CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the results and discussions of the research entitled "An Investigation on Listening Proficiency Levels in English for Service and Hospitality Industry of Thai Students in Public and Private Universities". The purposes of this study are:

- to investigate graduating students' listening ability in English for the service and hospitality industry.
- to find the cut-off scores for eight levels of listening ability.
- to find ability descriptors for each level of listening ability.

The data were presented in tables and the interpretations of the tables were done in prose. The data were presented and discussed in four sections as follows:

Section One: Summary of the L-PESH Test quality.

Section Two: Cut-off score and descriptor setting.

Section Three: Graduating students' listening ability in English for service and hospitality industry.

Section Four: Students' attitudes and comments towards the L-PESH Test.

Section One: Summary of the L-PESH Test Quality

In this section, the results are presented in Tables 4.1 to 4.4 and followed by a discussion and summary of the L-PESH Test statistics.

Table 4.1 Summary of L-PESH Test Statistics

Type	Mean	Min	Median	Max	Std	Var
Test scores	42.16	21.00	41.00	73.00	11.85	140.41
Diff.index	0.53	0.20	0.55	0.88	0.17	0.30
Delta	12.32	0.00	12.40	16.80	2.33	5.42
Disc. Index	0.36	-0.09	0.37	0.69	0.15	0.02
Biserial	0.40	-0.09	0.41	0.80	0.17	0.03
Point-Biserial RPB	0.32	-0.08	0.34	0.53	0.12	0.01

KR20 = 0.89	SEM20 = 4.00
KR21 = 0.87	SEM21 = 4.29
Total number of test takers = 250	
Total number of test items = 80	
High Group = 67	Low Group = 67
Good items that should be kept	61 items.
The items that should be revised	16 items.
The items that should be deleted	3 items.

From Table 4.1, there were 250 test takers who took the L-PESH Test in the main study. The L-PESH Test included 80 multiple-choice test items. The test had very high reliability (KR 20=0.89) with 61 items to be kept, 16 items to be revised, and 3 items to be discarded. The highest score was 73 while the lowest was 21. The mean score was 42.16 while the median was 41 with the standard deviation of 11.85. The mean of difficulty index of the test was 0.53 while the mean of discrimination index was 0.36.

Table 4.2 Difficulty Index of the Test

Difficulty value	<0.20	0.20- 0.30	0.31- 0.40	0.41- 0.50	0.51- 0.60	0.61- 0.70	0.71- 0.80	0.81- 0.90	>0.90
No. of test item	1	8	16	11	11	20	10	3	-

Difficulty index:	> = 0.95	This test item is very easy.
	= 0.81 - 0.94	This test item is easy.
	= 0.20 - 0.80	This test item is good.
	< = 0.20	This test item is too difficult.

From Table 4.2, the difficulty index of the L-PESH Test is presented. In this research the difficulty index was set at 0.20- 0.80. There were 76 items (95%) that had acceptable difficulty value. There were 3 items (3.75%) that were too easy and should be discarded. There was 1 item (1.25%) that was too difficult and should be discarded. The discrimination index of the test is presented in Table 4.3

Table 4.3 Discrimination Index of the L-PESH Test

Discrimination value	<0	0	< = 0.19	0.20-0.29	0.30-0.39	> = 0.40
No. of test item	1 (1.25%)	- (0%)	9 (11.25%)	7 (8.75%)	20 (25%)	43 (53.75%)

Discrimination index:

> = 0.40	The test item has very good discrimination value.
= 0.30 - 0.39	The test item has good discrimination value.
= 0.20 - 0.29	The test item has fair discrimination value.
< = 0.19	The test item has low discrimination value.
= 0	The test item has no discrimination value.

The discrimination index of the L-PESH Test is presented in Table 4.3. The acceptable discrimination index was set at 0.20 and above. From the table, there were 43 items that had very good discrimination value. There were 20 items with good discrimination value and 7 items with fair discrimination value. However, there were 9 items that had low discrimination value and should be revised. There was 1 item that had no discrimination value and should be deleted.

Table 4.4 Delta of Discrimination Value

Delta value	< 9.5 very easy items	9.5- 16.5 good items	> 16.5 very difficult items	Items that delta value cannot be analyzed
No. of test items	4	74	1	1

Table 4.4 presents the delta of discrimination value. From the table, there were 4 items that were very easy, 74 items that were good, 1 item that was very difficult, and 1 item that delta value could not be analyzed.

