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Popular songs in the L2 classroom not only increase interest and motivation, but also serve to meet a number of pedagogical needs. However, for song-based tasks to gain wider acceptance, it must be shown that they are as effective as conventional tasks. This paper reports a study comparing the progress in listening comprehension for two groups: one given listening practice with conventional (nonmusical) materials ($n=358$), and the other given listening practice with popular song gap-fill exercises ($n=334$). Results on pre- and post-test scores using the Japan Association of College English Teachers (JACET) Basic Listening Comprehension Test indicate that both groups improved equally and made significant progress. On post-treatment questionnaires, the song group expressed both higher approval for the time spent on the tasks and increased interest in English.

Research into L2 listening comprehension development has shown that foreign language learners must acquire the ability to:
(a) discriminate among the distinctive sounds of the target language; (b) recognize reduced forms of words; (c) distinguish word boundaries; and (d) guess the meanings of words from the contexts in which they occur (see Richards, 1983; Rost, 1990). In most Japanese
high schools, however, students of English are offered little exposure to the actual sounds of the language in context, and routinely fail to correctly distinguish spoken words they might otherwise understand in written form. In order to provide students with exposure to authentic English, and at the same time stimulate motivation for the lessons, teachers are increasingly utilizing materials based on English language movies and songs. Though both media can provide listening practice, songs have the additional advantage of almost always being heard in the original language (i.e., no L1 subtitles or dubbing). In addition, like movies, the topics and language of pop songs tend to reflect the interests, values, and tastes of young adult EFL learners more accurately than the material used in commercial textbooks (Coe, 1972; Dubin, 1974; Loew, 1979; Murphey, 1988, 1989; Smith, 1976).

In addition to increasing interest in the content of lessons, songs can be used to introduce practically any area of the language learning syllabus (DeSelms, 1983; Dubin, 1974; Sekara, 1985; Urbancic & Vixmuller, 1981). In the last few years several resource books presenting song-based activities for classroom use have been published (Cranmer & Laroy, 1992; Griffey, 1992; Murphey, 1992), in addition to a number of textbooks containing exercises using songs (Berglund, 1983; Dougill, 1989; House & Manning, 1992; Kanel, 1995; 1997; Kanzaki, 1988; Mosdell, 1984; Posener, 1987; Someya & Ferrasci, 1988; Sato & Sasanuma, 1988). There is still, however, a lack of research examining the effects of song use on language acquisition. As with any other teaching method, for song-based activities to gain legitimacy, it must be demonstrated that they are as effective as conventional activities.

The Effect of Music on Cognitive and Affective Variables

The role of music and song in development of human languages, as well as the linguistic development of the individual, has been acknowledged by anthropologists (Murphey, 1990b). Studies of both normal and learning-disabled students suggest that properties of music (rhythm, melody, harmony, dynamics, form and mood) aid the cognitive processing of first language vocabulary, enhance retention and promote overall language development and reading skills (Botari & Evans, 1982; Gfeller, 1983; Isern, 1958; Jalongo & Bromley, 1984; McCarthy, 1985; Schuster & Mouzon, 1982). In addition, music has the potential to break down many of the affective barriers that inhibit learning (Lozanov, 1979; Meyer, 1956; Stoudemire, 1975), and can make learners more receptive to subject matter by increasing consciousness and emotional involvement in the learning process (Rosenfeld, 1985).
Barber (1980) first described a phenomenon which she called the "Din in the head" to account for the involuntary rehearsals that often take place in foreign language learners' minds. Krashen (1983) hypothesized that the Din was a result of the stimulation of the Language Acquisition Device (LAD). Parr and Krashen (1986) later surveyed second language learners, finding that three-quarters have had the Din experience to some degree: frequently occurring after extended periods of comprehensible foreign language input.

Murphey (1984; 1990a) hypothesized that music and song might provide a similar Din, and described what he called the "song-stuck-in-my-head" (SSIMH) phenomenon (i.e., a song or melody we just cannot get out of our heads). In a survey of 30 native speakers of English and 19 native speakers of other languages, he found that all had experienced the SSIMH, and that all but two had had it in a second language. Murphey reasoned that if the Din works to stimulate language acquisition, so then should the SSIMH phenomenon. In contrast to Krashen's concepts of the Din, however, Murphey suggested that the SSIMH phenomenon does not necessarily need comprehensible input. This notion is particularly important when considering students at the beginning levels of foreign language acquisition. Murphey concluded that if prior exposure to language does affect subsequent learning, many EFL/ESL students have already experienced a significant amount of contact with English through songs.

