# The Effect of English Movies on College English Listening Teaching

Jiaosheng Qiu
Taishan University, China

*Abstract*—It is commonly acknowledged that listening plays an important role in language learning. Researchers at home and abroad have been diligently pursuing various approaches on teaching listening to improve students' listening proficiency. Among them, teaching English listening through movies is regarded as one of the effective ways to fulfill the need. However, most of the studies on teaching listening through English movies are theory recounting. What's more, researchers just consider the change of listening achievement in their experimental studies, almost pay no attention to anxiety and motivation, which are believed to be two important determinants of second language learning achievement. The present study explored the effects of utilizing English movies on teaching college English listening with considering anxiety, motivation and achievement.

*Index Terms*—college English listening, English movies, listening anxiety, motivation

## I. INTRODUCTION

Listening is an important skill which requires active engagement in language teaching. Researchers conducted many studies to explore ways of College English listening teaching to correspond its importance. Wang and Miao (2003) believe that video materials can benefit students with different learning styles in teaching listening. Studies on the effect of movies in listening teaching were conducted later both theoretically and experimentally. Long (2003) discussed the prospects of using films in teaching college listening refer to the advantages, feasibility, film selection, problems and possible solutions. Jiang (2006) analyzed the status of college English listening and the role of English films in listening teaching. Shen (2011) carried out an empirical study in Lanzhou Jiao Tong University to prove that English movies had a positive effect on both learner's motivation and achievement.

Researchers and teachers both at home and abroad come to realize the importance of listening and they have made large quantities of studies on listening, many of which related to teaching listening through movies. However, few studies about the teaching listening through movies mentioned the effect on the listeners' motivation and anxiety of this teaching method. In this study, the author conducts a study about the effect on the listeners' motivation and anxiety of teaching listening through movies, concerning variables of participants' listening anxiety, motivation and listening achievement, in the hope of offering meaningful implications for the teaching and learning of listening.

The study tries to identify the effects of English movies on teaching college English listening. To be more specific, this study is trying to answer the following research questions:

1. Can teaching college English listening through movies reduce anxiety compared with traditional ways of teaching listening?

2. Can teaching college English listening through movies promote motivation compared with traditional ways of teaching listening?

3. Can teaching college English listening through movies improve students' achievement compared with traditional ways of teaching listening?

The study aims at investigating the effect of teaching listening through movies in improving students' listening achievement and in its capacity to promote their motivation and reduce anxiety, the findings of the study will surely contribute to college English listening teaching in China as an empirical study of the effect of English movies on college English listening teaching,

## II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### A. Subjects

Ninety students participated in the study from September, 2011 to January, 2012. All of the subjects were sophomores and most of them have been exposed to listening comprehension activities ever since they were in junior middle schools, and some even in primary schools; therefore, each of them has had the experience of learning English for at least 7 years. Among these ninety students, forty of them majored in accounting were assigned to the experimental group while the other forty majored in marketing management were assigned to the control group.

### B. Instruments

To find out how students feel about English listening and how they are motivated to improve their listening ability, the author adopted two questionnaires in his study: Foreign Language Listening Anxiety Scale (FLLAS) and Motivation for English Listening Questionnaire (MELQ). Two tests were conducted to measure the subjects' listening skill before and after the experiments were conducted.

*C.   Teaching Process*

The current study had been conducted from September, 2011 to 2012, January, students in control group got the traditional ways of teaching English listening with the second edition of New Horizon College English (Listening and Speaking Course, Book 3), while students in experimental group took English movies as their main content of English listening. The teaching process of experimental group were carried out with three movies: *The Lion King , Sleepless in Seattle* and *Forrest Gump.*

**1. Background Introduction**

Before watching *The Lion King*, a brief introduction including the background, main characters and rewards of the movie was given to students. The following questions were listed:

1) Have you watched the Lion King?

2) Do you know the characters in this film? Who are they?

3) Do you know Simba in the movie? Try to describe it using one word.

Then the students will have a discussion and give their answers. Additional contents can be filled up by the teacher as the students didn't have enough knowledge about the movie.

**2. While-watching**

For the playing of the movie, the teacher can decide whether the students should watch the whole movie or segment it into several parts to play according to different teaching aims and the difficulty levels of videos.

**2.1 Watching the Movie With No Interruption**

A movie can be played with no interruption if it is within or a little beyond students' linguistic and contextual competence. Through classroom observation, the author noticed that most students are reluctant to be interrupted while watching the movie, and they just want to have an overall impression about the movie and needn't to pay much attention to details. After watching, several questions were listed for them.The students are required to answer these questions with one or two sentences, even several words are OK. Then they are asked to have a discussion about these questions to have a better understanding of the movie.

**2.2 Scanning Certain Part for Certain Activity**

If a movie is much beyond students' linguistic and contextual competence, it should be played by segmenting it into several parts, it can be divided by its scenes or time. In this part, the students need to finish some assignments after scanning several segments of the movie.

**2.3 Dubbing**

Dubbing means showing students only pictures on the screen without any sound, and the students are required to add the sound. If they want to do this part well, they should be accurate performers. First, they need listen to the actors and actresses carefully and remember the exact words. To have a better job, they also have to imitate the pronunciation and intonation. This part seems to be the students' favorite, that's because they can learn a lot in the form of entertainment. So we can say dubbing is one of these ways to stimulate students' interest to learn English.

**2.4 Role Play**

Students were required to work in groups to carry out role play. Role play should be based on a short scene which can be situational dialogues in the movie. It appeared to be that some shy students are more active in this part.

*D.   Data Collection and Treatment*

The listening proficiency pretest was held in September, 2011while the post test was held in January, 2012. The collected data of the questionnaire were analyzed by the software SPSS 17.0. Quantitative data analysis was carried out in the study. The descriptive statistics was employed to find sums and means of tests and questionnaires. Independent samples t-tests were performed to find out the differences between same variables of the two classes, and the purpose of paired-samples t-tests was to discover the changes of each variable in the pretest and post test for both classes.

III.   RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

*A.   Results and Analysis about Anxiety*

**1.1 The Anxiety Comparison Between Control Class and Experimental Class in the Pretest**

The 33 items in FLLAS were scored on a five-point scale. A higher score may indicate a relatively higher level of listening anxiety. Table 3-1 tells us that before the experiment, the students from the two groups share a roughly equal level of listening anxiety (average value: 3.1245 to 3.1786; sum: 103.1081 to 104.8947), and it's also true for these four categories of anxiety items. Besides, Table 3-2 shows a result of $p > .05$ for each item of listening anxiety, which indicates that the anxiety differences between the control and experimental classes are not significant.