To sum up for discussion and summary of the test quality, the researcher used the interpretation from Tables 4.1-4.4. From this interpretation it was found that the L-PESH Test quality was acceptable with very high reliability (KR 20=0.89). This means that the test results can be considered consistent and stable. Such consistency

is desirable because the researcher does not want to base the decisions on an unreliable or inconsistent test result that may lead to unreliable decision or judgment. In addition, the result from the item analysis (APPENDIX I) and Table 4.2, 95 % of the L-PESH Test items had an acceptable difficulty value (r = 0.20-0.80). This means that the majority of the test items were not too easy or too difficult for the test takers to answer correctly. For the discrimination value, it was found that 53.75% of the test items had a very good discrimination value, 25% and 8.75% of the test items had a good discrimination value and a fair discrimination value respectively. However, there were 11.25% of the test items that had low discrimination values and needed revising. There were 1.25 % of the test items that had no discrimination value and should be deleted. This means that the majority of the test items could separate the good students from the poor students. The higher discrimination value the test items possessed, the more reliable the test results were.

In conclusion, the L-PESH Test which was used as a research instrument in this study had acceptable quality and could yield reliable and consistent results in assessing graduating students' listening ability in English for the service and hospitality industry. However, there were some test items to be revised and discarded in order to improve the quality of the test for further use. This indicates that to develop a test, no matter as a low or a high stake test, test developers need a lot of test trials, test analyses, and test item revision, until the test is acceptable, or to meet a set standard. In addition, as the L-PESH Test is an ESP test, it does not only need revising in terms of the statistical values, but also needs revising in terms of the test content. This makes it necessary for the ESP test to be an ongoing process, with regular updates.

Section Two: Cut-off Score and Descriptor Setting

This section presents the process in establishing the cut-off scores and their descriptors for the L-PESH Test. Table 4.5 illustrates the frequency of scores that the test takers received. The total score is 80, and the total number of the test takers is 250.

Table 4.5 Frequency of Students Who Received Each Score

Test score	80	79	78	77	76	75	74	73	72	71	70	69	68	67	66
No. of students	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	2	1	1	4	-	2
Test score	65	64	63	62	61	60	59	58	57	56	55	54	53	52	51
No. of students	3	3	1	2	1	2	4	3	5	1	6	-	3	3	5
Test score	50	49	48	47	46	45	44	43	42	41	40	39	38	37	36
No. of students	13	1	4	7	8	11	8	6	7	8	5	4	7	10	10
Test score	35	34	33	32	31	30	29	28	27	26	25	24	23	22	21
No. of students	13	8	9	14	8	2	7	5	4	6	-	2	5	2	2
Test score	20	19	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6
No. of students	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Test score	5	4	3	2	1										
No. of students	-	-	-	-	-										

Table 4.5 shows the frequency of scores that the test takers received. This information was used together with frameworks suggested by Angoff (1971), Brown (1996), Morgan and Michaelides (2005), and Claycomb (1999) in setting cut-off scores and listening ability descriptors for the L-PESH Test. The result of cut-off score setting is presented in the following table, Table 4.6.

The cut-off scores were established by means of calculating the mean and the standard deviation of the L-PESH Test scores in the normal distribution. The mean score was 42.16 and the standard deviation of the scores was 11.85. See details of the calculation in the following table.

Table 4.6 Cut-off Score Calculation

Ability level	Formula	Calculation	Original Cut-off scores	Revised cut-off scores and its range
Distinguished	Mean score + 3SD	42.16+ 3(11.85)	77.71	77 (77-80)
Superior	Mean score + 2SD	42.16+ 2(11.85)	65.86	65 (65-76)
Advanced-High	Mean score + 1SD	42.16+ 1(11.85)	54.01	53 (53-64)
Advanced-Low	Mean score	42.16	42.16	41 (41-52)
Intermediate-High	Mean score - 1SD	42.16- 1(11.85)	30.31	29 (29-40)
Intermediate-Low	Mean score - 2SD	42.16- 2(11.85)	18.46	17 (17-28)
Novice-High	Mean score - 3SD	42.16- 3(11.85)	6.51	5 (5-16)
Novice-Low				0 (0-4)

Mean score = 42.16

SD = 11.85

Total test score = 80

The cut-off scores received from the calculation were sent to educators and hoteliers to discuss and validate them. After that the adjusted cut-off scores were set up as presented in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7 Cut-off Scores and Ability Levels of the L-PESH Test

