Chapter 5

Summary, Conclusion, and Suggestions

In the last chapter of this thesis, the summary, conclusion of this study and suggestion are presented. The summary is about the encapsulation of the study which is based on the research findings and the discussion of the findings. The conclusion is a digest of the research findings highlighting the main point of the study. Meanwhile, the suggestion is about the recommendation which is directed to inspire other researchers to explore ideas for conducting further researches and provide valuable input as pedagogical implications for English teachers to develop their English listening materials and teaching methodology by taking into account students' language learning strategies to gain better and more fruitful learning and teaching dynamics.

Summary

This present study was conducted based on the fact that most of the English for Specific Purposes (ESP) teachers ignored the importance of providing ESP comprehensible inputs through listening

and collaborating language learning strategies in teaching ESP. At the real ESP classroom, teachers tend to test students' listening comprehension while they are teaching listening, thus students often feel anxious and confused what to do with the listening tasks. Many students are rarely exposed to the authentic listening materials meanwhile they are demanded to master listening comprehension and pass the international standard language proficiency test such as TOEIC or TOEFL. In fact, teaching listening is quite complicated since there are many variables should be taken into account for the success of second language acquisition particularly ESP.

Starting from this real ELT context especially teaching ESP for engineering students, thus a research investigating the effect of language learning strategies on engineering students' listening comprehension should be conducted. The ex post facto study was selected since language learning strategy was an independent variable which has occurred and can not be manipulated. This method was also intended to reveal the effect of language learning strategies on engineering students' listening comprehension.

The findings of the research figured out three main points of the research result dealing with the correlation, the effectiveness and

the most effective variable. The research findings reveal that there is correlation between language learning strategies and engineering students' listening comprehension. The highest correlation can be gained by compensation strategy (with correlation value 0,16) and cognitive strategy group (with correlation value -0,14). It means that students who activate compensation strategies can improve their listening scores for about 0.16. Thus, the more frequent they activate compensation strategies the higher listening score will be gained. Otherwise students who activate cognitive strategies can decrease their listening scores for about 0.14. Thus, the more frequent they activate cognitive strategies the lower listening score will be gained.

At the second rank of correlation, metacognitive was revealed as a language learning strategy having positive correlation (within correlational value 0.12). Memory and social were found as learning strategy having negative correlation (within correlational value -0.08 and -0.07). While the least positive correlational value 0.01 was gained by a group of students who applied affective strategy. It means that students who activate affective strategies can improve their listening scores for about 0.01. Although the increase of listening

score was not significantly gained, somehow this affective strategy still support students' improvement of listening comprehension.

Based on the results of correlation analysis above, it can be concluded that there was correlation between language learning strategies and students' listening comprehension which was dominantly achieved by Compensation and Cognitive strategy groups. Thus, the first hypothesis was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected.

There were 3 major classifications of language learning strategy group regarding their listening comprehension scores namely (1) a group with the highest listening mean scores (78.50 - 88.50) comprising of metacognitive affective students and socio compensation students group, (2) a large group within listening mean scores ranged from 60 to 72.50 consisting of 5 single major strategies and 3 combined strategies, and (3) the last group with the lowest listening mean score (56.25) representing cognitive group of students who most dominantly use cognitive strategy in accomplishing listening tasks.

Based on the statistical analysis of ANOVA, the alternative hypothesis was accepted whereas the null hypothesis was rejected

because *F* ratio (2.85) > *F*-table (2.00) and p-value (0.007) < α (0.05). It proved that there was difference of engineering students' listening comprehension achievement among various learning strategy groups. Thus, diverse language learning strategies applied by engineering students affect their listening comprehension.