Language Learning Songs vs. Authentic Songs

Because authentic songs sometimes contain non-standard structures and vocabulary, and irregular stress and intonational patterns, some educators have expressed doubts as to whether the potential benefits of their use outweigh the possible detrimental effect of an incorrect model of the spoken language (Coe, 1972; Jolly, 1975; Richards, 1969). Richards (1969) advised that control should be applied to the language of songs, just as to any other part of the English course, and called for the creation of special English language learning songs. During the 1970s and early 1980s, numerous ESL song books were published that did contain controlled language and few, if any, of the "mistakes" found in authentic songs.1

A number of educators, however, began to counter previous objections to authentic songs, basing their arguments on the changing pre-

We now take an entirely different view of the knowledge that the learner must acquire. Today’s concern with both the semantic element in language and motivation requirements for successful learning goes a long way toward overriding some of those earlier simplistic warnings. (p. 4)

For many educators selectivity was the answer to the made-for-ESL versus authentic song controversy. Pearse (1981) recognized that controlling language was often necessary for beginners, but argued that “with careful selection from the ‘top twenty’ and best selling LPs, this can be done quite easily” (p. 9). McBeath (1986) advised teachers to be selective when using songs with non-standard grammar or excessive slang, but maintained that songs especially constructed for ESL were often not as effective as authentic music since the lyrics could just end up becoming “a meaningless collection of phonemes” written to satisfy a narrow pedagogical objective (p. 44).1

Classroom Research into the Use of Music and Songs

Several studies measuring improvement in foreign language vocabulary and listening ability have shown that material based on songs is as effective as conventional material. Hahn (1972) found that junior high school males studying German vocabulary through songs achieved significantly higher scores on vocabulary tests than subjects studying vocabulary through dialogs. Medina (1993), in a study of Spanish-speaking elementary school subjects, found that exposure to English vocabulary through songs produced the same gains as through spoken versions of the material. A comparison of song-based listening texts with traditional dialog or narrative listening texts (Alley, 1990) found that first year high school Spanish learners made equally significant progress in improving listening comprehension with both types of material. Wilcox (1995) compared ESL learners’ pronunciation development using songs and found that subjects progressed as much with songs as with nonmusical methods.

In a comparison of two different song methods, Grant, Clark and Koch (1996) found that students who studied listening through song-based gap-fill quizzes made the same progress as those who studied through song-based comprehension quizzes.

Student Attitudes Toward the Use of Songs in the Language Classroom

Kanel and Grant (1993) surveyed 550 Japanese college students who studied listening using popular song gap-fill quizzes. Regardless of English proficiency level, major, or sex, the respondents indicated that the song
quizzes increased their interest and motivation in studying English, were as beneficial as, or more beneficial than, the other classroom materials in improving their listening ability, and felt that the exercises should be done often, perhaps every class. In a similar survey of American students studying Japanese (Jolly, 1975), the respondents indicated that songs created a relaxed and enjoyable atmosphere, livened up the pace of the lessons, and were an effective means of increasing vocabulary, studying Japanese culture, and discovering the relationship between language and culture.

To further examine the use of songs for language teaching, particularly listening development in an EFL teaching context, a study was conducted at a four-year university in Osaka, Japan, during the 1993-94 academic year. The researcher specifically set out to determine:

1) whether students’ listening comprehension ability would progress as effectively with song-based tasks as it would with conventional nonmusical listening tasks, and

2) whether song-based tasks are equally effective at all levels of English proficiency.

The Study

Hypotheses

1) Scores obtained on a post-treatment test of listening comprehension for subjects using song-based tasks (song group) would not differ significantly from scores obtained by subjects using conventional nonmusical listening tasks (text group);

2) Scores obtained by subjects at each level of proficiency (A-D) in the song group would not differ significantly from scores obtained by subjects in the text group at the same level of proficiency;

3) Scores obtained for both song and text groups would show significant improvement over pre-test scores;

4) Scores obtained for subjects at all levels of listening proficiency in both groups would show significant improvement over pre-test scores.

