

In the name of Allah

the compassionate

the merciful



Semnan University
Faculty of Humanities
English Language and Literature Department

*Thesis Submitted to the office of Graduate Studies in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in
Teaching English as a Foreign Language*

**The Effect of Transcribing on Iranian EFL Learners' Phonemic Perception,
Listening, and Dictation**

Supervisor:

Dr. Aram Reza Sadeghi Beniss

Advisor:

Dr. Hadi Farjami

By:

Mohammad Afshar Rad

February, 2014

Dedications

To my parents, for their endless support and encouragement

throughout my life

To my wife, for her patience and prayers for me

Acknowledgements

First of all, my heartfelt thanks and gratefulness go to Allah, the Almighty who bestowed me with patience, perseverance and all the means to complete this research. Thanks go to Him for all His endless blessings and favors.

I am enormously indebted to my advisor, Dr. Sadeghi for all his efforts. I have been privileged to work with him as he always acted like a torch to show me the way through the jungle of research. If it had not been for his support, this thesis could not have been completed.

I gratefully would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Farjami for his valuable suggestions and insightful comments at the final stages of the thesis writing.

I would like to express my special thanks to Dr. Moradan for his useful comments on my proposal in the Seminar course.

I would also like to express my heartfelt thanks to all professors of the Department of English Language and Literature, Semnan University for helping me directly or indirectly in conducting this study.

My thanks are also extended to Dr. Schmidt at University of Hawai`i, for helping me overcome the ambiguity present in distinguishing between different terms associated with consciousness.

My thanks also go to Dr. Naghshbandi for his valuable comments on some sections of my thesis.

I also owe thanks to the manager of TICE Language School (in Sabzevar) as well as the participants of this study for their cooperation and help.

Finally, it is beyond description how much I owe my wife for her patience especially when things were most difficult. For her, I will be grateful forever.

Abstract

The importance of phonology, listening, and dictation has been recognized in L2 studies. However, each of these areas has suffered from some type of neglect. In phonology, the emphasis has been on production rather than perception while perception provides the foundation for production. Regarding listening, most of the techniques proposed to develop this skill are based on top-down processing. This leads to an underestimation of bottom-up processing. Dictation has been used as a tool for improving different areas of language while it can be considered as an end itself which needs some techniques for its improvement. To address the imbalance in each area, this study introduces transcribing as an aural input enhancement device and examines its effect on beginning Iranian EFL learners' phonemic perception, listening, and dictation. To this end, three types of instruments including minimal pair test, listening test, and partial dictation test were employed to serve as both pretests and posttests. A total of thirty one females, aged 14-16, participated in this study. The participants who were chosen through convenience sampling were randomly assigned to two groups of control (N=15) and experimental (N=16). The treatment took 20 sessions. Each session the control group was assigned to listen to some passages while the experimental group transcribed the same passages. At the end of the treatment, three independent samples *t* tests were conducted to compare the control and experimental groups. The results of the first *t* test indicate that transcribing has a significant positive effect on beginning learners' phonemic perception ($p = .037$). The second *t* test was employed to compare the listening comprehension ability of the two groups. The results show that the participants of the experimental group outperformed those in the control group ($p < .001$). The third *t* test was used to compare the means of the two groups on partial dictation test. Based on the findings, the difference between the two groups was highly significant in terms of their dictation-taking ability ($p < .001$). Considering the positive effect of transcribing on

phonemic perception, listening, and dictation, it is advisable for teachers to include transcribing exercise, which is based on bottom-up primacy, for developing beginning learners' listening ability at both phonemic level and higher levels as well as their dictation-taking ability.

Keywords: transcribing, phonemic perception, listening, dictation, input enhancement, bottom-up processes, top-down processes.