The statistical analysis of Tukey's HSD test proved the significant differences in gaining listening comprehension score among groups of students who applied memory strategies, cognitive strategies, compensation strategies, metacognitive strategies, affective strategies, social strategies, and other combined strategies. The significant differences obviously can be seen among 2 comparison of strategies, namely: (1) comparison between metacognitive affective and cognitive strategies with difference mean 32.50 and p-value equals to 0.005, and (2) comparison between socio compensation and cognitive strategies with difference mean 22.25 and p-value equals to 0.022. Whereas th**e** other combinations of strategies have an equal average conclusion in the range of 0.079 - 1.000. Hence, based on the Tukey's HSD test result, it can be inferred that H0 is rejected, otherwise H3 is accepted.

Conclusion

A digest of the research findings highlighting the main point of the study is presented. The present study find out that there is correlation between language learning strategies and engineering students' listening comprehension which was dominantly achieved by compensation and cognitive strategies. Thus, the first hypothesis was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected.

To figure out the effectiveness of language learning strategies on engineering students' listening comprehension, the statistical analysis of ANOVA proved that there was difference of engineering students' listening comprehension achievement among various learning strategy groups. Thus, the second hypothesis was accepted and the null hypothesis was rejected. Since the diverse language learning strategies applied by engineering students affect their listening comprehension.

Meanwhile, the most effective language learning strategies can be revealed from the significant differences of listening comprehension achievement which has been effectively verified and attested by using Tukey's HSD test. The research findings pointed out the collaboration of metacognitive and affective strategies was the

most effective strategy followed by a combination of social and compensation strategies.

Suggestions

Based on the result of the present study, several suggestions are made for either practical applications of the study or recommendation for further related study. As pedagogical implication, the research endorsed English teachers or lecturers to develop students' listening strategies and encourage them to apply the most effective strategies (i.e. metacognitive affective) in listening comprehension. Thus, teachers should design a well structured teaching and learning listening activities and guide students to activate the effective listening strategies. Here are the guidelines of teaching and learning listening activities as an alternative:

Table 5.1

The Alternative Teaching and Learning Listening Activities

I	**Pre-Listening**	
	Activating background knowledge	a. Engage students in entertaining pre-listening activities to lower their anxiety (affective) b. Displaying picture related to the topic to attract students' attention (metacognitive) c. Giving questions to link the topic with already

		known material (metacognitive) d. Encourage students to set the goal for accomplishing listening tasks (metacognitive) e. Guide students to make accurate predictions (compensation)
II	**While Listening**	
	Collaborating all effective listening strategies	a. Guide students to use keywords and semantic mapping (memory) b. Guide students to guess intelligently by using linguistic and other clues (compensation) c. Guide students to analyze expressions and get the idea quickly (cognitive) d. Guide students to effectively take notes, summarize and highlight the main point of listening (cognitive) e. Guide students to control their emotional temperature by using checklist (affective)
III	**Post-Listening**	
	Evaluating learning outcome	a. Encourage students to ask questions for clarification or correction (social) b. Encourage students to cooperate with others to accomplish listening tasks (social) c. Guide students to evaluate their learning through self-monitoring (metacognitive) d. Guide students to make positive statements and reward themselves (affective) e. Encourage students to practice naturalistically using various resources (cognitive)

Teachers are also suggested to create conducive learning environments to lower students' anxiety before and during listening, then motivate them to engage in cognitive and metacognitive processes that include strategies for facilitating comprehension and coping with listening difficulties.

The research also provide feedback for English teachers to develop approaches and implement the best and effective learning strategies in teaching listening comprehension at the classrooms.

Moreover, the result of this research urge students to apply language learning strategies in the classroom and further develop learning strategies outside English classroom through extensive listening to be autonomous or independent learners.