Ability Level	L-PESH cut-off scores	range	No. of students	Percent
Distinguished	77-80	4	0	0%
Superior	65-76	12	15	6%
Advanced-High	53-64	12	31	12.4%
Advanced-Low	41-52	12	81	32.4%
Intermediate-High	29-40	12	97	38.8%
Intermediate-Low	17-28	12	26	10.4%
Novice-High	5-16	12	0	0%
Novice-Low	0-4	4	0	0%

N = 250   100%

Table 4.7 presents eight ability levels and the cut-off scores. The number and percentage of students who fell in each ability level are also presented. From the table, it is interesting to see that there were no students in the highest ability level, "Distinguished". There were no students grouped under the levels of "Novice-High" and "Novice-Low", as well. There were 15 students in "Superior" level, 31 students in "Advanced-High" level, and 81 students in "Advanced-Low. The "Intermediate-

High" level covered 97 students, while "Intermediate-Low" included 26 students. The total number of the students who took the test was 250.

Table 4.8 shows the item grouping based on the difficulty index.

Table 4.8 Item Grouping According to the Difficulty Index

Difficulty value	Item no.	Discrimina-tion value	No. of test takers who answer correctly			Total number of test takers who answer correctly (%)	
			H	M	L		
>0.90	-	-	-	-	-	-	
0.81-0.90	1	0.20	65	106	50	221	88%
	3	0.28	67	96	50	213	85%
	7	0.09	58	89	54	201	80%
0.71-0.80	10	0.37	62	78	37	177	71%
	14	0.46	63	84	33	180	72%
	23	0.49	62	81	33	176	70%
	28	0.34	62	89	38	189	76%
	48	0.14	51	93	41	185	74%
	59	0.36	64	89	40	193	77%
	70	0.40	67	83	38	188	75%
	72	0.21	60	94	45	199	80%
	75	0.35	61	87	39	187	75%
	79	0.05	50	84	43	177	71%
0.61-0.70	2	0.57	61	76	26	163	65%
	4	0.57	64	69	25	158	63%
	5	0.49	62	81	27	170	68%
	9	0.33	56	79	32	167	67%
	17	0.53	61	69	25	155	62%
	19	0.40	57	78	30	165	66%
	24	0.55	61	74	28	163	65%
	29	0.36	58	84	33	175	70%
	38	0.29	53	75	31	159	64%
	40	0.32	54	65	35	154	62%
	42	0.51	62	83	29	174	70%
	54	0.49	56	68	28	152	61%
	55	0.43	56	72	32	160	64%
	56	0.16	58	73	44	175	70%
	57	0.44	57	72	27	156	62%
	58	0.48	59	73	29	161	64%
	60	0.49	61	82	30	173	69%
	65	0.47	60	75	32	167	67%
	68	0.38	58	69	36	163	65%
	74	0.17	43	72	38	153	61%
0.51-0.60	18	0.62	55	59	15	129	52%
	25	0.44	56	56	28	140	56%

	27	0.69	62	61	16	139	56%
	32	0.34	46	61	28	135	54%
	33	0.66	55	64	16	135	54%
	34	0.46	54	67	24	145	58%
	35	0.46	52	64	24	140	56%
	37	0.44	52	63	22	137	55%
	46	0.47	52	74	21	147	59%
	64	0.59	60	67	18	145	58%
	80	0.39	53	69	27	149	60%
0.41-0.50	11	0.27	36	47	22	105	42%
	12	0.38	45	42	18	105	42%
	13	0.33	44	53	19	116	46%
	21	0.33	44	57	21	122	49%
	49	0.34	43	53	23	119	48%
	50	0.39	42	52	16	110	44%
	61	0.31	43	63	19	125	50%
	63	0.55	48	47	16	111	44%
	69	0.40	39	46	16	101	40%
	71	0.59	53	54	14	121	48%
	78	0.21	42	39	32	113	45%
0.31-0.40	6	0.70	44	33	7	84	34%
	8	0.50	37	40	12	89	36%
	16	0.53	39	28	10	77	31%
	20	0.80	49	27	9	85	34%
	22	0.25	31	46	18	122	49%
	26	0.28	34	32	13	95	38%
	30	0.40	33	33	10	176	70%
	31	0.39	42	37	21	79	32%
	36	0.77	49	37	9	76	30%
	43	0.13	28	37	20	100	40%
	45	0.12	28	50	16	95	38%
	52	0.62	47	35	13	85	34%
	66	0.14	30	43	27	94	38%
	73	0.48	45	32	17	147	59%
	76	0.46	42	39	16	95	38%
	77	0.30	36	37	19	100	40%
0.21-0.30	39	-0.09	14	39	20	73	29%
	41	0.53	33	17	7	57	23%
	44	0.33	23	23	11	57	23%
	47	0.44	36	27	11	74	30%
	51	0.49	33	23	7	63	25%
	53	0.49	31	27	8	66	26%
	62	0.32	27	21	11	59	24%
	67	0.08	21	29	17	67	27%
<0.20	15	0.75	30	18	1	49	20%