TABLE 3-1
THE ANXIETY OF CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST

|  | class(con=1;exp=2) |  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| average value | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.1245 | .33431 | .05496 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.1786 | .44824 | .07271 |
| sum | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 103.1081 | 11.03224 | 1.81369 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 104.8947 | 14.79187 | 2.39956 |
| tension and worry | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.1541 | .51402 | .08450 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.3079 | .51903 | .08420 |
| lack of confidence | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.0372 | .34844 | .05728 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.1447 | .48849 | .07924 |
| prior knowledge insufficient | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.0565 | .44657 | .07342 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 2.9928 | .58206 | .09442 |
| other items | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.4122 | .58694 | .09649 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.4342 | .49211 | .07983 |

TABLE 3-2
THE T-TEST OF ANXIETY OF CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST

|  |  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | t-test for Equality of Means | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference |
| average value | Equal variances assumed | 4.35 | 0.041 | -0.592 | 73 | 0.556 | -0.05414 | 0.0915 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | -0.594 | 68.406 | 0.554 | -0.05414 | 0.09115 |
| sum | Equal variances assumed | 4.35 | 0.041 | -0.592 | 73 | 0.556 | -1.78663 | 3.01949 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | -0.594 | 68.406 | 0.554 | -1.78663 | 3.00788 |
| tension and worry | Equal variances assumed | 0.118 | 0.733 | -1.289 | 73 | 0.201 | -0.15384 | 0.11931 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | -1.29 | 72.978 | 0.201 | -0.15384 | 0.11929 |
| lack of confidence | Equal variances assumed | 1.577 | 0.213 | -1.095 | 73 | 0.277 | -0.10757 | 0.09821 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | -1.1 | 66.976 | 0.275 | -0.10757 | 0.09778 |
| prior knowledge insufficient | Equal variances assumed | 3.879 | 0.053 | 0.531 | 73 | 0.597 | 0.06369 | 0.12002 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 0.532 | 69.248 | 0.596 | 0.06369 | 0.11961 |
| other items | Equal variances assumed | 1.163 | 0.284 | -0.176 | 73 | 0.86 | -0.02205 | 0.12494 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | -0.176 | 70.164 | 0.861 | -0.02205 | 0.12524 |

From the analysis above we can see that though there is small difference of anxiety level between the two classes (average value: from 3.1245 to 3.1786; sum: from 103.1081 to 104.8947), students in the two classes shared the same listening anxiety level, which is one of the basic principles for us to choose the subjects.

**1.2 The Anxiety Comparison of Control Class between Pretest and Posttest**

In order to find out whether the participants in the control class show differences in their listening anxiety in a semester's time, the paired-samples t-test was run. As can be seen in Table 3-3 and Table 3-4, for the 37 subjects in control class, the mean score of average value in the posttest (M=3.2228) was greater than the mean score of average value in the pretest (M=3.1441), but the difference was not significant (p=.420), except for other items (p=.000), none of other types of anxiety was significantly different from each other, though the mean scores of prior knowledge insufficient and tension and worry in the posttest were greater than what in the pretest but lack of confidence was on the opposite.

TABLE 3-3
THE ANXIETY OF CONTROL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| pretest=1 posttest=2 | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pair 1 | average value1 of anxiety | 3.1441 | 37 | 0.34583 | 0.05685 |
| | average value2 of anxiety | 3.2228 | 37 | 0.47136 | 0.07749 |
| Pair 2 | lack of confidence1 | 3.1182 | 37 | 0.37609 | 0.06183 |
| | lack of confidence2 | 2.9493 | 37 | 0.35778 | 0.05882 |
| Pair 3 | tension and worry1 | 3.1541 | 37 | 0.51402 | 0.0845 |
| | tension and worry2 | 3.2946 | 37 | 0.62714 | 0.1031 |
| Pair 4 | prior knowledge insufficient1 | 3.0565 | 37 | 0.44657 | 0.07342 |
| | prior knowledge insufficient2 | 3.1032 | 37 | 0.67968 | 0.11174 |
| Pair 5 | other items1 | 3.4122 | 37 | 0.58694 | 0.09649 |
| | other items2 | 3.9189 | 37 | 0.43722 | 0.07188 |

TABLE 3-4
THE T-TEST OF ANXIETY OF CONTROL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| pretest=1 posttest=2 | | Paired Differences | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | average value1 of anxiety - average value2of anxiety | -0.07862 | 0.58636 | 0.0964 | -0.27413 | 0.11688 | -0.816 | 36 | 0.42 |
| Pair 2 | lack of confidence1 - lack of confidence2 | 0.16892 | 0.56074 | 0.09218 | -0.01804 | 0.35588 | 1.832 | 36 | 0.075 |
| Pair 3 | tension and worry1 - tension and worry2 | -0.14054 | 0.83015 | 0.13648 | -0.41733 | 0.13624 | -1.03 | 36 | 0.31 |
| Pair 4 | prior knowledge insufficient1 - prior knowledge insufficient2 | -0.04668 | 0.78835 | 0.1296 | -0.30953 | 0.21617 | -0.36 | 36 | 0.721 |
| Pair 5 | other items1 -other items2 | -0.50676 | 0.78503 | 0.12906 | -0.7685 | -0.24501 | -3.927 | 36 | 0 |

Judging from the statistics and the analysis, we can know that after a four-month listening learning, participants' listening anxiety level became higher at the end of the third semester unexpectedly. This is quite against the author's expectation, as the anxiety level of the students is predicted to be a positive change at first. So the result of experimental class is expected to be different.

**1.3 The Anxiety Comparison of Experimental Class between Pretest and Posttest**

Participants in the experimental group received one semester movie-aided teaching in their listening class. As displayed in Table 3-5 and Table 3-6, for anxiety of the 38 subjects in experimental class, the mean score of average value in the posttest (M=3.2142) was greater than the mean score of average value in the pretest (M=3.1818), but the difference was not significant (p=.748), and no types of anxiety were significantly different from each other, though the mean scores of lack of confidence, prior knowledge insufficient and other items in the posttest were greater than that in the pretest. But the result tension and worry category was on the opposite.