Some points of evaluation can be explored after reviewing the result of the present study which should be taken into account in designing the next further researches:

Table 5.2

The Weakness of the Research and Recommendations for Future Research

No	Point to Consider	Recommendations for Future Research
1	The use of ESP Listening Comprehension Test (Teacher Made Test)	The use of International Standard Test for Vocational Education such as TOEIC is recommended to use as an accurate test instruments to gain more valid result of the research.
2	The use of SILL questionnaire to measure students' language learning strategies should be reviewed.	The use of more specific questionnaire and other technique in measuring students listening strategies should be taken into account in designing further researches.
3	The object of the study is limited only engineering students	The effect of language learning strategies on EFL learners or Senior High School Students' listening and other language skills are also need to be investigated.
4	The use of ex post facto as method of the study should be developed.	The effectiveness of language learning strategies on engineering students' listening comprehension can be reviewed thoroughly by using experimental method of strategy based instruction.

These are some promising research directions for further studies: (1) The experimental study on strategy based instruction that facilitates cognitive and metacognitive processing in listening comprehension needs more rigorous research. (2) The integrated models of listening instruction orchestrating top-down and bottom-up processing at different proficiency levels for different tasks must be tested for their relative effectiveness in teaching students how to listen and how to develop word recognition skills. (3) Extensive listening as an alternative solution to effectively improve students' listening comprehension needs to be explored. Since it is the one that encourage students to be autonomous or independent learners.

References

Al-Alwan, Ahmed, et. al. (2013). EFL Learners' Listening Comprehension and Awareness of Metacognitive Strategy: How Are They Related? *International Education Studies Journal Vol 6, No 9*, 31 - 39.

Bidabadi, Farinaz Shirani; Yamat, Hamidah. (2011). The Relationship Between Listening Strategies Used by Iranian EFL Freshman

University Students and Their Listening Proficiency Levels. *ELT Journal Vol 4, No 1 March*, 26 - 32.

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S. K. (2007). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Method.* London: Allyn & Bacon.

Borg, W.R. & Gall, M.D. (1989). *Educational Research An Introduction.* White Plains: Longman Inc.

Brown, A. (1978). 'Knowing When, Where, and How to Remember: A Problem of Metacognition' in R. Glaser (ed). *Advances in Instructional Psychology (Hillsdale: Erlbaum) I*, 77-165.

Brown, D. H. (2007). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy.* White Plains NY: Longman.

Chamot, A. (1995). *Learning Strategies and Listening Comprehension in Mendelsohn and Rubin 1995 : 13-130.*

Chamot, A. U. (1999). *The Learning Strategies Handbook.* New York: Addison Wesley Longman, inc.

Depdiknas. (2006). *Standar Isi dan Standar Kompetensi Lulusan Tingkat SMA dan MA (The Standard of Content and*

Competence Standard of Junior High School and Islamic Junior High School Graduates). Jakarta: Binatama Raya.

Febrian, M. Reza, et. al. (2014). The Difference Between Successful and Unsuccessful Learners in English Listening Learning Strategies. *Jurnal U-Jet FKIP Unila Vol 3, No 7*, 1-8.

Field, J. (2001). Finding One's Way in the Fog: Listening Strategies and Second Language Learners. *Modern English Teacher 9 (1)*, 29-34.

Field, J. (2008). *Listening in the Language Classroom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Flavell, J. (1979). Metacognition and Cognitive Monitoring: A New Area of Cognitive Development Enquiry. *American Psychologist 34*, 906-911.

Gay, L., Mills, G., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational Research: Competencies for Analysis and Applications.* New Jersey: Pearson Education, inc.

Goh, C. (1997). Metacognitive Awareness and Second Language Listeners. *ELT Journal 51*, 361-369.

Goh, C. (2002a). Exploring Listening Comprehension Tactics and Their Interaction Patterns. *System 30*, 185 - 206.

Goh, C. (2002b). *Teaching Listening in the Language Classroom.* Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Goh, C. (2008). Metacognitive Instruction for Second Language Listening Development: Theory, Practice and Research Implications. *RELC Journal 39, 188,* 192.

Goh, C.M.; Paltridge and Starfield. (2013). *The Handbook of English for Specific Purposes.* West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, inc.