Method

Subjects: The 692 subjects, native speakers of Japanese, were predominately male non-English majors enrolled in 20 first- or second-year required English classes at a Japanese university.
Design: Assignment to classes was based on students' academic majors, identification numbers, and year in school rather than on placement tests or self-grouping. The randomness of this assignment was deemed satisfactory for a quasi-experimental design. Ten full-time instructors, nine Japanese and one American, the researcher, who were teaching approximately seven classes each of this type were involved in the study. The instructors were directed to select two of their classes and assign one class to the song group and the other to the text group, resulting in 10 classes in each group. The instructors made an effort to select the two classes from the same academic major, and with the same course designations. (See Appendix A: Table of Instructors, Method, Majors, Year, and Texts).

The English curriculum consisted of four required courses: a) English I, first year reading; b) English II, first year conversation; c) English III, second year reading, and d) English IV, second year conversation. In addition to the class involved in the project, subjects were enrolled in one other English class during the academic year. First year subjects took both English I and II, and second year subjects took both English III and IV. Though no control over the amount of listening practice in their other classes was possible, it was reasoned that the randomization of class assignments to the study groups would balance the effect of any outside practice, in effect giving neither group an advantage.

Classroom materials and procedures: Students in the song groups were given listening practice through a series of song gap-fill worksheets prepared by the researcher (see Appendices B: List of Songs Used by the Song Groups, and C: Sample Song Worksheet). Gap-fill exercises were chosen over other types of listening tasks (e.g., dictation, true/false or multiple choice comprehension questions, passage correction, scrambled lyrics) because they are the simplest to construct and probably the most commonly used song-based tasks (Griffee, 1992; Murphey, 1992). More importantly, for low to intermediate EFL learners, those tasks provide practice in listening discrimination (i.e., distinguishing among L2 sounds, recognition of reduced forms, and word boundaries), which can lead to increased overall comprehension (see Richards, 1983; Rost, 1990).

Songs were chosen by the researcher based on experience using song gap-fill exercises during the two years prior to the current study (Kanel & Grant, 1993). Selection was based primarily on whether the songs had a) relatively clear enunciation and normal rhythm and intonation patterns, b) a conversational or narrative style, and c) a fairly
wide range of vocabulary and grammatical structures. In all cases, taped versions of the songs by the original artists were used. Deletions were of a single lexical item except for occasional contracted forms. There were 15-30 deletions in each song depending on the song's tempo and length. The difficulty of the items was gradually increased over the course of the study as students became accustomed to the exercises. To further stimulate interest in the song exercises, a brief 120-150 word background of the singer(s) was provided for the instructor to read to the class before the quiz, if time permitted (see Appendix D: Sample Background Sheet).

Teachers played each song two times for the quiz, then put the answers on the blackboard while students corrected their own quizzes. Teachers then played the song for a third time while students analyzed their errors.

Students in the text groups were taught listening with nonmusical materials, either commercially available textbooks, or instructor created listening worksheets (see Appendix E: Sample of Instructor Prepared Cloze-Dictation Worksheet). The textbook selection was left to the discretion of individual instructors, however, the researcher provided a list of textbooks which contained exercises with items comparable those appearing on the JACET Basic Listening Comprehension Test (see discussion of Measure below). Instructors were directed to select materials which they felt would be most beneficial to students' listening comprehension development.

Listening materials in both text and song groups were used 20-30 minutes a week for the 14 class periods between the pre- and post-tests. For the remaining 60-70 minutes of class time, instructors taught equivalent lessons to both groups in accordance with the course designation. Instructors were directed to provide no additional listening practice during this time.

Measure: For both financial and practical considerations, the Japan Association of College English Teachers (JACET) Basic Listening Comprehension Test was selected as the most appropriate measure of non-English majors' English proficiency. Because there was no part B available at the time, it was used for both the pre- and post-test. Since the test administrations were separated by more than six months, and the answers never revealed to the subjects, it was reasoned that any practice effect would be minimal, and in any case equal for both groups. The pre-test was used to determine subjects' initial listening proficiency levels (i.e., A-D, with A being the highest level). The post-test results
were compared with the pre-test results to determine the effect of the two treatments.

