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PREFACE

Simon Belasco (1971) states that "he was jolted by the realization that it is possible to develop so-called 'speaking' ability and yet be virtually incompetent in understanding the spoken language." There seems little evidence to support the transfer of learning from productive aspect to receptive aspect.

Instead, a growing body of evidence indicates that forcing students to speak before they have internalized the language, has detrimental effects on the acquisition of language competence.

Based on the evidence which indicates that shifting from a focus on speaking to a focus on listening is advantageous, the language learning process should be improved by the language teaching profession.

This paper is divided into five chapters. In Chapter I, after reviewing the foreign language instruction in Japan, I tried to present the problem that the language learning process should be shifted from a focus on speaking to a focus on listening. As the possible solution, two instructional strategies based on the concept of delayed oral response were taken up and proposed to be reexamined in Japan.

In Chapter II, the concept of delayed oral response is documented by summarizing what are the reactions against the audio-lingual approach, why delay of oral response is
considered important, how long the oral response is delayed, and what are the effects of this delay on the language learning process.

In Chapter III, the documented instructional strategies advocated in the United States are introduced with the research evidence.

In Chapter IV, the result of the experiments is reported and the conclusion for establishing a tentative program for listening-skill building is shown.

Chapter V is a lesson-by-lesson plan which is based on the result of the experiments described in Chapter IV.

I wish to express my hearty gratitude to Professor Shoroku Aoki for the guidance and encouragement he extended to me.

Tadashi Takahashi

December 1981
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ABSTRACT

The Ministry of Education issued *The Course of English* in 1952. The balanced knowledge of English based on the four skills with priority to oral skills was expounded in it. For that new phase of English education in Japan, American linguists played a significant role in introducing the Oral Approach based on the behaviorism and the structural linguistics.

Since the stimulus oriented methodologies were introduced, it has been claimed that practice in production is one of the best means of developing recognition. Many teachers in the profession at present seem to believe that the primary skill to be taught in foreign language is speaking. Many also seem to believe that the best way to learn to speak is to practice speaking. Some professionals in the past have even argued that speaking is one of the best ways to develop recognition or listening ability.

Charles C. Fries(1945), for example, expressed it like this:

> This recognition of the difference between productive and receptive controls of language does not imply a mechanical separation of the materials into "practices" in producing for the sake of production only, and "practices" in recognition for the sake of receiving only. As a matter of fact practice in production is one of the best means of developing recognition. (p.8)

However, this assumption that practice in production (speaking) is one of the best means of developing recognition (listening comprehension) is not a "matter of fact or data". There seems little empirical evidence to support the transfer
of learning from speaking to listening, from productive aspect to receptive aspect.

Instead, there are a number of studies that help create the idea of focusing on listening while developing the oral response as an alternative approach to foreign language teaching (Asher, 1969, Postovsky, 1971, Winitz, 1973). Some writers are now indicating that they have not found this type of transfer which Fries took for granted.

Simon Belasco (1971), for example, writes that he was "...jolted by the realization that it is possible to develop so-called 'speaking' ability (vocalizing) and yet be virtually incompetent in understanding the spoken language." The audio-lingual approach which Belasco used, has always placed listening first in the sequence of skills, but in practice this has largely been listening for speaking rather than listening for understanding. The basic idea has been for the student to imitate the sounds by immediately repeating them after they hear them. One of the causes of confusion may be understanding the role of imitation. Many consider language learning to be a form of imitation.

A growing body of evidence indicates that forcing students to speak before they have internalized the language, has detrimental effects on the acquisition of the language competence (Asher, 1969, Ervin, 1970, Postovsky, 1971, Winitz, 1973, Furguson, 1974, Gary, 1975). The requirement to respond orally immediately after one hears a native speaker's voice, as in the mimicry- memorization pattern practice of
the audio-lingual approach seems to reduce the retention of material. The reduction in retention may be due to the effects of stress, or it may be due to the lack of internal information processing. Or it may be due to both of them.

The advantages to shifting from a focus on speaking to a focus on listening are...1) the greater utility of listening over the other skills, 2) the greater positive transfer from listening to the other skills, 3) no negative transfer from speaking to other skills, and 4) the positive attitude even among those of lower aptitude for an approach which seems to them more effective.

When one recognizes the need for listening skills, it is necessary to build up a listening-skill program, through careful graded exposure just as it was felt necessary to build up the other skills by carefully graded exercise. There are two approaches recently advocated for listening-skill building in the United States: one is "The Total Physical Response Approach" by James J. Asher of San Jose State University, and the other is "The Optimized Habit Reinforcement" (its text is THE LEARNABLES) by Harris Winitz of the University of Missouri, Kansas City. They were examined through experiments in Japan.