TABLE 3-5
THE ANXIETY OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| pretest=1 posttest=2 | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pair 1 | average value1 of anxiety | 3.1818 | 38 | .45090 | .07315 |
| | average value2 of anxiety | 3.2142 | 38 | .41572 | .06744 |
| Pair 2 | tension and worry1 | 3.3079 | 38 | .51903 | .08420 |
| | tension and worry2 | 3.2474 | 38 | .51346 | .08329 |
| Pair 3 | lack of confidence1 | 3.1579 | 38 | .50478 | .08189 |
| | lack of confidence2 | 3.2110 | 38 | .47525 | .07710 |
| Pair 4 | prior knowledge insufficient1 | 2.9928 | 38 | .58206 | .09442 |
| | prior knowledge insufficient2 | 3.0120 | 38 | .48850 | .07924 |
| Pair 5 | other items1 | 3.4342 | 38 | .49211 | .07983 |
| | other items2 | 3.6579 | 38 | .47370 | .07684 |

TABLE 3-6
THE T-TEST OF ANXIETY OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower | Upper | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
| Pair 1 | average value1 of anxiety – average value 2 of anxiety | -0.0324 | 0.61662 | 0.10003 | -0.23507 | 0.17028 | -0.324 | 37 | 0.748 |
| Pair 2 | tension and worry1 - tension and worry2 | 0.06053 | 0.71529 | 0.11604 | -0.17458 | 0.29564 | 0.522 | 37 | 0.605 |
| Pair 3 | lack of confidence1 - lack of confidence2 | -0.0531 | 0.68886 | 0.11175 | -0.27953 | 0.17332 | -0.475 | 37 | 0.637 |
| Pair 4 | prior knowledge insufficient1 - prior knowledge insufficient2 | -0.01914 | 0.77519 | 0.12575 | -0.27394 | 0.23566 | -0.152 | 37 | 0.880 |
| Pair 5 | other items1 - other items2 | -0.22368 | 0.73703 | 0.11956 | -0.46594 | 0.01857 | -1.871 | 37 | 0.069 |

Statistics and analysis show that, after one semester's teaching, just as the control class, the listening anxiety level of participants in the experimental class also became higher at the end of the third semester.

**1.4 The Anxiety Comparison between Control Class and Experimental Class in the Posttest**

Table 3-7 tells us that after the experiment, students' anxiety level of the experimental classes (average value=3.2094; sum=105.5789) is lower than that obtained from the control class (average value=3.3014; sum=108.9459). And it's also true for the three types of anxiety: *lack of confidence, prior knowledge insufficient* and *tension and worry*. Table 3-8 shows us that p-value is bigger than .05 for every item of listening anxiety, so we can say that the anxiety differences between control and experimental classes in the posttest are not significant.

TABLE 3-7
THE ANXIETY COMPARISON BETWEEN CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE POSTTEST

| | Class (con=1 exp=2) | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| average value | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.3014 | .56983 | .09368 |
| | | 2 | 38 | 3.2094 | .43034 | .06981 |
| sum | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 108.9459 | 18.80447 | 3.09144 |
| | | 2 | 38 | 105.5789 | 14.27269 | 2.31534 |
| lack of confidence | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.4155 | .59370 | .09760 |
| | | 2 | 38 | 3.2110 | .47525 | .07710 |
| tension and worry | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.2838 | .61487 | .10108 |
| | | 2 | 38 | 3.2743 | .51006 | .08274 |
| prior knowledge insufficient | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.1032 | .67968 | .11174 |
| | | 2 | 38 | 3.0120 | .48850 | .07924 |
| other items | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.6351 | .56395 | .09271 |
| | | 2 | 38 | 3.6579 | .47370 | .07684 |

TABLE 3-8
THE T-TEST OF ANXIETY BETWEEN CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE POSTTES

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference |
| average value | Equal variances assumed | 1.66 | 0.202 | 0.79 | 73 | 0.432 | 0.09199 | 0.1164 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.787 | 66.986 | 0.434 | 0.09199 | 0.11683 |
| sum | Equal variances assumed | 1.632 | 0.205 | 0.875 | 73 | 0.384 | 3.367 | 3.84834 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.872 | 67.155 | 0.386 | 3.367 | 3.86235 |
| lack of confidence | Equal variances assumed | 1.762 | 0.188 | 1.649 | 73 | 0.103 | 0.20454 | 0.12401 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.645 | 68.857 | 0.105 | 0.20454 | 0.12438 |
| tension and worry | Equal variances assumed | 0.411 | 0.524 | 0.073 | 73 | 0.942 | 0.00951 | 0.1303 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.073 | 69.88 | 0.942 | 0.00951 | 0.13063 |
| prior knowledge insufficient | Equal variances assumed | 3.737 | 0.057 | 0.669 | 73 | 0.506 | 0.09123 | 0.1364 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.666 | 65.258 | 0.508 | 0.09123 | 0.13699 |
| other items | Equal variances assumed | 1.05 | 0.309 | -0.189 | 73 | 0.85 | -0.02276 | 0.12014 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -0.189 | 70.212 | 0.851 | -0.02276 | 0.12042 |

From the analysis, we can know that after a semester's learning (from September, 2011 to January, 2012), a non-significant improvement of the average value of anxiety appeared in both classes (which can be indicated in 2.1.3 and 2.1.4). And more specifically, the control class got an increase of 0.0787 (3.2228 in posttest and 3.1441 in pretest), while the experimental class got 0.0324 (3.2142 in posttest and 3.1818 in pretest). Analysis of the two average values with independent samples t-test showed no significant difference. Thus, it can be seen that both the traditional ways of teaching college English listening and the way of teaching college English listening through movies can not reduce

students' listening anxiety, which just denied the first experimental hypothesis totally and answered the first research question.

Actually, the researcher was really confused about the changes of anxiety level of the two classes, for the researcher had expected the participants' anxiety level would be a positive change after a semester's learning, but the result was on the opposite. Anyway, the following research was carried on all the same and an increase of motivation was expected by the author.

*B.   Results and Analysis about Motivation*

**2.1 The Motivation Comparison between Control Class and Experimental Class in the Pretest**

Descriptive statistics of the subjects' listening motivation obtained is displayed in Table 3-9. As can be observed in the table, the participants in the experimental class (class 2) got a bigger mean value (3.3355) than students in the control class's (class 1) motivation(3.2483). In addition, the experimental group has also got bigger mean scores on 6 categories of motivation, including aspects of competition, decision, professional learning, value, working and achievement.