Table 4.8 presents the test items grouped together, based on their item difficulty value. The table also shows discrimination value of each test item together with the number and the percentage of the test takers who answered those items

correctly. This information was used in establishing the L-PESH Test Can-Do Guide illustrated in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9 The L-PESH Test Can-do Guide

difficulty value	Item no.	Can-do guide of the L-PESH test item
>0.90	-	-
0.81-0.90	1	Able to relate a picture to restaurant setting.
	3	Able to relate a picture to receptionist work.
	7	Able to relate a picture to front office setting.
0.71-0.80	10	Able to relate a picture to banquet and seminar room setting.
	14	Know how to apologize (as a waiter/waitress).
	23	Able to arrange a room reservation.
	28	Able to ask for and tell the opening/closing time.
	48	Understand money exchange rate.
	59	Able to deal with complaint about the room.
	70	Know how to name dining utensil in a restaurant.
	72	Understand the training lessons/lectures.
	75	Able to understand a more complicated talk about
	79	concierge duty.
0.61-0.70	2	Able to relate a picture to front office setting.
	4	Able to relate a picture to checking in-out setting.
	5	Able to relate a picture to restaurant setting.
	9	Able to relate a picture to valet boy/driver/ bell boy work.
	17	Able to ask for preferences when taking room service order.
	19	Able to discuss the price and arranging facilities for conference room.
	24	Know how to answer the phone appropriately.
	29	Understand register "How do you like your steak cook?"
	38	Able to handle a room service/house keeping work.
	40	Know how to give directions to the guests.
	42	Know how to use alphabet code in spelling names, etc.
	54	Know how to deal with complaints in housekeeping work.
	55	Able to arrange a reservation for the guests.
	56	Understand several of room types and rates.
	57	Able to do the work on money exchange.
	58	
	60	Know how to appease anger and offer complementary drinks.
	65	Able to make and change appointment.
	68	Able to discuss about the job/position.
	74	Understand a concierge work concerning a log book.
0.51-0.60	18	Know how to discuss about a conference room.
	25	Able to arrange a table reservation in a restaurant.

	27	Know how to make suggestions to the guest about food.
	32	Know how to deal with food/drinks/dessert order.
	33	Know how to recommend the food to the guests.
	34	Know how to hold the line, asks the guest to wait (on the phone).
	35	Know how to arrange a room reservation.
	37	Know how to ask for or give directions.
	46	Able to calm down the guests and help them solve their problems.
	64	Understand training lectures on making cocktails.
	80	Understand a long and complicated talk.
0.41-0.50	11	Understand the process of paying bills and registration.
	12	Able to respond to a request.
	13	Able to take order at the table.
	21	Able to discuss about time.
	49	Able to arrange time and schedule.
	50	Able to take order for drinks.
	61	Able to discuss about emergency and illness.
	63	Understand training lessons on making cocktails.
	69	Able to discuss about jobs, positions, and qualifications.
	71	Know how to set dining table.
	78	Able to discuss about the room rate.
0.31-0.40	6	Able to relate a picture to house keeping work.
	8	Able to relate a picture to
	16	Able to understand the register "Have you got a light?" used in waiter/waitress work.
	20	Know how to respond to a request in a restaurant.
	22	Able to discuss about checking out.
	26	Know how to take order for a drink in a bar.
	30	Understand the register "short of" and can deal with a request.
	31	Know how to respond to an order.
	36	Know how to answer the phone appropriately.
	43	Able to tell the time.
	45	Able to make an implication from the guest's reply (about food).
	52	Know how to deal with complaints in housekeeping work.
	66	Understand a long and complicated talk.
	73	Understand a long and complicated talk about routine work.
	76	
	77	Know how to explain types of rooms, facilities, and rates.
0.21-0.30	39	Know how to make an implication from the talk.
	41	Able to leave and take a message.
	44	Able to take an order for dessert.
	47	Understand the bill setting process.
	51	Able to offer laundry service to the guest.
	53	Know how to deal with complaints in housekeeping work.

	62	Know how to ask about symptoms of the guest who is sick.
	67	Understand a long and complicated talk.(in training)
<0.20	15	Able to discuss about complicated schedule and time.