In addition to this, by examining the indications that comprehension must be built in "chunks" or "pauses", a hypothetical gradation for listening comprehension would be proposed through the experiments on how chunks or pauses work on listening comprehension.
These empirical studies have been attempted with acute hope that much more attention should be paid to listening comprehension, and that drastic changes in English language education in Japan must be made. It should be established, for example, that the course primarily focuses on listening-skill building for a certain amount of time, especially at the very beginning stage.

Based on the conclusions derived from the experiments and the evidence advocated by psycholinguists or neuro-linguists, a tentative program for listening-skill building is described.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose for foreign language education should naturally be different in each country reflecting her political and social necessity, and also be varied as time goes on. We might roughly say that the origin of foreign language education in Japan started in the Meiji Era, approximately over a century ago. Judging from the situation at that time in Japan, we could imagine that the emphasis in foreign language instruction was placed on the written form of the language rather than sound form of the language in order to catch up with the cultural development in foreign countries. We tried hard to absorb the knowledge of technology, which was far advanced in European countries and the United States, through written form of the material.

But can we find the reason why the emphasis on receptive skill of reading remained for over a century in spite of the great social changes? One of the reasons which made a screen against the necessity of direct communication through the sound form of the language was the geographical isolation from other countries, especially far from English speaking countries. In addition to this, shifting from a focus on receptive skill to productive skill was affected by the isolationism we had experienced in the Edo Era and during the World War II.

Foreign Language instruction in Japan was constrained
by those external conditions, and what is worse was that the historical and social changes were disregarded by such internal conditions as methodologies brought in by the language instructors. Another reason we have to refer to here is the existence of English as a subject of entrance examination to the higher institutions, which played a role in maintaining the grammar-translation method.

In prewar Japan linguists of English on the whole followed Daniel Jones in phonetics, Otto Jespersen in general theory and grammar, and Harold E. Palmer in applied linguistics. Although Palmer made his best efforts, English linguistics in Japan was generally concerned with the written form of English.

In 1952, the Ministry of Education issued The Course of English in which balanced knowledge of English based on the four skills with priority to oral skills was expounded. For that new phase of English education in Japan, American linguists such as Fries, Twaddell, Marckwardt, Hill et al. played a significant role in introducing the Oral Approach based on the behaviorism and the structural linguistics. Pattern practice, contrastive studies of English and Japanese, and language laboratory developments were all introduced and emphasized by those linguists.

Through a long history of foreign language instruction, the attention has never been paid to English as a means of direct communication as today. Since the stimulus oriented methodologies were introduced, it has been claimed that
practice in production is one of the best means of developing recognition. Many teachers in the profession at present seem to believe that the primary skill to be taught in foreign language is speaking. Many also seem to believe that the best way to learn to speak is to practice speaking. Some professionals in the past have even argued that speaking is one of the best ways to develop recognition or listening ability.

Charles C. Fries (1945), for example, expressed it like this:

"This recognition of the difference between productive and receptive controls of language does not imply a mechanical separation of the materials into "practices" in producing for the sake of production only, and "practices" in recognition for the sake of receiving only. As a matter of fact practice in production is one of the best means of developing recognition." (p.8)

However, this assumption that practice in production (speaking) is one of the best means of developing recognition (listening comprehension) is not a "matter of fact or data." There seems little empirical evidence to support the transfer of learning from speaking to listening, from productive aspect to receptive aspect.

Instead, there are a number of studies that help create the idea of focusing on listening while developing the oral response as an alternative approach to foreign language teaching. Some writers are now indicating that they have

---

not found this type of transfer which Fries took for granted.  

Simon Belasco (1971), for example, writes that he was "...jolted by the realization that it is possible to develop so-called 'speaking' ability (vocalizing) and yet be virtually incompetent in understanding the spoken language." The audio-lingual approach which Belasco used, has always placed listening first in the sequence of skills, but in practice this has largely been listening for speaking rather than listening for understanding. The basic idea has been for the student to imitate the sounds by immediately repeating them after they hear them. One of the causes of confusion may be understanding the role of imitation. Many consider language learning to be a form of imitation.