List of Abbreviations

EFL	English as a Foreign Language
ELT	English Language Teaching
FL	Foreign Language
GTM	Grammar Translation Method
L1	First Language
L2	Second Language
LTM	Long Term Memory
NL	Native Language
SLA	Second Language Acquisition
STM	Short Term Memory
TEFL	Teaching of English as a Foreign Language
TL	Target Language
WM	Working Memory

Table of Contents

TITLE PAGE	II
DEDICATIONS	III
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	IV
ABSTRACT.....	V
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	VII
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VIII
LIST OF TABLES	XIII
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. INTRODUCTION	2
1.2. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	3
1.3. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	7
1.4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS	8
1.5. RESEARCH HYPOTHESES	8
1.6. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY	9
1.7. OUTLINE OF THE CHAPTERS	11
CHAPTER 2	12
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	12
2.1. INTRODUCTION	13
2.2. TRANSCRIBING	14
2.3. ATTENTION.....	15
2.3.1. <i>Clarifying the Ambiguity (Terminology Related to Consciousness)</i>	17
2.3.2. <i>Noticing Hypothesis</i>	19

2.3.3. <i>Experimental Paradigms to Study Attention</i>	20
2.3.3.1. Selective Attention.....	21
2.3.3.2. Divided Attention.....	21
2.3.4. <i>Input Enhancement (Consciousness Raising)</i>	22
2.4. MEMORY	23
2.5. PRONUNCIATION.....	25
2.5.1. <i>Definition of Pronunciation</i>	25
2.5.2 <i>History of Pronunciation</i>	26
2.5.3. <i>Importance of Pronunciation</i>	27
2.5.4. <i>Components of Pronunciation</i>	28
2.5.5. <i>How to Teach Pronunciation</i>	30
2.5.6. <i>Phonological Awareness, Phonemic Awareness, or Auditory Discrimination</i>	32
2.6. LISTENING	33
2.6.1. <i>Definition of Listening</i>	33
2.6.2. <i>History of Listening Skill in ELT</i>	34
2.6.3. <i>Importance of Listening</i>	36
2.6.4. <i>Listening Skill: From Shadow to Light</i>	37
2.6.5. <i>Dichotomous Views of Listening Skill</i>	39
2.6.5.1. Listening as Comprehension or Acquisition.....	39
2.6.5.1.1. Listening as Comprehension	39
2.6.5.1.2. Listening as Acquisition.....	39
2.6.5.2. Listening as Product or Process	40
2.6.5.2.1. Listening as Product.....	40
2.6.5.2.2. Listening as Process	41
2.6.6. <i>Processes of Listening</i>	42
2.6.6.1. Listening as a Bottom-up Process.....	42
2.6.6.2. Listening as a Top-down Process	42
2.6.6.3. Listening as an Interactive Process	43
2.6.7. <i>What Makes Listening Difficult?</i>	45
2.6.7.1. Different Feature/Sound Recognition Systems in NL and TL.....	45
2.6.7.2. Drawing on Different Sources of Information.....	46
2.6.7.3. Transient Nature of Spoken Language	47

2.6.7.4. Features of Connected Speech	47
2.6.8. <i>Ways to Develop Listening</i>	48
2.6.8.1. Using Different Strategies.....	49
2.6.8.2. Using Different Processes.....	50
2.6.8.3. Using Authentic Materials and Technology	50
2.7. DICTATION	50
2.7.1. <i>Definition of Dictation</i>	50
2.7.2. <i>History of Dictation</i>	51
2.7.3. <i>Controversy over Dictation</i>	54
2.7.3.1. Dictation as a Testing Device	54
2.7.3.2. Dictation as a Teaching Device	56
2.7.4. <i>Different Types of Dictation</i>	57
2.7.4.1. Standard dictation	58
2.7.4.2. Partial Dictation	59
2.7.4.3. Elicited dictation	59
2.7.4.4. Dicto-comp	60
2.7.4.5. Dictation with competing noise	60
2.7.5. <i>Advantage of Partial Dictation over Other Forms</i>	60
2.7.6. <i>Validity and reliability of dictation</i>	61
CHAPTER 3	63
METHODOLOGY	63
3.1. INTRODUCTION	64
3.2. PARTICIPANTS	64
3.3. INSTRUMENTS.....	65
3.3.1. <i>Minimal Pair Test</i>	65
3.3.2. <i>Listening Comprehension Tests</i>	66
3.3.2.1. Listening Pretest.....	66
3.3.2.2. Listening Posttest	67
3.3.3. <i>Partial Dictation Test</i>	68