TABLE 3-9
THE MOTIVATION COMPARISON BETWEEN CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST

|  | class(con=1;exp=2) |  | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| average value | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.2483 | .37642 | .06188 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.3355 | .34462 | .05590 |
| competition motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 4.1243 | .70766 | .11634 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 4.4737 | .54509 | .08843 |
| abroad motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 2.6014 | .76707 | .12611 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 2.5855 | .73585 | .11937 |
| interest motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.4865 | .63176 | .10386 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.4013 | .72256 | .11721 |
| decision motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.2455 | .54183 | .08908 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.3092 | .38745 | .06285 |
| sense of self efficacy | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 2.3896 | .64581 | .10617 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 2.3750 | .65438 | .10615 |
| atmosphere motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 2.9189 | .69569 | .11437 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 2.5702 | .67074 | .10881 |
| professional learning motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.5135 | .53630 | .08817 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 4.0175 | .58483 | .09487 |
| avoidance motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 2.9640 | .69293 | .11392 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 2.6491 | .76306 | .12379 |
| value motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.7838 | 1.11518 | .18333 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 4.2500 | .56652 | .09190 |
| working motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.2838 | .71240 | .11712 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.5789 | .73085 | .11856 |
| achievement motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.5405 | .77619 | .12761 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.8289 | .63964 | .10376 |

In order to find out whether all the above-mentioned differences are significant or not, the independent samples t test was performed. According to the result listed in Table 3-10, the mean scores of the two classes don't differ from each other significantly (p=.298), and except for competition motivation, atmosphere motivation, professional learning motivation and value motivation, all the other seven types of motivation don't differ from each other significantly.

TABLE 3-10
THE T-TEST OF MOTIVATION IN THE PRETEST BETWEEN CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean difference | Std. Error difference | Lower | Upper |
| average value | Equal variances assumed | 0.567 | 0.454 | -1.048 | 73 | 0.298 | -0.08726 | 0.0833 | -0.25327 | 0.07875 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.046 | 72.048 | 0.299 | -0.08726 | 0.0834 | -0.25351 | 0.07898 |
| competition motivation | Equal variances assumed | 2.702 | 0.105 | -2.399 | 73 | 0.019 | -0.34936 | 0.14563 | -0.63959 | -0.05913 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -2.391 | 67.644 | 0.02 | -0.34936 | 0.14613 | -0.64098 | -0.05774 |
| abroad motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.032 | 0.859 | 0.091 | 73 | 0.928 | 0.01583 | 0.17355 | -0.33005 | 0.3617 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.091 | 72.659 | 0.928 | 0.01583 | 0.17364 | -0.33027 | 0.36192 |
| interest motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.258 | 0.613 | 0.543 | 73 | 0.589 | 0.08517 | 0.15689 | -0.22751 | 0.39785 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.544 | 72.178 | 0.588 | 0.08517 | 0.15661 | -0.22701 | 0.39735 |
| decision motivation | Equal variances assumed | 3.067 | 0.084 | -0.587 | 73 | 0.559 | -0.06372 | 0.10854 | -0.28004 | 0.15261 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -0.584 | 65.076 | 0.561 | -0.06372 | 0.10902 | -0.28143 | 0.154 |
| sense of self efficiency | Equal variances assumed | 0.049 | 0.825 | 0.097 | 73 | 0.923 | 0.01464 | 0.15016 | -0.28463 | 0.31391 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.098 | 72.986 | 0.923 | 0.01464 | 0.15014 | -0.28458 | 0.31386 |
| atmosphere motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.028 | 0.867 | 2.21 | 73 | 0.030 | 0.34874 | 0.15778 | 0.03428 | 0.6632 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.209 | 72.707 | 0.030 | 0.34874 | 0.15786 | 0.03411 | 0.66338 |
| professional learning motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.094 | 0.76 | -3.887 | 73 | 0.000 | -0.50403 | 0.12967 | -0.76246 | -0.2456 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -3.892 | 72.743 | 0.000 | -0.50403 | 0.12952 | -0.76217 | -0.24589 |
| avoidance motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.862 | 0.356 | 1.869 | 73 | 0.066 | 0.31484 | 0.16844 | -0.02087 | 0.65055 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.872 | 72.652 | 0.065 | 0.31484 | 0.16823 | -0.02046 | 0.65014 |
| value motivation | Equal variances assumed | 10.27 | 0.002 | -2.292 | 73 | 0.025 | -0.46622 | 0.20345 | -0.87169 | -0.06074 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -2.273 | 53.103 | 0.027 | -0.46622 | 0.20508 | -0.87753 | -0.0549 |
| working motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.163 | 0.688 | -1.771 | 73 | 0.081 | -0.29516 | 0.16671 | -0.62741 | 0.03709 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.771 | 73 | 0.081 | -0.29516 | 0.16665 | -0.6273 | 0.03697 |
| achievement motivation | Equal variances assumed | 1.058 | 0.307 | -1.758 | 73 | 0.083 | -0.28841 | 0.16404 | -0.61535 | 0.03853 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.754 | 69.698 | 0.084 | -0.28841 | 0.16447 | -0.61645 | 0.03964 |

The analysis above indicates that though there is small difference of motivation level between the two classes (average value: from 3.2483 to 3.3355), students in the two classes shared the same listening motivation level, which is another principle for choosing the subjects.

**2.2 The Motivation Comparison of Control Class between Pretest and Posttest**

A paired-samples t-test in Table 3-11 and Table 3-12 was run to find out whether the participants in the control class show differences of their listening motivation after the experiment. As we can see from these two tables, for the 37 subjects in control class, the mean score of question items' average value in the posttest (M=3.1047) was significantly lower at the p<.05 level (note: p=0.028) than that in the pretest (M=3.2666). And the mean scores of abroad motivation, interest motivation, decision motivation and atmosphere motivation in the posttest (M=1.9865, 3.0878, 2.8378, 2.5676) were significantly lower than that in the pretest (M=2.6014, 3.4865, 3.8356). By contrast, the mean scores of value motivation and achievement motivation in the posttest (M=3.2973, 4.2703) were significantly higher than that in the pretest (M=2.9459, 3.5405). It also needs to point out that differences of other types of motivation also existed, but none of them was significant.