A growing body of evidence indicates that forcing students to speak before they have internalized the language, has detrimental effects on the acquisition of language competence (Asher, 1969, Ervin, 1970, Postovsky, 1971, Winitz, 1973, Furguson, 1974, Gary, 1975, Bandura, 1977). The requirement to respond orally immediately after one hears a native speaker's voice, as in the mimicry-memorization pattern practice of the audio-lingual approach seems to reduce the retention of material. The reduction in retention

---

may be due to the effects of stress, or it may be due to the lack of internal information processing. Or it may be due to both of them.

There are numbers of studies which indicate that a listener needs time to process the information received (Locascio, 1972, Craik, 1973, Kappel et al., 1973). Much of this evidence indicates that the longer this processing takes, the greater the retention will be.

There are a number of advantages to shifting from a response oriented approach to a stimulus oriented approach, from a focus on speaking to a focus on listening. The advantages are summarized as follows:

1. the greater utility of listening over the other skills,
2. the greater positive transfer from listening to the other skills,
3. no negative transfer from speaking to other skills,
4. the positive attitude even among those of lower aptitude for an approach which seems to them more effective.

When one recognizes the need for listening skills, one may react by reexamining the audio-lingual procedure, in which a student is generally exposed to a great amount of listening opportunity, but an analysis indicates that it may not be very effective, because listening opportunity is not always equivalent to listening practice.

It is necessary to build up listening-skill, through careful graded exposure just as it was felt necessary to build up the other skills by carefully graded exercise. Therefore, this paper will focus primarily on the approaches
recently advocated for listening-skill building by two outstanding scholars in the United States; one is "The Total Physical Response Approach" by James J. Asher of San Jose State University and the other is "The Optimized Habit Reinforcement" (its text is THE LEARNABLES) by Harris Winitz of the University of Missouri, Kansas City. By examining these two approaches through experiments in Japan, it will be discussed whether they share the same result with those in the United States or not.

In addition to this, by examining the indications that comprehension must be built up in "chunks" or "pauses", a hypothetical gradation for listening comprehension would be proposed through the experiments on how chunks or pauses work on listening comprehension.

These empirical studies have been attempted with acute hope that much more attention should be paid to the listening comprehension, and that drastic changes in English language education in Japan must be made. It should be established, for example, that the course primarily focuses on listening-skill building for a certain amount of time; for one year, though it is undeterminable, especially at the very beginning stage.

By focusing our attention on listening comprehension and by delaying oral response, the language learning process can be improved by the language teaching profession. Also, the process can be made much more effective for the learner and far more enjoyable for both the teacher and the
student. In order to be on this stage, however, it will take more than one person's opinion based on those limited findings. It will take a massive movement of the entire profession to pay attention to the listening comprehension and to reexamine some of its most basic assumption.
CHAPTER II

THE BASIC CONCEPT OF DELAYED ORAL RESPONSE

A. The Reaction Against the Audio-Lingual Approach

In recent years cognitive psychologists have begun to challenge the basic principles of behavioristic theories of learning. Their theories rest upon neuro-psychological bases of thought and language, and as such are said to be mentalistic. Learning is not viewed as an array of conditioned responses to previously met stimuli, but as the acquisition and storage of knowledge. Behavioristic psychologists focus on the individual's response while cognitive psychologists emphasize the mental processes underlying that response.

The major complaints against the audio-lingual approach, in general, are as follows:

1. Claims that "New Key" procedures would produce bilingual graduates are not being realized.

2. Reliance upon only one sense modality in beginning language work may hinder some students who are more eye-oriented.

3. Teachers find it impossible to eliminate the mother tongue from the classroom; nor do they feel that such a practice is desirable.

4. Avoiding any discussion of grammar until the structure has been overlearned is time consuming and frustrating to the students.

5. The continuous repetition required for overlearning is monotonous to the students and places considerable physical strain upon the teacher.

---

Ausubel (1964)\(^2\) rejects the conditioning theory of learning saying, "...it is evident that the use of the conditioning paradigm to explain the process whereby representational meaning is acquired constitutes an unwarranted extension of principles that are valid for certain simple kinds of learning to a more complex task and qualitatively different kind of learning." Behavioristic theories, then, may explain simple levels of learning. However, they are not sufficiently encompassing to explain such complex processes as representational learning, i.e., the ability to symbolize the world through words.