Table 4.9 presents the groups of test items and their can-do guide. From this grouping, ability descriptors could be drawn and set out into 9 levels of test item difficulty. These detailed descriptors were later adjusted and used in explaining the description for each ability level of the L-PESH Test.

Table 4.10 The L-PESH Proficiency Table

Ability Level	L-PESH cut-off scores	Descriptions
Distinguished	77-80	- make inferences within the cultural framework of the target language - understand all forms and styles of speech concerned with social, and professional needs tailored to different audiences - function in all of the situations described below whether professional or social, concerning concrete or abstract subjects Note: The listener in this level may have difficulty with some dialects and slang.
Superior	65-76	- understand registers used in the area of service and hospitality - make implication from the guest replies, requests, and complaints - handle emergencies and guest' s illness - understand and deal with complicated and serious requests or complaints - understand most work related situations - understand most speakers of English in international meetings - function in all of the situations described in the

		lower ability levels Note: In this level, the listener rarely misunderstands but may not understand excessively rapid speech with strong cultural references.
Advanced-High	53-64	- understand explanations about how to perform routine tasks related to service and hospitality industry - understand co-worker discussing simple problems that arose at work - understand and deal with simple requests and complaints - understand description and narration in different time frames or aspects - understand short lectures or interviews on both familiar and new topics - function in all of the situations described in the lower ability levels Note: In this level, the listener shows an emerging awareness of culturally implied meanings beyond the surface meanings of the text but may fail to grasp sociocultural nuances of the message.
Advanced-Low	41-52	- understand simple exchanges in everyday professional or personal life with both native English and non-native English speakers (face-to-face) - sustain understanding over longer stretches of connected discourse on a number of topics pertaining to different times and places - take order at the table in the hotel restaurants or bars

		- understand and explain simple dishes or drinks in the menu to the guests - arrange a table or a room reservation - understand and make simple suggestions about food and rooms to the guests - function in all of the situations described in the lower ability levels Note: Understanding in this level may be uneven because of variety of linguistic and extra linguistic factors in the text.
Intermediate-High	29-40	- understand explanations related to routine work in one to one situations - understand limited social conversations (face-to –face) - understand simple directions and time - take simple phone messages Note: Understanding in this level is inconsistent because the listener may fail to grasp main ideas and details.
Intermediate-Low	17-28	- understand adequately for immediate survival needs such as basic greeting to the hotel guest "Good morning/afternoon/evening". - understand simple questions in social situations, spoken slowly and deliberately, such as "How are you?", "What's your name?" - understand utterances which consist of learned elements in a limited number of content areas Note: Misunderstandings in both main ideas and details frequently arise.
Novice-High	5-16	- understand short, learned utterances with repetition, rephrasing, and presented in slow rate speech - understand some words and phrases from simple

		questions and statements, high-frequency commands, and courtesy formulae about topics Note: The listener requires long pauses for assimilation.
Novice-Low	0-4	-understand some frequently used isolated words. - have no ability to understand even short utterances Note: The listener has very limited understanding.

Table 4.10 presents eight ability levels of the L-PESH Test and their cut-off-scores and descriptions. The ability levels were ranked from the highest ability to the lowest ability as Distinguished, Superior, Advanced-High, Advanced-Low, Intermediate-High, Intermediate-Low, Novice-High, and Novice-Low respectively. These ability levels were justified and trianguiated with the results of the interviews with 5 experts and 5 test takers.

From the data presented in Tables 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, and 4.10 together with the information from the literature review, the ability description of each level is explained as follows:

Distinguished: The test takers in this performance level can do the following:
- make inferences within the cultural framework of the target
language
- understand all forms and styles of speech concerned with social, and
professional needs tailored to different audiences
- function in all of the situations described below whether
professional or social, concerning concrete or abstract subjects

Note: The listener in this level may have difficulty with some dialects and slang.

Superior: The test takers in this performance level can do the following:

- understand registers used in the area of service and hospitality
- make implication from the guest replies, requests, and complaints
- handle emergencies and guest s illness
- understand and deal with complicated and serious requests or complaints
- understand most work related situations
- understand most speakers of English in international meetings
- function in all of the situations described in the lower ability levels

Note: In this level, the listener rarely misunderstands but may not understand excessively rapid speech with strong cultural references.

Advanced-High: The test takers in this performance level can do the following:

- understand explanations about how to perform routine tasks related to service and hospitality industry
- understand co-worker discussing simple problems that arose at work
- understand and deal with simple requests and complaints
- understand description and narration in different time frames or aspects

- understand short lectures or interviews on both familiar and new topics
- function in all of the situations described in the lower ability levels

Note: In this level, the listener shows an emerging awareness of culturally implied meanings beyond the surface meanings of the text but may fail to grasp sociocultural nuances of the message.