TABLE 3-11
THE MOTIVATION OF CONTROL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| pretest=1 posttest=2 | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pair 1 | average value1 of motivation | 3.2666 | 37 | 0.3826 | 0.0629 |
| | average value2 of motivation | 3.1047 | 37 | 0.28204 | 0.04637 |
| Pair 2 | competition motivation 1 | 4.1297 | 37 | 0.70587 | 0.11604 |
| | competition motivation 2 | 4.3027 | 37 | 0.55901 | 0.0919 |
| Pair 3 | abroad motivation1 | 2.6014 | 37 | 0.76707 | 0.12611 |
| | abroad motivation2 | 1.9865 | 37 | 0.69957 | 0.11501 |
| Pair 4 | interest motivation1 | 3.4865 | 37 | 0.63176 | 0.10386 |
| | interest motivation2 | 3.0878 | 37 | 0.66983 | 0.11012 |
| Pair 5 | decision motivation1 | 3.8356 | 37 | 0.79288 | 0.13035 |
| | decision motivation2 | 2.8378 | 37 | 0.56278 | 0.09252 |
| Pair 6 | sense of self efficiency1 | 2.3896 | 37 | 0.64581 | 0.10617 |
| | sense of self efficiency2 | 2.25 | 37 | 0.48233 | 0.07929 |
| Pair 7 | atmosphere motivation1 | 2.9189 | 37 | 0.69569 | 0.11437 |
| | atmosphere motivation2 | 2.5676 | 37 | 0.65671 | 0.10796 |
| Pair 8 | professional learning motivation1 | 3.5135 | 37 | 0.5363 | 0.08817 |
| | professional learning motivation2 | 3.5766 | 37 | 0.64141 | 0.10545 |
| Pair 9 | avoidance motivation1 | 2.964 | 37 | 0.69293 | 0.11392 |
| | avoidance motivation2 | 3.2252 | 37 | 0.86443 | 0.14211 |
| Pair 10 | value motivation1 | 2.9459 | 37 | 0.63228 | 0.10395 |
| | value motivation2 | 3.2973 | 37 | 0.7403 | 0.12171 |
| Pair 11 | working motivation1 | 3.2838 | 37 | 0.7124 | 0.11712 |
| | working motivation2 | 3.3378 | 37 | 0.67756 | 0.11139 |
| Pair 12 | achievement motivation1 | 3.5405 | 37 | 0.77619 | 0.12761 |
| | achievement motivation2 | 4.2703 | 37 | 0.52168 | 0.08576 |

TABLE 3-12
THE T- TEST OF MOTIVATION OF CONTROL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| pretest=1 posttest=2 | | Paired Differences | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | average value1 of motivation-average value2 of motivation | 0.16192 | 0.43099 | 0.07085 | 0.01822 | 0.30562 | 2.285 | 36 | 0.028 |
| Pair 2 | competition motivation 1 - competition motivation 2 | -0.17297 | 0.94064 | 0.15464 | -0.4866 | 0.14065 | -1.119 | 36 | 0.271 |
| Pair 3 | abroad motivation1 - abroad motivation2 | 0.61486 | 1.03346 | 0.1699 | 0.27029 | 0.95944 | 3.619 | 36 | 0.001 |
| Pair 4 | interest motivation1 - interest motivation2 | 0.39865 | 0.88282 | 0.14513 | 0.1043 | 0.693 | 2.747 | 36 | 0.009 |
| Pair 5 | decision motivation1 - decision motivation2 | 0.99775 | 0.9318 | 0.15319 | 0.68707 | 1.30842 | 6.513 | 36 | 0 |
| Pair 6 | sense of self efficiency1 - sense of self efficiency2 | 0.13964 | 0.68495 | 0.11261 | -0.08873 | 0.36801 | 1.24 | 36 | 0.223 |
| Pair 7 | atmosphere motivation1 - atmosphere motivation2 | 0.35135 | 0.8125 | 0.13357 | 0.08045 | 0.62225 | 2.63 | 36 | 0.012 |
| Pair 8 | professional learning motivation1 - professional learning motivation2 | -0.06306 | 0.74053 | 0.12174 | -0.30997 | 0.18384 | -0.518 | 36 | 0.608 |
| Pair 9 | avoidance motivation1 - avoidance motivation2 | -0.26126 | 1.09188 | 0.1795 | -0.62531 | 0.10279 | -1.455 | 36 | 0.154 |
| pair 10 | value motivation1 - value motivation2 | -0.35135 | 1.04659 | 0.17206 | -0.7003 | -0.0024 | -2.042 | 36 | 0.049 |
| pair 11 | working motivation1 - working motivation2 | -0.05405 | 1.00543 | 0.16529 | -0.38928 | 0.28117 | -0.327 | 36 | 0.746 |
| Pair 12 | achievement motivation1 - achievement motivation2 | -0.72973 | 0.96892 | 0.15929 | -1.05279 | -0.40667 | -4.581 | 36 | 0 |

**2.3 The Motivation Comparison of the Experimental Class between Pretest and Posttest**

As displayed in Table 3-13 and Table 3-14, after one semester movie-aided teaching in listening class, for the 38 subjects in experimental class, the mean score of average value in the posttest (M=3.1518) was significantly lower at the p<.05 level (note: p=0.004) than the mean score of average value in the pretest (M=3.3173), and the mean scores of

abroad motivation, professional learning motivation, working motivation and decision motivation in the posttest (M=2.1328, 3.5088, 3.0921, 2.9123) were significantly lower than those in the pretest (M=2.855, 4.0175, 3.5789, 4.0197), while the mean score of avoidance motivation in the posttest (M=3.2544) was significantly higher than that in the pretest (M=2.6491). In addition, differences in other types of motivation also existed, but none of them was significant. To sum up, the motivation of the experimental class got a decrease in the posttest.

TABLE 3-13
THE MOTIVATION OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| pretest=1 posttest=2 | | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pair 1 | average value1 of motivation | 3.3173 | 38 | .24675 | .04003 |
| | average value2 of motivation | 3.1518 | 38 | .28089 | .04557 |
| Pair 2 | competition motivation 1 | 4.4737 | 38 | .54509 | .08843 |
| | competition motivation 2 | 4.2303 | 38 | .62402 | .10123 |
| Pair 3 | abroad motivation1 | 2.5855 | 38 | .73585 | .11937 |
| | abroad motivation2 | 2.1382 | 38 | .63325 | .10273 |
| Pair 4 | interest motivation1 | 3.4013 | 38 | .72256 | .11721 |
| | interest motivation2 | 3.4145 | 38 | .75846 | .12304 |
| Pair 5 | atmosphere motivation1 | 2.5702 | 38 | .67074 | .10881 |
| | atmosphere motivation2 | 2.5877 | 38 | .64577 | .10476 |
| Pair 6 | professional learning motivation1 | 4.0175 | 38 | .58483 | .09487 |
| | professional learning motivation2 | 3.5088 | 38 | .55202 | .08955 |
| Pair 7 | value motivation1 | 3.0921[a] | 38 | .56777 | .09211 |
| | value motivation2 | 3.0921[a] | 38 | .56777 | .09211 |
| Pair 8 | working motivation1 | 3.5789 | 38 | .73085 | .11856 |
| | working motivation2 | 3.0921 | 38 | .61353 | .09953 |
| Pair 9 | achievement motivation1 | 3.8289 | 38 | .63964 | .10376 |
| | achievement motivation2 | 3.9342 | 38 | .88662 | .14383 |
| Pair 10 | avoidance motivation1 | 2.6491 | 38 | .76306 | .12379 |
| | avoidance motivation2 | 3.2544 | 38 | .78436 | .12724 |
| Pair 11 | decision motivation1 | 4.0197 | 38 | .54951 | .08914 |
| | decision motivation2 | 2.9123 | 38 | .52916 | .08584 |
| Pair 12 | sense of self efficiency1 | 2.3750 | 38 | .65438 | .10615 |
| | sense of self efficiency2 | 2.5197 | 38 | .51130 | .08294 |