In fact, the model for learning which Ausubel (1968)\(^3\) postulates is quite different from behavioristic techniques. He feels that the learning process must be one of "meaningful learning." Information acquired in a rote fashion, i.e., "arbitrarily and verbatim" is of little use to the learner and is quickly forgotten. The important criterion is whether the new knowledge can be incorporated, or "subsumed", into the learner's existing cognitive structure, i.e., what he already knows. In order for the learner to relate new material to what he has learned previously this material must be "relatable to his structure of knowledge on a nonarbitrary and nonverbatim basis." The implication


here is that the instructional materials should assist the student to understand all that he is to learn and to relate all new material to prior knowledge. This newly acquired knowledge must not be learned in an arbitrary or verbatim fashion. In other words, the student must be able, after learning, to state what he knows in his own terms. Ausubel (1968) again states that "the acquisition of large bodies of knowledge is simply impossible in the absence of meaningful learning."

The assumption based on behavioristic theories, has been that language is conditioned verbal behavior. However, many writers in language, psychology, and linguistics are now saying that language is much more complex than had been previously supposed. Spolsky (1966) draws an important distinction when he states, "Knowing a language involves not just the performance of language-like behaviors, but an underlying competence that makes such performance possible. By ignoring this, it has been easy to make exaggerated claims for the effectiveness of operant conditioning in second-language teaching." Chomsky (1966) questions the behavioristic interpretation of language learning saying, "...it seems to me impossible to accept the view that linguistic behavior


5 Bernard Spolsky, "A Psycholinguistic Critique of Programmed Foreign Language Instruction," IRAL, Vol.IV, 1966. p.120.

is a matter of habit, that it is slowly acquired by reinforcement, association, and generalization..."

It now appears that the infinite variety of possible communicative utterances in the native speaker's repertoire cannot be accounted for the basis of stimulus-response learning. Miller et al. (1960) say that if the conditionings of stimulus-response connections were the means of language acquisition, a childhood 100 years long without any interruption for sleeping, eating, etc., and a perfect retention of every string of twenty words after one presentation would be necessary to account for the language skill. McNeil (1965) seconds this notion and emphasizes the creative aspects of language when he explains, "The use of language resembles more writing a play than performing in one."

Ohmann (1969) points out that the native speaker is so familiar with his own language that he is likely to be aware of the complexity of the skill he possesses. He has the ability to comprehend and to use an infinite variety of sentences, many of them completely novel. To emphasize the complexity of language Ohmann uses as an example a situation in which twenty-five native speakers are asked to describe

---


a scene in which a tourist is waiting outside a telephone booth while a bear talks on the phone. A computer analysis of the twenty-five descriptions showed that they contain enough linguistic data for "19.8 billion sentences, all describing just one situation." He goes on to say that, "When one reflects that the number of seconds in a century is only 3.2 billion, it is clear that no speaker has heard, read, or spoken more than a tiny fraction of the sentences he could speak or understand, and that no one learns English by learning any particular sentences of English."

In addition to these reactions, more research evidence of the detrimental effects of the oral response in the audio-lingual approach will be described next.

B. Why Should Speaking Be Delayed?

An increasing evidence shows that speaking before having internalized the language has detrimental effects on language acquisition. The reduction of retention by the immediate reproduction may be due to the psychological causes as mentioned before. There are a number of studies which indicate that the depth of the cognitive processing of information received, closely relates to the retention (Craik, 1973, Locascio, 1972, Kappel et al., 1973, Furguson, 1974).

Action such as speaking right after hearing, as in the mimicry-memorization pattern practices of the audio-lingual approach seems to be detrimental to the depth of
processing the information received. The study of Craik (1973) is especially helpful in understanding this phenomenon. In one experiment the subjects were given a list of single words. About each word, they were asked one question, but not all of the questions were alike. There were five questions, each designed to force the learner to process the word at a greater "cognitive depth" than the question which preceded it.

In this experiment, it was assumed that each question would force the student to make a deeper decision about the word. The deeper decisions required some additional time, but this led to dramatically better performance on both a recognition task and on a recall task. Craik (1973) believes that when attention is diverted from an item that is in primary memory, "it will be lost from primary memory and will be forgotten....at a rate appropriate to its level of analysis."

In related experiments, some of the subjects were required to pronounce aloud the words in a list while other subjects only read the items silently or heard them spoken by the experimenter. The recall of both groups of subjects was compared. One report concluded that,

11 Ibid. p.51.
...it appears that the requirement of active vocalization at presentation interferes with effective coding operations. Active vocalization may demand more attention... The effect may not involve just the disruption of rehearsal strategies, but may instead lessen the selective attention capabilities that are necessary for effective encoding in memory. Thus, the advantages of hearing the word rather than pronouncing it oneself are mainly at the longer retention intervals, when the information in echoic memory has dissipated( Tell and Furguson, 1974).