IAB & PPNS. (2008, June 18). Advertorial PPNS on TVRI. Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia.

International Test Center. (2014). *Laporan Pelaksanaan dan Hasil ETS TOEIC Pemetaan Mahasiswa Baru PPNS.* Jakarta: ITC.

Jakeman, V. & McDowell, C. (2001). *IELTS Practice Tests Plus.* Essex: Pearson Education, Ltd.

Kato, S. (2005). How Language Learning Strategies Affect English Proficiency in Japanese University Students. *Japanese Journal, Vol. 7, No. 1,* 239 - 262.

Lalonde, C. (1998). *Language Learning Strategies and Their Relationships to Achievement Gains on Two English Language Proficiency Measures.* Ottawa: National Library of Canada.

Liu, X., & Goh, C. (2006). 'Improving Second Language Listening: Awareness and Involvement' in T.S.C. Farell (ed). *Language Teacher Research in Asia (Alexandria, VA: TESOL)*, 91-106.

Lynch, T. & Mendelsohn, D. (2002). Listening. Dalam N. Schmitt, *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (hal. 193). London: Hodder Education.

Mareschal, C. (2007). *Student Perceptions of a Self-regulatory Approach to Second Language Listening Comprehension Development.* Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Ottawa, Canada.

McMillan, J. H. (2008). *Educational Research: Fundamentls for the Consumer.* Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.

Mendelsohn, D. (1995). *'Applying Learning Strategies in the Second/Foreign Language Listening Comprehension Lesson' in Mendelsohn and Rubin 1995.*

Mendelsohn, D. (1998). Teaching Listening. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 18*, 81-101.

Mendelsohn, D. (2001). Listening Comprehension: We've Come a long way, but .... *Contact 27*, 33 - 40.

Mueller, D. (1992). *An Interactive Guide to Educational Research A Modular Approach.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Oxford, R. L. (1990). *Language Learning Strategies: What Every Teacher Should Know.* Boston: Heinle & Heinle publishers.

Park, G.-P. (2010). Investigation into Learning Strategies Used by Effective and Less Effective EFL Learners in Korea. *Asian Social Science Journal*, 3-13.

Renandya, W. A. & Farell, T. S. C. (2011). "Teacher, the tape is too fast": Extensive Listening in ELT. *ELT Journal 65*, 52 - 59.

Renandya, W. A. (2012, February 22nd). *Five Reasons Why Listening Strategy Instruction Might Not Work with Proficiency Learners*. Dipetik April 17th, 2014, dari ELT Worldonline: http://blog.nus.edu.sg/eltwo/2012/02/22/five-reasons-why-listening-strategy-instruction-might-not-work-with-lower-proficiency-learners/

Rubin, J. (1994). A Review of Second Language Listening Comprehension Research. *The Modern Language Journal*, 199-221.

Thompson, I., & Rubin, J. (1996). Can Strategy Instruction Improve Listening Comprehension? *Foreign Language Annals*, 331-342.

UPT Bahasa. (2012). *Laporan TOEIC Preparation Course Program.* Surabaya: UPT Bahasa PPNS.

Vandergrift, L. (2003a). From Prediction through Reflection: Guiding Students Through the Process of L2 Listening. *Canadian Modern Language Review 59 (3)*, 425-440.

Vandergrift, L. (2004). Listening to Learn or Learning to Listen? *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics 24*, 3-25.

Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. (2012). *Teaching and Learning Second Language Listening: Metacognition in Action.* New York: Routledge.

Vandergrift, L., & Tafaghodtari, M. H. (2010). Teaching L2 Learners How to Listen does Make a Difference: An Empirical Study. *Language Learning 60 (2)*, 470-497.

Zeng, Y. (2012). *Metacognition and Self-Regulated Learning (SRL) for Chinese EFL Listening Development.* . Singapore: Unpublished PhD Thesis, National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University.