The test consists of 40 multiple choice items divided equally into four sections: 1) picture, 2) statement, 3) dialog, and 4) narrative. The taped instructions are in Japanese, and the items are heard only once in English. The time of the test is approximately 45 minutes. Subjects were given the pre-test in the second week of May, with no prior warning, and given the post-test in the third week of November, again with no prior warning.4

Though the construct validity of the test has not yet been empirically demonstrated, considerable attention has been given to reliability: JACET determined a Cronbach Alpha value of approximately 0.9 (JACET, 1993).

**Analyses**

Analyses were based on the raw scores obtained on the JACET Test (maximum score = 40 points). Mean scores on the pre-test were compared with post-test scores using analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine the effect of the two treatments. There was no previous support for positing a difference in mean scores between the two main treatment groups, thus, null hypotheses were adopted for hypotheses one and two. The significance level was set at $\alpha < .05$, non-directional.

For hypotheses three and four, it was felt that 14 class periods of listening practice with either treatment would result in enough improvement in listening comprehension ability to posit statistically significant gains in test scores. The significance level was set at $\alpha < .05$, directional.

**Results**

Table 1 presents pre- and post-test descriptive statistics for the two treatments and proficiency levels.

Initially, histograms and cell plots of mean scores and standard deviations on the pre-test for the total population ($n = 692$), song group ($n = 334$), and text group ($n = 358$) were examined and showed normal distributions and variances, satisfying the assumptions for ANOVA. A two-way ANOVA (Table 2), using the pre-test scores as the dependent variable and treatment and level as the independent variables, showed no significant differences between the two main treatment groups ($F = .173; p = .6776; \alpha = .05$), and that both groups had four significantly different levels ($F = 1305.518; p = .0001$). This supports the earlier stipulation that assignment was random and that the two groups were at the same level of proficiency.
Table 1: Pre- and post-test descriptive statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Pre-test Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Post-test Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>17.308</td>
<td>4.568</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>19.746</td>
<td>5.668</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>+2.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>17.693</td>
<td>5.323</td>
<td>.281</td>
<td>19.846</td>
<td>5.875</td>
<td>.310</td>
<td>+2.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27.571</td>
<td>1.555</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td>31.000</td>
<td>2.717</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>+3.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>21.740</td>
<td>2.084</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>23.479</td>
<td>4.867</td>
<td>.497</td>
<td>+1.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22.020</td>
<td>1.954</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>23.030</td>
<td>4.906</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>+1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>15.853</td>
<td>1.868</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>18.081</td>
<td>4.086</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>+2.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>15.599</td>
<td>1.883</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>17.747</td>
<td>4.306</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>+2.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10.681</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>14.660</td>
<td>3.766</td>
<td>.549</td>
<td>+3.979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A three-way repeated measures ANOVA (Table 3), using pre- and post-test scores as the dependent variable and treatment, level and pre- and post-test scores (the repeated measures) as independent variables showed no effect for treatment on the two main groups ($F = 1.089; p = .2971$). This confirmed the first null hypothesis of no significant difference between treatments. Interaction tests on the effect of level and treatment confirmed the second null hypothesis of no effect for treatment on proficiency levels ($F = 1.920; p = .1249$). The third hypothesis, that scores for both treatment groups would show significant improvement from pre- to post-test, was confirmed ($F = 152.641; p = .0001$), as was the fourth hypothesis that sub-

Table 2: Two-way ANOVA of the pre-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.6776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13901.630</td>
<td>4633.877</td>
<td>1305.518</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment * Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28.666</td>
<td>9.555</td>
<td>2.692</td>
<td>.0453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>2427.828</td>
<td>3.549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent: Pre-test
Table 3: Three-way repeated-measures ANCOVA of the pre- & post-tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F Value</th>
<th>p Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.748</td>
<td>16.748</td>
<td>1.219</td>
<td>.2700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>123592.008</td>
<td>7864.003</td>
<td>572.212</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment * Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.320</td>
<td>1.773</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>.9429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject (Group)</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>9400.327</td>
<td>13.743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- Post Test</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1248.549</td>
<td>1248.549</td>
<td>152.641</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- Post Test * Treatment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.905</td>
<td>8.905</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>.2971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- Post Test * Level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>327.783</td>
<td>109.261</td>
<td>13.358</td>
<td>.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- Post Test * Treatment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47.119</td>
<td>15.706</td>
<td>1.920</td>
<td>.1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre- Post Test * Subject (Group)</td>
<td>684</td>
<td>5594.891</td>
<td>8.180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent: Measure

jects at all proficiency levels in both treatments groups would improve significantly ($F = 13.358; p = .0001$).