In another study on associative reaction time in language acquisition, Ley and Locascio(1972) come to a similar conclusion.

...our research suggests that one must make associations to verbal materials during learning in order that the material can be later recalled and that some procedure such as repeatedly saying the material aloud interferes with the associative process, and therefore has a detrimental effect on learning.

Further support for the Craik position comes from another study which presents evidence that, "the nonvoiced items in a serial recall task were processed to a deeper level than the voiced items."( Kappel et al.,1973)

Craik has further evidence that the test of immediate recall such as occurs in mimicry-memory drills, is of little value in longer term memory storage and thus in retention of language competence. His key experiment began like many


others: subjects did free recall of word list, and the probability of recall for each word was plotted against its position in the series. As expected, when recall began immediately, the last few words in the list were the most likely to be recalled, that is, there was a strong recency effect. Many experimenters have used this type of evidence to suggest techniques for studying. Craik, however, went further. At the end of going through a number of lists, in this fashion, Craik then required the subjects to try to recall all of the words from all of the lists with which the subjects had dealt one at a time. This task produced a striking "negative recency effect". The very words which had occurred at the end of the individual lists and which had been strongest in immediate free recall now were least recalled. Craik (1973) interpreted this finding as showing that "words originally retrieved from primary memory were not well registered in the long term storage."

The experiments just reviewed were all done with native speakers of the language. We may not be able therefore to generalize to foreign language learning directly. However, by analogy, there seems to be much food for thought in these experiments, and it would seem even more closely related to foreign language teaching than even with one's native language.

One study by Oller (1971) may give us some clues of how these experiments related to second-language learning. He demonstrated that sentences are easier to learn if the student meets them in a meaningful context. One explanation for this may be that the meaningful context permits, indeed demands more complex processing. A short experiment by Asher may however be more to the point, but it adds another potential dimension not normally present with native speakers. Asher (1969) had two groups of students perform certain drill movements by command in Russian. He found that the students who merely performed the commands did so with a greater degree of reliability than those who first repeated the commands orally before performing the necessary movement. While the effects of voicing on retention as indicated by the previously reviewed experiments probably had some effects, Asher (1969) introduced the additional factor of stress as a factor in the retarding of listening fluency.

...the stress of trying to pronounce the alien utterance may retard listening fluency... The optimal strategy may be serial learning in which one achieves listening fluency just before one attempts to speak.

J. B. Biggs (1968) has pointed out that stress has an effect similar to that of voicing as found in the previously reviewed experiments.


18 Ibid. p. 13.

...when decisions are made under emotional or stressful conditions, immediate memory span capacity is effectively lowered. A convenient way of putting this is that the stress signals themselves occupy valuable immediate memory span space.

Meyers and Duham (1971) have also found that high anxiety appears to inhibit the use of memory span in the solution of concept problems. Further findings indicating the debilitating effects of anxiety are reported widely in the literature. The effects of anxiety and stress on the receptive skills such as listening comprehension are especially pertinent. Listening comprehension is basically a form of discrimination learning. Anxiety, often brought on by task overload can be major deterrent to any form of discrimination learning. The effects of anxiety on learning in general have been widely studied, and there seems to be a clear relationship between anxiety and stimulus generalization, the opposite of stimulus discrimination. Eysenck (1962) has put it this way,

...conditioning is related to anxiety for the simple reason that it has been shown conclusively that the ease with which a conditioned reflex is formed depends very much on the anxiety of the person on whom the experiment is being performed. What is more, there is a good deal of what is called "stimulus generalization" in the anxious person.

Discrimination learning is much more difficult for the anxious person. Listening comprehension is a complex


task all by itself and when speaking is added before this is thoroughly learned, then task overload results and this usually brings on anxiety. Even simple imitation, such as in the mimic-memory drills, is a complex task and can create task overload in a beginning student. Ervin-Tripp(1970) has put it this way.

At a minimum, it can be shown that imitation requires perception, storage, organization of output, and motor output. In addition, before the storage phase, there will be interaction if the material is interpretable.

As the requirement to speak exceeds simple imitation and extends to "situational dialogues" and on further to "free conversation", it can create task overload even for the more advanced student. The consequence of this is to push the student back to the habit formations he knows best, his own language. As Gaier(1952) expressed it this way,

...it leads to an impairment in the ability to improvise in an unstructured and/or new situation. This results in stereotyped, habitual and familiar approach that may be maladaptive in the situation.