Advanced-Low: The test takers in this performance level can do the following:

- understand simple exchanges in everyday professional or personal

life with both native English and non-native English speakers (face-to-face)

- sustain understanding over longer stretches of connected discourse on a number of topics pertaining to different times and places
- take order at the table in the hotel restaurants or bars
- understand and explain simple dishes or drinks in the menu to the guests
- arrange a table or a room reservation
- understand and make simple suggestions about food and rooms to the guests
- function in all of the situations described in the lower ability levels

Note: Understanding in this level may be uneven because of the variety of linguistic and extra linguistic factors in the text.

Intermediate-High: The test takers in this performance level can do the following:

- understand explanations related to routine work in one to one situations
- understand limited social conversations (face-to –face)
- understand simple directions and time
- take simple phone messages

Note: Understanding in this level is inconsistent because the listener may fail to grasp main ideas and details.

Intermediate-Low: The test takers in this performance level can do the following:

- understand adequately for immediate survival needs such as basic greeting to the hotel guest "Good morning/afternoon/evening"
- understand simple questions in social situations, spoken slowly and deliberately, such as "How are you?", "What's your name?"
- understand utterances which consist of learned elements in a limited number of content areas

Note: Misunderstandings in both main ideas and details frequently arise.

Novice-High: The test takers in this performance level can do the

following:

- understand short, learned utterances with repetition, rephrasing, and

presented in slow rate speech

- understand some words and phrases from simple questions and

statements, high-frequency commands, and courtesy formulae about

topics

Note: The listener requires long pauses for assimilation.

Novice-Low: The test takers in this performance level can do the

following:

-understand some frequently used isolated words.

- have no ability to understand even short utterances

Note: The listener has very limited understanding.

Table 4.11 The Ability Levels of the L-PESH Test Related to Positions in Service and Hospitality Industry Based on TOEIC Requirement

L-PESH ability level	TOEIC requirement in Thai hotels	Samples of job related
Distinguished (77-80)	700-900	Assistant to General Manager, Training Manager, Administrative manager, Personnel Manager, Outlet manager, Sales and Marketing Manager, Assistant to Group Training Manger, HRD Manager, F&B Manager, Front Office Manger, Executive secretary, Spa manager, Chief Engineer, etc.
Superior (65-76)	600-650	Front Office Assistant Manager, Reservation Agents, Business Center supervisor, Front Office supervisor, Public Relation Officer, Sale& Marketing Officer, Purchasing Officer, Engineer, Accountant, etc.
Advanced-High (53-64)	500-550	Cashier, Electrical Engineer Assistant Executive Spa Receptionist, Front Officers, Reservation Officers, etc.

Advanced-Low (41-52)	400-450	Waiter, Waitress, Japanese Restaurant Server, Butler, Bell captain, Housekeeping, etc.
Intermediate-High (29-40)	300-350	Mini-bar Man, F&B Staff, Lounge/Lobby Bar Receptionist, Laundry Manger, Florist Supervisor, Operator, etc.
Intermediate-Low (17-28)	200-250	Driver, Laundry Staff, Technician, Electrician, Carpenter, Maid, etc.
Novice-High (5-16)	100-150	Messenger, Security Officer, Florist, Valet Boy, Store, Gardener, Kitchen Staff, etc.
Novice-Low (0-4)	<100	No job related to this ability level.

Table 4.11 presents the ability levels of the L-PESH Test compared to the TOEIC scores required by many hotels in Bangkok. The information on the required TOEIC scores was drawn from the previous literature review in Chapter Two.

From the interpretations of Tables 4.11, it was concluded that the test takers whose scores fell into each ability level can fit themselves into the appropriate positions. However, some test takers who want to get a job in the higher ability level may require additional or on the job training. Moreover, different hotels have different requirements for each position. This has to be considered according to hotel policies or requirements. Therefore, the results in this study can serve as a broad framework for the employers to recruit their employees.

Based on the data analysis presented in the previous section, it can be concluded that the two hypotheses posited in Chapter One can be accepted. The L-PESH Test can measure listening ability in English for the Service and Hospitality Industry and can differentiate students into eight different ability levels of listening ability in English for service and hospitality industry.

Section Three: Graduating students' listening ability in English for the service and hospitality industry.