TABLE 3-14
THE T-TEST OF MOTIVATION OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| | | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
| | | | | | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | average value1 of motivation – average value2 of motivation | 0.16546 | 0.32697 | 0.05304 | 0.05798 | 0.27293 | 3.119 | 37 | 0.004 |
| Pair 2 | competition motivation 1 - competition motivation 2 | 0.24342 | 0.80322 | 0.1303 | -0.02059 | 0.50743 | 1.868 | 37 | 0.070 |
| Pair 3 | abroad motivation1 - abroad motivation2 | 0.44737 | 0.82846 | 0.13439 | 0.17506 | 0.71968 | 3.329 | 37 | 0.002 |
| Pair 4 | interest motivation1 - interest motivation2 | -0.01316 | 1.15511 | 0.18738 | -0.39283 | 0.36652 | -0.07 | 37 | 0.944 |
| Pair 5 | atmosphere motivation1 - atmosphere motivation2 | -0.01754 | 0.80145 | 0.13001 | -0.28097 | 0.24589 | -0.135 | 37 | 0.893 |
| Pair 6 | professional learning motivation1 - professional learning motivation2 | 0.50877 | 0.58375 | 0.0947 | 0.3169 | 0.70065 | 5.373 | 37 | 0.000 |
| Pair 7 | working motivation1 - working motivation2 | 0.48684 | 0.9041 | 0.14666 | 0.18967 | 0.78401 | 3.319 | 37 | 0.002 |
| Pair 8 | achievement motivation1 - achievement motivation2 | -0.10526 | 1.18069 | 0.19153 | -0.49335 | 0.28282 | -0.55 | 37 | 0.586 |
| Pair 9 | avoidance motivation1 - avoidance motivation2 | -0.60526 | 1.09833 | 0.17817 | -0.96628 | -0.24425 | -3.397 | 37 | 0.002 |
| Pair 10 | decision motivation1 - decision motivation2 | 1.10746 | 0.68825 | 0.11165 | 0.88123 | 1.33368 | 9.919 | 37 | 0.000 |
| Pair 11 | sense of self efficiency1 - sense of self efficiency2 | -0.14474 | 0.82534 | 0.13389 | -0.41602 | 0.12655 | -1.081 | 37 | 0.287 |

**2.4 The Motivation Comparison between Control Class and Experimental Class in the Posttest**

Comparison of the change in the motivation level of the participants from the two groups would also shed light on the answer of the current topic. The findings (Table 3-15) indicate that average value of the experimental class's (class 2) motivation is bigger (M=3.2488) than that of the control class's (class 1) motivation (M=3.2140). In addition, for abroad motivation, interest motivation, decision motivation, sense of self efficiency and atmosphere motivation, participants from class 2 showed a bigger mean value. In order to find out whether all those differences are significant

or not, the independent samples t test was performed. As it can be seen in Table 3-16, the average values of the two classes don't differ from each other significantly (p=.298). Besides, except for achievement motivation (Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, P=.013; t-test for Equality of Means, P=.049), all other ten types of motivation don't differ from each other significantly.

TABLE 3-15
THE MOTIVATION COMPARISON BETWEEN CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE POSTTEST

|  | class(con=1;exp=2) | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| average value | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.2140 | .31799 | .05228 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.2488 | .31759 | .05152 |
| competition motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 4.3027 | .55901 | .09190 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 4.2303 | .62402 | .10123 |
| abroad motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 1.9865 | .69957 | .11501 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 2.1382 | .63325 | .10273 |
| interest motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.0878 | .66983 | .11012 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.4145 | .75846 | .12304 |
| decision motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.8243 | .60053 | .09873 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 4.0351 | .65118 | .10564 |
| sense of self efficiency | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 2.1014 | .60799 | .09995 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 2.3180 | .68687 | .11143 |
| atmosphere motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.0541 | .53584 | .08809 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.0789 | .48666 | .07895 |
| professional learning motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.5766 | .64141 | .10545 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.5088 | .55202 | .08955 |
| avoidance motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 2.8288 | .54784 | .09007 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 2.7105 | .50920 | .08260 |
| value motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.2973 | .74030 | .12171 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.1184 | .59768 | .09696 |
| working motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 3.3378 | .67756 | .11139 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.0921 | .61353 | .09953 |
| achievement motivation | dimension1 | 1 | 37 | 4.2703 | .52168 | .08576 |
|  |  | 2 | 38 | 3.9342 | .88662 | .14383 |

TABLE 3-16
THE T-TEST OF MOTIVATION BETWEEN CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | F | Sig. | | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| average value | Equal variances assumed | 0.001 | 0.969 | -0.474 | 73 | 0.637 | -0.03482 | 0.0734 | -0.1811 | 0.11145 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -0.474 | 72.942 | 0.637 | -0.03482 | 0.0734 | -0.18111 | 0.11146 |
| competition motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.099 | 0.754 | 0.529 | 73 | 0.598 | 0.07244 | 0.13693 | -0.20045 | 0.34533 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.53 | 72.504 | 0.598 | 0.07244 | 0.13672 | -0.20008 | 0.34496 |
| abroad motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.244 | 0.623 | -0.985 | 73 | 0.328 | -0.15167 | 0.154 | -0.45859 | 0.15525 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -0.984 | 71.856 | 0.329 | -0.15167 | 0.15421 | -0.45909 | 0.15574 |
| interest motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.424 | 0.517 | -1.975 | 73 | 0.052 | -0.32664 | 0.1654 | -0.65627 | 0.003 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.978 | 72.322 | 0.052 | -0.32664 | 0.16512 | -0.65577 | 0.0025 |
| decision motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.9 | 0.346 | -1.456 | 73 | 0.150 | -0.21076 | 0.14475 | -0.49924 | 0.07772 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.458 | 72.789 | 0.149 | -0.21076 | 0.14459 | -0.49894 | 0.07742 |
| sense of self efficiency | Equal variances assumed | 0.114 | 0.737 | -1.445 | 73 | 0.153 | -0.21663 | 0.14993 | -0.51545 | 0.08218 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1.447 | 72.353 | 0.152 | -0.21663 | 0.14969 | -0.515 | 0.08174 |
| atmosphere motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.156 | 0.694 | -0.211 | 73 | 0.834 | -0.02489 | 0.11814 | -0.26034 | 0.21055 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -0.21 | 71.914 | 0.834 | -0.02489 | 0.11829 | -0.26071 | 0.21092 |
| professional learning motivation | Equal variances assumed | 1.267 | 0.264 | 0.491 | 73 | 0.625 | 0.0678 | 0.13806 | -0.20735 | 0.34296 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.49 | 70.814 | 0.626 | 0.0678 | 0.13834 | -0.20805 | 0.34366 |
| avoidance motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.338 | 0.563 | 0.969 | 73 | 0.336 | 0.1183 | 0.12209 | -0.12502 | 0.36162 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 0.968 | 72.278 | 0.336 | 0.1183 | 0.12221 | -0.1253 | 0.36191 |
| value motivation | Equal variances assumed | 1.394 | 0.242 | 1.153 | 73 | 0.253 | 0.17888 | 0.15516 | -0.13036 | 0.48811 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.15 | 69.111 | 0.254 | 0.17888 | 0.1556 | -0.13154 | 0.48929 |
| working motivation | Equal variances assumed | 0.109 | 0.742 | 1.647 | 73 | 0.104 | 0.24573 | 0.14918 | -0.05158 | 0.54304 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 1.645 | 71.862 | 0.104 | 0.24573 | 0.14938 | -0.05206 | 0.54352 |
| achievement motivation | Equal variances assumed | 6.501 | 0.013 | 1.994 | 73 | 0.050 | 0.33606 | 0.16856 | 0.00012 | 0.672 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | 2.007 | 60.171 | 0.049 | 0.33606 | 0.16746 | 0.00111 | 0.67101 |