3.3.3.1. Partial Dictation Pretest	68
3.3.3.2. Partial Dictation Posttest.....	68
3.4. PROCEDURE.....	70
3.4.1. <i>Implementation Procedure</i>	70
3.4.2. <i>Scoring procedure</i>	71
3.4.3. <i>The Experiment</i>	72
3.5. DATA ANALYSIS	73
CHAPTER 4.....	76
RESULTS	76
4.1. INTRODUCTION	77
4.2. PHONEMIC PERCEPTION.....	78
4.2.1. <i>Assumption 1: Normality of Distribution</i>	79
4.2.2. <i>Assumption 2: Homogeneity of Variances</i>	80
4.2.3. <i>Comparison of the Groups in Minimal Pair Pretest and Posttest</i>	81
4.3. LISTENING	83
4.3.1 <i>Assumption 1: Normality of Distribution</i>	84
4.3.2. <i>Assumption 2: Homogeneity of Variances</i>	85
4.3.3. <i>Comparison of the Groups in Listening Pretest and Posttest</i>	86
4.4. DICTATION	87
4.4.1. <i>Assumption 1: Normality of Distribution</i>	87
4.4.2. <i>Assumption 2: Homogeneity of Variances</i>	88
4.4.3 <i>Comparison of the Groups in Partial Dictation Pretest and Posttest</i>	89
CHAPTER 5	DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS
	91
5.1. INTRODUCTION	92
5.2. STUDY OVERVIEW	92
5.3. GENERAL FINDINGS.....	93
5.4. DISCUSSION.....	94
5.4.1. <i>Phonemic Perception</i>	94
5.4.2. <i>Listening</i>	98
5.4.3. <i>Dictation</i>	101

5.5. CONCLUSION	102
5.6. PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS.....	104
5.7. LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH.....	106
REFERENCES.....	108
APPENDICES	130
APPENDIX 1	131
MINIMAL PAIR TEST.....	131
APPENDIX 2.....	134
LISTENING POSTTEST	134
APPENDIX 3.....	137
DICTATION POSTTEST	137

List of Tables

Table 3.1. Problematic Minimal Pairs for EFL learners whose L1 is Farsi	65
Table 3.2 Number of Items and Time Dedicated to Each Section of the Listening Posttest.....	67
Table 3.3 Number of Deleted Words and Syllables for Each Section of the Dictation Posttest	69
Table 3.4 Type of Data and Procedures Used to Compare Groups in Pretests and Posttests	74
Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics for Minimal Pair Pretest and Posttest.....	78
Table 4.2 Results of Normality Tests for Minimal Pair Pretest and Posttest	79
Table 4.3 Skewness Statistics, Standard Error of Skewness, and Skewness Ratio for Minimal Pair Pretest and Posttest	80
Table 4.4 Results of Levene’s Test for Minimal Pair Pretest and Posttest	80
Table 4.5 Results of Independent Samples t Test for Minimal Pair Pretest and Posttest	81
Table 4.6 Mean Scores of the Problematic Sound Pairs for Iranian EFL Learners	83
Table 4.7 Descriptive Statistics for Listening Pretest and Posttest	84
Table 4.8 Results of Normality Tests for Listening Pretest and Posttest	84
Table 4.9 Skewness Statistics, Standard Error of Skewness, and Skewness Ratio for Listening Pretest and Posttest	85
Table 4.10 Results of Levene’s Test for Listening Pretest and Posttest.....	85
Table 4.11 Results of Independent Samples t Test for Listening Posttest	86
Table 4.12 Descriptive Statistics for Partial Dictation Pretest and Posttest	87
Table 4.13 Results of Normality Tests for Partial Dictation Pretest and Posttest	88
Table 4.14 Skewness Statistics, Standard Error of Skewness, and Skewness Rario for Partial Dictation Pretest and Posttest	88
Table 4.15 Results of Levene’s Test for Partial Dictation Pretest and Posttest	89

