve my listening ability.	24%	50%	16%	11%	0%
Group R	SA	A	N	D	SD
1. I think reading stories regularly helped improve my reading proficiency.	22%	73%	5%	0%	0%

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = neither agree or disagree; D = disagree ; SD = strongly disagree. Percentages in this table have been rounded up to the nearest whole number, and thus may not add to 100.

As shown, respondents in Group L answered overwhelmingly in the affirmative that their listening ability improved as a result of listening to stories during the experimentation period; and so did the subjects in Group R. However, 11% of the students from Group L disagreed with this statement. Some of the more frequent comments from Group L were that they thought listening to stories read aloud helped get them used to English in its aural form, improve their pronunciation, and enhance their overall listening ability. As for the students in Group R, the more typical comments mentioned were that they believed reading short narratives had contributed positively to their reading fluency, reading comprehension, word recognition ability,

reading habits, and grammar.

Item 2 delves into whether the learners found listening to or reading stories a good way to increase their vocabulary. Pertaining results are given in the table below:

Table 4-14. Group L and Group R’s Beliefs towards the Effectiveness of the Two Learning Methods on Promoting Vocabulary Learning.

Item 2					
Group L	SA	A	N	D	SD
2. I think listening to stories regularly helped increase my vocabulary.	5%	47%	21%	20%	0%
Group R	SA	A	N	D	SD
2. I think reading stories regularly helped increase my vocabulary.	16%	65%	19%	0%	%

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = neither agree or disagree; D = disagree ; SD = strongly disagree. Percentages in this table have been rounded up to the nearest whole number, and thus may not add to 100.

The striking point about these results is that students from both groups shared the view that listening to or reading stories yielded positive results in their lexical gains. As can be observed here, slightly more than half of the students from Group L (52%) and a great majority of the students from Group R (81%) expressed this belief. It is important to note that while none of the participants from Group R disagreed with the statement “I think reading stories regularly helped increase my vocabulary,” 20% from Group L expressed skepticism about the effects of listening to stories on vocabulary learning. Overall, despite a small percentage of the subjects from Group L answering in the negative, there was general agreement among the students with this statement. As a whole, the students typically commented that they got to practice inferring meaning of words from context, and that the content of the stories helped them learn and recall the meanings of the TWs. In addition, many of the students from Group R also reported that they could learn new words and review learned ones at the

same time, and that learning words from context seemed to make it more possible to them that later on they would be able to use the words to make sentences or in another context.

For Item 3, Group L and Group R seemed to be divided on this statement. With Item 3, the researcher asked whether the participants were in favor of the two learning methods. Results concerning this item are cited in the table below:

Table 4-15. Group L and Group R's Beliefs towards the Two Learning Methods.

Item 3					
Group	SA	A	N	D	SD
Group L					
3. I like learning vocabulary this way.	11%	18%	34%	29%	8%
Group R					
3. I like learning vocabulary this way.	8%	38%	46%	8%	0%

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = neither agree or disagree; D = disagree ; SD = strongly disagree. Percentages in this table have been rounded up to the nearest whole number, and thus may not add to 100.

As shown, in Group L, the students (37%) who responded in the negative outnumbered those (29%) who answered in the affirmative; whereas in Group R, almost half of the respondents (46%) agreed with this statement and merely 8% disagreed. When asked to comment on the statement, many of the students wrote that they found it of more interest to learn vocabulary by listening to or reading stories than to learn by studying vocabulary lists.

With Item 4, the researcher probed into whether the subjects would like their English teachers to continue using the same methods to help improve their English proficiency. The results can be observed in the table below:

Table 4-16. Group L and Group R's Beliefs towards Continuing to Use the Two Learning Methods for Enhancing General Language Proficiency.

Item 4					
Group L	SA	A	N	D	SD
4. I hope the teacher will continue using the same method to help improve my English.	8%	24%	47%	18%	2%
Group R	SA	A	N	D	SD
4. I hope the teacher will continue using the same method to help improve my English.	8%	30%	51%	11%	0%

Note. SA = strongly agree; A = agree; N = neither agree or disagree; D = disagree ; SD = strongly disagree. Percentages in this table have been rounded up to the nearest whole number, and thus may not add to 100.

In both groups, about one-third of the participants were in support of the idea of their English teachers including short stories in their curriculum, while 18% of the students from Group L and 11% from Group R were opposed to it. Nine participants from Group L commented that they liked the idea but wished to take a look at the words unfamiliar to them before listening, and to have the written text to read after listening, otherwise they might not be able to learn much vocabulary and retain it for long. On the other hand, 6 respondents from Group R wrote that they liked reading interesting narratives, but they were against doing it in class, because they thought of this as a self-learning activity they would be ready to engage in by themselves if asked to.

The last two items of the questionnaire (Item 5 and Item6) were open-ended questions designed to give the subjects the opportunity to respond freely. Item 5 asked about the advantages of the two learning methods, while Item 6 inquired into the disadvantages. Regarding Item 5, in summary, subjects in Group L referred to listening to stories was as fun, motivating, contributing to incidental vocabulary

learning while imposing no pressure onto them and, more importantly, developing their listening ability, which is an aspect of English learning that according to the respondents tends to be ignored by their English teachers. In Group R, the learners in general described reading short stories as a fun, natural, and rewarding activity where they acquired not only lexical but also world knowledge presented in the text content.

The following is a selection of the comments (provided by the students in Chinese and translated by the researcher into English) Group L made in responding to Item 6. The number at the end of each comment indicates the number of similar occurrences:

- I find it quite time-consuming learning vocabulary this way. The amount of time I spent listening to those stories did not really correspond to that of the vocabulary knowledge I learned (6).
- I don't think I can remember for a long time the meanings of the words I learned from listening to stories, unless I get to hear those words on a frequent basis (4).
- Sometimes I did not get the meanings of the words just by listening to the stories. And, very often, even if I got the meanings, I did not feel quite sure if I got the meanings right (7).
- I don't have much confidence in this learning method because I am not really used to and a little bit insecure about learning English with only my ears (6).
- When I did not comprehend much of the content of the stories, it was difficult for me to learn the vocabulary in the texts (4).
- Sometimes I ignored or paid no attention to the new words, and even when I heard them, I did not really have enough time to make out their meanings, because it was kind of difficult to focus on both the new vocabulary and the content at the same time (5).