From the analysis we can know that after a semester's learning (from September, 2011 to January, 2012), a non-significant reduction of the average value of motivation appeared in both classes, the control class got an reduction of 0.1619 (3.1047 in posttest and 3.2666 in pretest) while the experimental got 0.1655 (3.1518 in posttest and 3.3173 in pretest). Analyzing the two average values with independent samples t-test, the researcher find no significant differences; that is to say, both the traditional ways of teaching college English listening and the way of teaching college English listening through movies can not promote students' listening motivation, which just denied the second experimental hypothesis totally and answered the second research question.

Until now, we can draw to the conclusion that after one semester's teaching, both the anxiety level and motivation level of these two classes turned out to be a negative change in the posttest, and both of the first two experimental hypotheses were denied. The change of the students' listening achievement will be discussed in the following research.

*C. Results and Analysis about Achievement*

**3.1 The Achievement Comparison between Control Class and Experimental Class in the Pretest**

Before the experiment was conducted, the subjects were asked to take a listening proficiency test. As Table 3-17 and Table 3-18 show, the 37 students in control group had an achievement mean of 42.11, while the 38 members in experimental group had an achievement mean of 41.95, and the mean of achievement did not differ significantly at the

p<.05 level (note: p=.888). Levene's Test for Equality of Variances indicates variances for control and experimental groups do not differ significantly from each other (note: p=.755).

TABLE 3-17
THE ACHIEVEMENT COMPARISON BETWEEN CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST

|  | Class (con=1 exp=2) | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ach | dimension1  1 | 37 | 42.11 | 4.618 | .759 |
|  | 2 | 38 | 41.95 | 5.204 | .844 |

TABLE 3-18
THE T-TEST OF ACHIEVEMENT BETWEEN CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST

|  |  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | Lower | Upper |
| ach | Equal variances assumed | 0.098 | 0.755 | 0.141 | 73 | 0.888 | 0.161 | 1.137 | -2.105 | 2.427 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | 0.142 | 72.386 | 0.888 | 0.161 | 1.135 | -2.102 | 2.424 |

From the analysis above we can see that though there is small difference of achievement between the two classes (from 42.11 to 41.95), students in the two classes shared the same listening proficiency level, which is also one basic principle for choosing subjects.

## 3.2 The Achievement Comparison of Control Class between Pretest and Posttest

In order to find out whether the participants in the control class show differences in their listening comprehension proficiency in a semester's time, the paired-samples t-test was run. As can be seen in Table 3-19 and Table 3-20, for the 37 subjects in control class, the mean score of achievement in the posttest (M=45.16) was greater than the mean score of achievement in the pretest (M=42.11), and the difference is significant at the p<.05 level (note: p=0.013).

TABLE 3-19
THE ACHIEVEMENT OF CONTROL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| pretest=1 posttest=2 |  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pair 1 | ach1 | 42.11 | 37 | 4.618 | 0.759 |
|  | ach2 | 45.16 | 37 | 6.436 | 1.058 |

TABLE 3-20
THE T-TEST OF ACHIEVEMENT OF CONTROL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| pretest=1 posttest=2 |  | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | ach1 - ach2 | -3.054 | 7.137 | 1.173 | -5.434 | -0.674 | -2.603 | 36 | 0.013 |

Judging from the statistics and the analysis, we can know that after a four-month listening learning, participants' listening level improved a lot, which is in accord with the author's prediction.

## 3.3 The Achievement Comparison of Experimental Class between Pretest and Posttest

Participants in the experimental group received one semester movie-aided teaching in their listening class. As displayed in Table 3-21 and Table 3-22, for the 38 subjects in experimental class, the mean score of achievement in the posttest (M=46.26) was greater than the mean score of achievement in the pretest (M=41.95), and the difference is significant at the p<.05 level (note: p=0.008).

TABLE 3-21
THE ACHIEVEMENT OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| pretest=1 posttest=2 |  | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Pair 1 | ach1 | 41.95 | 38 | 5.204 | .844 |
|  | ach2 | 46.26 | 38 | 7.800 | 1.265 |

TABLE 3-22
THE T-TEST OF ACHIEVEMENT OF EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE PRETEST AND POSTTEST

| pretest=1 posttest=2 |  | Paired Differences | | | | | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | | | | |
|  |  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper | | | |
| Pair 1 | ach1 - ach2 | -4.316 | 9.419 | 1.528 | -7.412 | -1.22 | -2.825 | 37 | 0.008 |

Statistics and analysis show that, after one semester's teaching, the situation about the experimental class was almost the same as the control class: their listening level improved in a significant way but with a significant decrease of motivation and a little increase of anxiety. The difference is that participants in the experimental class find significant decreases of motivation in aspects of going abroad, professional learning, working, and decision-making. And only avoidance motivation increased in a distinct way.

It is normal to get an increase of achievement in the post test, but the researcher was really confused about the changes of motivation and anxiety level of the two classes at first, for the researcher had expected the participants' motivation and anxiety level would be a positive change after a semester's learning, but the result was on the opposite.

### 3.4 The Achievement Comparison between Control Class and Experimental Class in the Posttest

To further explore the topic, the researcher conducted independent samples t test to find out that, after one semester's learning whether significant changes could be found in participants from the experimental class and control class. Table 3-23 and Table 3-24 indicate that the 38 students in experimental class had an achievement mean of 46.26 while the 37 members in control class had an achievement mean of 45.16, and the mean of achievement did not differ significantly at the $p<.05$ level (note: p= .508).