Table 4.16 Results of Independent Samples t Test for Partial Dictation Posttest..... 89

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Introduction

Listening as one of the four main language skills is perhaps the most fundamental one (Wolvin & Coakley, 1996). It builds the foundation for and facilitates learning other language skills (Oxford, 1990). However, it used to be overlooked especially in the early period of English Language Teaching (ELT) when the main focus was on grammar and written skills.

After years of neglect, listening has recently started to attract many researchers attention (Flowerdew, 1994; Nunan and Miller, 1996; Rost, 2002). As a result, many books have been written and different conferences have been held claiming to address this complex skill and help learners develop their listening ability. Furthermore, to improve listening, different techniques have been proposed (Kiany & Shiramiri, 2002). For example, Ur (1991) and Rost (1991) have presented more than 30 activities and exercises for teaching listening.

However, in most of these attempts the role of lower level processes, especially attention, in learning has been neglected. There has been extensive research into the role of attention in language learning. There is consensus among researchers that attention is a prerequisite for learning and no learning takes place without attention (Schmidt, 2001; Nissen & Bullemer, 1987; Shiffrin & Schneider, 1977; Velmans, 1991).

The role of attention and noticing becomes even greater when we consider listening as a facilitator of second language (L2) learning. Schmidt (1990, p. 139) distinguishes between input (what listeners hear) and intake (the part of input which is noticed by the listeners). It is the intake that becomes part of learners' linguistic competence and serves as the basis for language development.

One of the different techniques and exercises capitalizing on the role of attention to improve listening comprehension is dictation (Davis, 1995). It is recommended by many EFL (English as a Foreign Language) researchers in general and listening comprehension researchers in particular (Finocchiaro & Bonomo, 1973; Paulston, 1976; Morley, 1977; Rivers & Temperley, 1978; Byrne, 1978; Rost, 1991; Ur, 1991; Davis, 1995; Celce-Murcia, 1996; Gilbert, 1996).

Dictation can be used as both a useful device in testing and a helpful activity for learning (Morris, 1983; Sawyer and Silver, 1961; Valette, 1964). It can also be employed as a teaching device (Whitaker 1976). Although it was firstly associated with the *grammar translation method* (GTM) and was neglected with the dominance of *audiolingual method* in the 1960s, it regained popularity later because:

- As opposed to teaching and testing language components in isolation, dictation is a useful device for teaching and testing language as a whole (Oller, 1979).
- It highly correlates with measures of overall language proficiency (Stansfield, 1985).

1.2. Statement of the Problem

As noted earlier, the role of attention in learning is unquestionable. However, most discussions regarding its role have dealt with morphology and syntax while a few have focused on lexical learning and pragmatic development (Schmidt, 2001). Peters (as cited in Schmidt, 2001) suggests that attention and noticing play a crucial role in different domains of language learning including phonology.

Phonology has been recognized as an important area in L2 acquisition studies (Lado, 1957; Eckman, 1977; Major, 2001; Eckman and Elreyes, & Iverson, 2003); however, more weight is given to the study of learners' production. This emphasis on phonological production

has led to an underestimation of phonological perception while it is a prerequisite for phonological production (Mayberry, 2006). In response to this problem and in order to fill the existing gap, one of the purposes of the current study is investigating the role that attention plays in phonological perception.