According to the interpretation of Tables 4.5 to 4.10, the graduating students' listening ability in English for the service and hospitality could be concluded in the following paragraphs.

The graduating students' listening ability in English for service and hospitality industry was investigated in the L-PESH Test administration. Two hundred and fifty students took the test. They were grouped into eight ability levels according to their test scores. Fifteen students (6%) were in the "Superior" level, while thirty-one students (12.4%) were in the "Advanced-High" level, and eighty-one students (32.4%) were in the "Advanced-Low" level. The highest number of students, ninety-seven (38.8%) was in the "Intermediate-high" level, and twenty-six students (10.4%) were in the "Intermediate-Low" level. Interestingly, it was found that there were no graduating students grouped under the "Distinguished", "Novice-High", and "Novice–Low" levels. From this investigation, the researcher found that the graduating students from the selected universities had average listening ability level ranging from the Intermediate-High to the Advanced-Low level. It can be inferred that these graduating students had adequate listening proficiency to perform tasks in the related positions. Though the majority of their listening ability was considered average, with more training and practice in English, they can be employed or get promoted into higher positions in their career paths.

To sum up, listening plays significant roles in communication. The majority of tasks in the service and hospitality industry require sufficient ability at a certain level for a certain position. The graduating students who participated in this study possess average listening ability. This listening ability was found sufficient for the students to perform tasks in various positions in leading hotels in Bangkok. However, to make decision on students' English ability, it is not enough to consider just sufficient knowledge in a particular content area or adequate ability in a particular skill. Though listening and speaking skills are crucial in hotel work, reading and writing skills cannot be ignored. To make decisions on one student's

English ability, the teachers and the employers need to consider the total student performance as a whole rather than as one skill or one content area at a time.

Section Four: Students' attitudes and comments towards the L-PESH Test.

The student's attitude questionnaire was designed to investigate the background of the test takers and their opinion on the L-PESH Test. The reliability of the questionnaire was 0.72. Two hundred and fifty questionnaires were distributed to the test takers after the test administrations, 233 were returned. Seventeen questionnaires were missing. Descriptive statistics were applied to analyse results. The findings are as follows:

Table 4.12 illustrates the in formation drawn from Part One of the Questionnaire. The information was about the test takers' background.

Table 4.12 Background of the Test Takers

Background	Total	Per cent
Gender		
Male	51	22.0
Female	181	78.0
Age		
20 – 22 years	204	87.6
23 and upper	29	12.4
Institution		
Kasetsart University	65	27.90
Bangkok University	70	30.04
Kasem Bundit University	55	23.61
Rangsit University	43	18.45
GPA		
A (4.00)	-	-
B (3.00 – 3.99)	61	28.1
C (2.00 – 2.99)	144	66.4
D (1.00 – 1.99)	12	5.5

The highest grad of the English course received	Total	Per cent
A	81	34.9
B$^+$	51	22.0
B	30	12.9
C$^+$	40	17.2
C	24	10.3
D$^+$	5	2.2
D	1	.4

The lowest grade in English course received		
A	2	.9
B$^+$	2	.9
B	11	4.8
C$^+$	32	13.9
C	32	13.9
D$^+$	37	16.0
D	76	32.9
F	39	16.9

Standard test taken before		
TOEFL	2	.9
TOEIC	21	9.3
IELTS	2	.9
CU-TEP	1	.4
I have never taken any standard test before.	19.4	85.5
Others	6	2.7

From Table 4.12, it was found that the there were 233 test takers; 51 males and 181 females who filled out the questionnaires. The majority of the test takers are aged between 20-22 years. They are the 4th year students in Bangkok University, Kasem Bundit University, Kasetsart University, and Rangsit University. Their Grade Point Averages ranged from 3.99 to 1.00. The highest grade in English that the most

students received was "A", while the lowest grade was "D". Twenty-one test takers had taken the TOEIC test before, two students had taken TOEFL, another two had taken IELTS, and one had taken CU-TEP. However, the majority had not taken any standard tests before.

In the next Table, Table 4.13, the test takers' opinion towards the L-PESH Test is illustrated. Criteria to interpret the rating were:

1.00 – 1.79	The respondents agree with the question asked the least.
1.80 - 2.59	The respondents agree with the question asked less.
2.60 – 3.39	The respondents averagely agree with the question asked.
3.40 – 4.19	The respondents agree with the question asked a lot.
4.20 – 5.00	The respondents agree with the question asked the most.