An interaction plot illustrating the progress of both treatments at all four levels from pre- to post-test is shown in Figure 1.

**Follow-up Questionnaire**

The responses of the two groups to a follow-up questionnaire varied little in regard to evaluation of the procedures used in class, or the positive educational benefits of their respective listening exercises. Questionnaire items which asked whether the exercises helped improve pronunciation, intonation, and contracted forms all received approval ratings of 50-60% by both groups. In addition, both groups indicated that they wanted to do the exercises regularly. The song group, however, favored doing the exercises every week significantly more than the text group (song = 74%; text = 58%; Chi Square = 15.504; $p = .0001$) and found more value in the time spent on the quizzes (song = 61%; text = 48%; Chi Square = 9.686; $p = .0018$). The song group also expressed significantly more interest in studying English than the text group (song = 50%; text = 32%; Chi Square = 20.008; $p = .0001$).
The specific concerns of this study were to determine whether song-based tasks, in the form of regular gap-fill quizzes, would be as effective at improving listening comprehension as conventional listening tasks at all levels of listening proficiency as operationally defined by the JACET Basic Listening Comprehension Test. The post-test scores showed significant improvement for both text and song groups at all levels and that neither treatment was more effective than the other. These findings confirmed all of the original hypotheses and concurred with the studies discussed earlier that suggest song-based language teaching tasks are as effective as nonmusical tasks.

For the purposes of this study, only song gap-fill tasks were utilized for the song treatment. It was reasoned that the relatively low level of subjects in this study would benefit most by practice in listening discrimination, and that improvement in the ability to distinguish words in context would result in increased listening comprehension ability. The results appear to support this reasoning. The materials used by the text group included listening discrimination tasks such as gap-fill and dictation, as well as comprehension items generally more similar to those
found on the JACET Listening Test than the song group's gap-fill tasks. Although the song group performed as well as the text group on the final measure of listening comprehension, a combination of gap-fill tasks and comprehension questions based on the songs' contents may have increased the song group's scores enough to have made them statistically significant. In addition, it is possible that the motivational advantages posited for song-based tasks could not compensate for the difficulty lower proficiency subjects had with the speed, vocabulary, and abstract and poetic nature of songs. In fact, though the number of higher proficiency subjects in this study was small, one might conclude by looking at their mean scores and the interaction plot that higher proficiency students do better with songs.

Conclusion

The number of intervening variables present in a study of this nature, (i.e., outside exposure to English, methods of individual instructors, gender, time of day, classroom environment, seating arrangement, musical training, and aptitude) make it impossible to posit a direct causal relationship between the two methods and the improvement in listening ability. Tighter controls on these variables in future studies could reveal what specific advantages songs and music might have over non-musical listening tasks. Although the results should be considered more descriptive than inferential, teachers may interpret these findings as support for rejecting the idea that song use in the L2 classroom is limited to entertainment or mood enhancement and has little practical value. Moreover, it is apparent from students' responses to the follow-up questionnaire that they feel song listening exercises are beneficial and want to do them regularly.

It is likely that the use of music and songs in L2 classrooms would gain wider acceptance if there were more empirical research demonstrating positive effects on second language acquisition. Although this study concerned itself with listening ability, improvement in students' oral production (i.e., intonation, pronunciation, stress, vocabulary, and contracted forms) through study with music and songs needs further investigation. Studies measuring the gains achieved through use of song-based activities compared with gains made through conventional activities are needed in areas such as the retention of specific forms, and the application and accuracy of their use. In addition, further research into the cognitive and affective advantages of music and songs is necessary, particularly in the areas of the Din and SSIMH phenomena, right-brain/
left-brain theory, and the relationship between musical ability and language aptitude.
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Notes
1. See Murphey (1990a) Song and Music in Language Learning, and Music and Song (1992b) for lists of both ELT song books and books with activities to teach English through authentic songs.
2. For further discussion, see Kanel (1996, pp. 118-120).
3. Originally there were five levels assigned by the JACET test, S, A, B, C, D, with S being the highest. However, because there were only 14 subjects in the S category in the subject population, and their scores were so much higher than the other subjects in their treatment groups, their data was deleted from the database.
4. Since the JACET test is available only twice a year, May and November, the amount of time for treatment was limited to 14 weeks, not including the intervening two month summer break.