It was also stated earlier that different activities have been suggested for improving listening skill. Nonetheless, almost all of them share the same problems. In these techniques, top-down processing, listening for gist, and listening strategies have been emphasized which result in a downplay of the role played by bottom-up processing. Moreover, these techniques either provide learners with practicing comprehension or test their listening rather than teaching them something which improves their performance in listening (Sheerin, 1987; Field, 2000).

Giving learners more practice by emphasizing repeated encounters has some disadvantages. The first disadvantage is that although an increase in the number of listening experiences may help some learners, there is no guarantee that it helps all of them. Repeated exposure to different listening practices for learners who have not been taught how to deal with them may turn to unnerving experiences for them. Field (2008, p. 29) states that “somebody who is a weak listener at the outset might well become increasingly demoralised by their lack of perceptible progress.” He believes that using extensive practice of listening is an opportunity when learners receive some training in the basics of listening. Otherwise, it’s a threat which results in fossilization of inefficient techniques.

Another disadvantage is that contribution of background knowledge to comprehension depends on learners’ ability to use bottom-up processes. In Mayberry’s (2006) words, “...low-level processes, affected by L1 [first language] phonemic interference and unfamiliarity with segmentation rules, prevent learners from being able to use any prior knowledge they have of the

L1 and L2 (cognate recognition, grammatical and lexical contexts, etc.) in listening tasks” (p. 227).

Like the techniques which only provide learners with practice, the techniques which test listening rather than teaching it are not flawless. They test learners’ listening before teaching it. It is axiomatic that teaching a linguistic point should precede testing it (Field, 2008).

Based on psycholinguistic research, the aforementioned techniques are in contrast with the best supported model of listening comprehension in which bottom-up processing is emphasized (Lindfield, Wingfield, & Goodglass. 1999; Field, 1999), what Marslen-Wilson (1989) called ‘bottom-up primacy’.

Wilson (2003, p. 336) also claims that:

...an excessive focus on meaning, either through extra vocabulary learning or additional listening practice, will not necessarily solve the listening comprehension problems of many students. So, we still need to find an approach to teaching listening that strikes a balance between attention to form and attention to meaning.

Acknowledging the role of top-down processing, Wislon (2003, p. 336) also states that “...the learners’ ultimate aim is to rely less on contextual guesswork, and more on hearing what was actually said. Current EFL teaching has tended to overlook this point.”

Although it is of utmost importance, listening is not an easy skill to develop. Researchers generally agree that language learners experience difficulties while listening to the target language (TL). To address these problems, Field (2000, p. 187) believes that, as the first step, we

should determine “which sub-skills are giving rise to problems of understanding, then devise micro-exercises to practice them.”

In a study trying to find the sources of difficulties that EFL listeners encountered while listening, Goh (2000) listed 10 problems, out of which five were related to perceptual processing. Tsui and Fullilove (1998), in one of the most extensive studies in the area of bottom-up/ top-down processing, concluded that low level listeners used more of top-down processes. They did so to compensate for perception problems, bottom-up processes. As Randall (2007) believes, to make sense of what they hear, EFL learners must first extract the salient features of the aural input they receive (bottom-up process). Although the features are the same in all languages, the combinations of these features differ from language to language. Therefore, “... the first job of second language learner is to adjust to the new combination of features used in the second language” (Randall, 2007. p. 51). Then this feature recognition system should become automatic in order to free *Working Memory* (WM) capacity for top-down processing.

In another study Koster (1987) found that nonnative subjects’ use of context was almost the same as that of native subjects. However, according to Randall (2007), native subjects’ use of top-down processes rests on highly proceduralised bottom-up ones which are not automatic in the case of nonnative learners. Consequently, we can conclude that the effectiveness of top-down processes depends on well-established bottom-up ones.

To develop and automatize decoding of aural linguistic input, the initial step that beginners need to take is paying attention to the input. In other words, learners should focus on sound and word recognition. Thus, there is a need for techniques which enhance learners’ awareness towards how sounds and words are pronounced. Some researchers have tried to