Table 4.13 The Test-Takers' Opinions Towards the L-PESH Test

Questions	Opinion towards the test (233 test takers)					$\bar{X}$	S.D.	Interpreta-tion
	The most	A lot	Average	Less	The least			
1. You are satisfied with the over all format of the L-PESH Test.	20 (9.0%)	109 (48.9%)	89 (39.9%)	3 (1.3%)	2 (0.9%)	3.64	.703	A lot
2. The font and size of the letters used in the test are suitable.	49 (21.1%)	132 (56.9%)	47 (20.3%)	2 (0.9%)	2 (0.9%)	3.97	.726	A lot
3. The pictures used in the test are clear.	20 (8.6%)	65 (28.0%)	90 (38.8%)	43 (18.5%)	14 (6.0%)	3.15	1.017	Average
4. The pictures used in the test are suitable with the test questions.	18 (7.9%)	103 (45.4%)	94 (41.4%)	11 (4.8%)	1 (0.4%)	3.56	.729	A lot
5. The total number of the test items is suitable.	13 (5.7%)	109 (47.4%)	96 (41.7%)	10 (4.3%)	2 (0.9%)	3.53	.710	A lot
6. The time for the test administration is suitable.	15 (6.7%)	80 (35.7%)	94 (42.0%)	28 (12.5%)	7 (3.1%)	3.30	.887	Average
7. The quality of the recording is clear.	14 (6.2%)	65 (28.6%)	97 (42.7%)	42 (18.5%)	9 (4.0%)	3.15	.927	Average
8. The speed of the dialogues and monologues in the recording is suitable.	14 (6.2%)	65 (28.8%)	88 (38.9%)	41 (18.1%)	18 (8.0%)	3.07	1.017	Average
9. The content of the test is related to the course content.	55 (23.9%)	138 (60.0%)	36 (15.7%)	1 (0.4%)	-	4.07	.640	A lot

10. The level of difficulty of the test is...	27 (12.0%)	114 (50.7%)	81 (36.0%)	2 (0.9%)	1 (0.4%)	3.73	.696	A lot
11. The L-PESH Test is helpful to your study and can enhance your English ability	96 (41.2%)	113 (48.5%)	22 (9.4%)	2 (0.9%)	-	4.30	.673	The most
Total	341 (13.6%)	1093 (43.6%)	834 (33.2%)	185 (7.4%)	56 (2.2%)	3.59	0.43	A lot

It can be summarized from Table 4.13 that the test takers had a good attitude towards the test. They were satisfied with the test. They agreed that the overall format (face validity) of the test was good. The content of the test was related and close to the content of the English courses they had taken. The most interesting point was that they believed that the L-PESH Test was helpful and could enhance their English ability.

In Part Three of the questionnaire, three open-ended questions were presented. The findings from this part were summarized in the following paragraphs.

Question number one: Please specify your opinion on the strengths and weaknesses of the L-PESH Test. The findings were:

Strengths of the test:

The students agreed that the test content was related to what they have learned. The test was not too difficult or too easy for them. The knowledge from the test could be applied in their future careers. In addition, they believed that the test could tell their ability in English listening. This helped them to know how to improve their English for future use in job application. Some of the test takers suggested that there should be this kind of test every week because they could learn and improve their English ability from the test.

Weaknesses of the test:

The majority of the group agreed that the weakest point of the test was that there was not enough time to think and mark the answers. There should be longer pauses between test items. The speed of the dialogues was too fast. Some of

the speakers' voice was too soft and not so clear. Some pictures were not clear. And lastly, few of the students mentioned that the instructions in the test were not clearly understood.

Question number Two: What do you think about having a variety of English accents, both native and non-native accents, in the recording?

The finding was that most students agreed to have a variety of English accents in the recording. They mentioned that in their real working situations, they hear not only the native English accent, but also the non-native ones. However, some of them found that the test was more difficult with the non-native English accents. They could hardly understand these accents. They believed that this caused them to achieve a lower score in the test.

Question number Three: Do you agree with the university to administer this proficiency test for every graduating student before they graduated? Why?

The finding was summarized here that all of the students who filled out the questionnaires agreed with the university to administer this proficiency test for every graduating student before they graduated. Many reasons were proposed to support this opinion as follows:

- They could know their present English ability before they graduated.
- They could know where and how to improve their English.
- The test was good to measure whether the students were ready to use English to perform their tasks.
- The students could be prepared to take the standard test by taking the L-PESH Test.
- There should be this kind of test at the end of each year, not just before graduating.
- If possible, the test score should be used in job applications.

Conclusion could be drawn from this finding that the L-PESH Test was satisfying and helpful to the test takers even though there were some weaknesses to be improved.