References


(Received December 21, 1996; revised April 24, 1997)
## Appendix A: Instructors, Song/Text Class Majors, Number of Subjects, Year in School, and Text Class Listening Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Song class major</th>
<th>$N$ Year</th>
<th>Text class major</th>
<th>$N$ Year</th>
<th>Text class listening material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashihara</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10 Minute Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujiwara</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10 Minute Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanazawa</td>
<td>Business Law</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10 Minute Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10 Minute Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawanishi</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Business</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10 Minute Listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimura</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Exercises from video tapescript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kusumoto</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Listening lessons from course text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Okuda</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Instructor created worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamamoto, E.</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Instructor created worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamamoto, T.</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Instructor created worksheets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>334</td>
<td></td>
<td>358</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Appendix B: List of Songs Used by the Song Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Artist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Love Me Tender</em></td>
<td>Elvis Presley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. <em>Imagine</em></td>
<td>John Lennon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. <em>Stand By Me</em></td>
<td>Ben E. King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <em>Yesterday Once More</em></td>
<td>The Carpenters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <em>Oh, Pretty Woman</em></td>
<td>Roy Orbison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <em>Tom’s Diner</em></td>
<td>Suzanne Vega</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <em>Honesty</em></td>
<td>Billy Joel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <em>Tears In Heaven</em></td>
<td>Eric Clapton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <em>I Will Always Love You</em></td>
<td>Dolly Parton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. <em>Help!</em></td>
<td>The Beatles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. <em>Time In A Bottle</em></td>
<td>Jim Croce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. <em>Are You Lonesome Tonight?</em></td>
<td>Elvis Presley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Sample Song Worksheet

*Love Me Tender* by Elvis Presley

Love me tender, love me (1)___________.
Never let me (2)_______________.
You have made my life (3)_____________,
And I love you (4)_______________.
*Love me tender, love me (5)_______________.
All my (6)______________ fulfill.
For my (7)______________ I love you.
And I (8)______________ will.
Love me tender, love me (9)_______________.
(10)________________ me to your heart.
For it's (11)______________ that I (12)_______________.
And we'll never (13)______________
Repeat *
Love me tender, love me (14)_______________.
Tell me you are (15)_______________.
I'll be yours through all the (16)_______________.
Till the end of (17)_______________.
Repeat *

Appendix D: Sample Background Sheet

Background: Elvis Presley

Elvis Presley, born in Mississippi in 1935, got his first guitar for his eleventh birthday. In his teens he listened to white country & western music and black rhythm & blues. His early singing style, called 'rock-a-billy,' combined both these types of music, and many listeners thought he was black at first. He worked as a truck driver until he signed a recording contract in 1954, and sang his first big hit, *Heartbreak Hotel*, on the *Ed Sullivan Show* in 1956. After two years in the army, from 1958 to 1960, Elvis appeared in movies during the 60s and 70s. He died of a heart attack in 1977 at the age of 42. *Love Me Tender*, from the movie of the same title, was recorded by Elvis in 1956.
Appendix E: Instructor Prepared Cloze-Dictation Worksheet

Listening Quiz (2)
Student no. ( ) Name ( )

Biological Clocks

Every (1 ) thing has what scientists call a biological clock that controls behavior. The biological clock tells plants when to form flowers and when the flowers should (2 ). It tells insects when to (3 ) the protective cocoon and fly away. And it tells animals and human beings when to (4 ), sleep and wake. It controls our (5 ) temperatures, the release of some hormones and even dreams. (6 ) outside the plant and animal affect the actions of some biological clocks. Scientists recently found, for example, that a (7 ) animal called the Siberian hamster changes the color of its fur because of the (8 ) of hours of daylight. In the short days of winter, its fur becomes (9 ). The fur becomes gray-brown in (10 ) in the longer hours of daylight in summer. Inner signals (11 ) other biological clocks. West German scientists found that some (12 ) of internal clock seems to order birds to (13 ) their long migration flights two times each year. Birds prevented from flying become restless when it is time for the (14 ). But they become (15 ) again when the time of the flight has ended.