TABLE 3-23
THE ACHIEVEMENT COMPARISON BETWEEN CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE POSTTEST

|  | class（con=1 exp=2） | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ach | dimension1  1 | 37 | 45.16 | 6.436 | 1.058 |
|  | 2 | 38 | 46.26 | 7.800 | 1.265 |

TABLE 3-24
THE T-TEST OF ACHIEVEMENT BETWEEN CONTROL CLASS AND EXPERIMENTAL CLASS IN THE POSTTEST

|  |  | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference |
| ach | Equal variances assumed | 3.622 | 0.061 | -0.666 | 73 | 0.508 | -1.101 | 1.654 |
|  | Equal variances not assumed |  |  | -0.667 | 71.101 | 0.507 | -1.101 | 1.649 |

From the analysis, we can know that after a semester's learning (from September, 2011 to January, 2012), a significant improvement of listening proficiency occurred in both classes (which can be indicated in 5.2.1 and 5.2.2). The control class got an increase of 3.05 (45.16 in post test and 42.11 in pretest) , while the experimental got 4.31 (46.26 in posttest and 41.95 in pretest). Apparently, the experimental class got a bigger increase, but analysis of the two achievement means with independent samples t-test showed there is no significant difference. That is to say, compared with traditional ways of teaching college English listening, it can not do better to improve students' achievement by the way of teaching college English listening through movies, which just denied the third experimental hypothesis and answered the third research question.

## IV.  DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSION

### A.  Major Findings

Many factors influence listening comprehension, including types and authenticity of listening materials, interest of the learners and their background knowledge, which makes teaching listening a challenging task. Teaching listening through movies is claimed as an effective way in the literature to improve the situation, but we need more empirical evidence to support this assumption. The attempts to explore this issue made in this study may not present favorable results apparently, but in a way has again witnessed the complexity of the situation in nature.

Firstly, the study indicates that students participated in the experiment didn't show a significant difference in their listening anxiety level after receiving one semester's listening teaching under different conditions, which indicates teaching listening through movies didn't bring significant reduction in students' anxiety level, compared with the traditional teaching approach. And the same group of students receiving the same treatment in their teaching didn't gain significant reduction in their anxiety level, either.

Secondly, this research witnesses some differences in students' motivation intensity after one semester's different teaching interference. Significant differences can be found in four types of motivation: competition, atmosphere, professional learning and value while all other seven types of motivation, including aspects of going abroad, interest, decision, self-efficacy, avoidance, work, and achievement, don't differ from each other significantly. But the identified difference in student subjects' mean score of motivation is not significant. Moreover, the researcher found a significantly lower mean value of motivation items in students who received traditional approach of listening teaching. The similar situation can be found in another group of students who received listening teaching through movies.

Favorable findings have been found in subjects' improvement in their listening proficiency. Students from both the experimental group and the control group have demonstrated improvement in this aspect, though at different levels. Furthermore, the researcher found a significant greater improvement in student subjects who received movie-aided listening teaching.

*B.   Implications for Teaching and Learning College English Listening*

According to the literature review and the findings, some meaningful and significant implications are provided for teaching and learning college English listening respectively.

Though there are an increasing number of experts and teachers at home and aboard have come to realize the value of teaching listening through movies in ELT with the development of psycholinguistics and teaching methodology, teachers should realize the challenge in teaching listening through movies to non-English majors. Factors like selection criteria of the movie, instructional activities during the class, the student's level of English proficiency and the interests of learners will all affect the result of teaching listening through movies. So the teachers should take all of them into account to make sure that students can get a significant increase of listening proficiency.

As for the students, the following suggestions may be helpful for their English listening learning: First, students should try every means to ccultivate interest in learning, that's the basement of language learning. Then, proper learning goals are also important for learners, the goals should be challenging and within the reach of learners' effort. Last but not least, the building of self-confidence is essential for students in language learning. So learners should try their best to keep self-confidence in language learning.

*C.   Limitations of the Study*

Several limitations of this study need to be recognized in interpreting the results. First of all, the number of the subjects is apparently small, compared with the great number of all the non-English majors in the university.

Second, the experiment was performed in a limited time, actually the author needs to spend many extra hours to prepare and negotiate with students about the contents and activities of the class. If it could last longer, more teaching strategies would be adopted, and more work would be conducted and the result would be different.

Though both the control group and experimental group were taught by the author in the study, it seems there is no variation in terms of the teacher's factor, but in fact we can hardly say that the author executed the two ways of teaching equally well in the study.

Due to all the limitations above, probably the reliability of the data and the validity of the research could be compromised, so as the findings.

*D.   Suggestions for Further Study*

All limitations exist in this study should be avoided in future research. For instance, since the sample of the subjects is quite small in size which makes the results are not very convincing, future research can carry out the study with a larger sample of learners to obtain more accurate and complete information. We should carry out the study in a longer period and try every means to make sure the consistency of same variables in different groups.

In spite of all these limitations above, empirically, there are still some possibilities of using movies to teach English listening for non-English majors. Student subjects in this study are influenced by the university culture. The relatively lower level of English and the longing for further studies give them impetus to make efforts to gain a better result in performance, which may influence their anxiety level and motivation intensity. In this sense, teachers and researchers could further explore strategies to carry out anxiety interference with a focus on positive and task-based guidance, which can help students gain sense of achievements. Meanwhile, efforts could also be made to provide students with positive emotional, professional and cognitive support, meaningful teaching materials and guidance on the development of autonomy and creativity. What's more, whether their speaking is also improved in the study is not mentioned, which suggests that there is much potential for future research using English movies in the language classroom.

REFERENCES

[1]   Jiang Yuxiu. (2006). Study on English film listening teaching. *Journal of Urumqi Adult Education Institute*, 2, 40-43.
[2]   Long Qianhong. (2003). English movies and the teaching of listening and speaking. *Media in Foreign Language Instruction,* 3, 48-51.
[3]   Shen Weiju. (2011). An empirical study of the effect of English film on listening teaching. *E-Education Research,* 3. 106-112.
[4]   Wang Shouyuan & Miao Xingwei. (2003). The theory and methods of English listening teaching. *Media in Foreign Language Instruction,* 4, 1-5.

**Jiaosheng Qiu** was born in Tengzhou, China in 1983. He received his master's degree in foreign linguistics and applied linguistics from Shandong Agricultural University, China in 2012.

He is currently a lecturer in the Department of College Foreign Languages Teaching, Taishan University, Tai'an, China. His research interests include Second Language Acquisition and College English Teaching.