The requirement to speak extensively under stressful conditions may be a major cause in developing habits of mixed language usage. It can happen even in good speakers if they are put under too much stress. It can happen to highly trained pilots and astronauts if they are put


under enough pressure and under conditions of task overload. In a study which reviewed a large number of experimental reports within the aerospace industry, Greer et al. (1972) pointed out that when a subject is task overloaded, errors increase and there is a tendency to revert to previously learned generalizations rather than make the specific distinctions required at that point. If task overload can do that to a trained astronaut, what might task overload do to a beginning foreign language learner.

Palmer (1925) indicated many years ago why stress and anxiety may be a factor in foreign language teaching when premature public response is called for. He points out that stress may not come just from the actual public statement, but just from expecting that he might be asked to produce publicly.

Failures tend to drop out. Mueller and Leutenegger (1964) have documented the effects of an intensive oral approach on drop out. By contrast, the report by Ingram, Nord and Dragnet (1975) documents the reduction of drop out


when a delay of oral response approach is tried.

Now it is true that some people have survived the immediate repeat back, mimic-memory approach. There are successes as well as failures using this approach. Indeed, some people have become quite successful learners of the language using this approach. Why have some been successful, while other have not.

Bandura's (1977) concept of efficacy expectation may help explain this phenomenon. "An efficacy expectation is the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required..." He goes on to point out that actually accomplishing the behavior required has powerful effects on the efficacy expectation. But he also points out that failure to perform can have very detrimental effects.

Performance accomplishments provide the most dependable source of efficacy expectations because they are based on one's own personal experiences. Successes raise mastery expectations; repeated failures lower them, especially if the mishaps occur early in the course of events. (p.81)

The result of early success in repeating phrases in the foreign language then creates a feeling of more success to come in speaking the foreign language. But early failure to speak correctly can create a feeling of further failure to come. Since the anticipation of failure tends to create stress and anxiety, and this in turn, as we have indicated, makes learning even more difficult, there is created a

self-fulfilling prophecies. It's a sort of deviation amplification where "the rich get richer and the poor get poorer." Bandura points out why this efficacy expectation is important. It helps the students over the rough spots.

Efficacy expectations determine how much effort people will expend, how long they will persist in the face of obstacles and aversive experiences. The stronger the efficacy or mastery expectations, the more active the efforts. Those who persist in performing activities that are subjectively threatening but relatively safe objectively will gain corrective experiences that further reinforce their sense of efficacy thereby eventually eliminating their fears and defensive behavior. Those who give up prematurely will retain their self-debilitating expectations and fears for a long time. (p. 80)

While we may glory in our successful language learners, an analysis of the failures might prove far more useful in improving our language teaching. Stress brought on by task overload which has been created by speaking—that beginning students speak before they are ready—may be one major cause of failure in foreign language teaching today. A major improvement in the teaching of foreign languages may be achieved by focusing on the reduction of stress producing circumstances and the promotion of self-confidence in every student of his ability to learn the language. This seems to be the central message in the literature on suggestopedia (Racle, 1979). One approach which may help your students to build continually successful steps of learning from beginning to end is to tell the beginning language learner...

not to speak, but to listen.

As some of the dangers of forcing students to speak before they are ready become apparent, and as some of the advantages of delaying oral response until the student can speak from an initial structure rather than an external model, become recognized, another question normally arises.

C. How Long Should Speaking Be Delayed?

At present there seems to be no definitive empirical evidence to reveal the fact of how long the time lag between listening and speaking should be. There are, however, some case studies which, while widely variant, may give some clues. Asher (1972) reports that after some 16 hours of classroom instruction using the Total Physical Response strategy, the students indicated a desire to speak and he then let the students manipulate the teacher through commands. In another publication, however, he recommends that "for at least one semester in college or six months to a year in high school, the goal of foreign language learning should be listening fluency only." The listening fluency, he goes on to explain, should be so keen that the student visits the country, he could understand almost anything he hears on the street, on television, or on the radio. He felt


that when this level of comprehension was achieved, the student would be ready for a graceful and nonstressful transition to speaking. Winitz and Reeds (1973) also agree with this general position.

It is a well documented fact that comprehension precedes speaking in the child...We regard this sequence of development--comprehension first, production second--a functional property of the human brain, which should not be violated in language instruction. Therefore, we take the point of view that foreign language instruction should discourage speaking until a high degree of comprehension is achieved, that is, until the student can understand a non-technical conversation and decode it with ease.

Palmer (1925) in recommending a period of three to six months before encouraging, points out that if the active oral response phases,

...are entered upon prematurely( e.g. before the pupils have received adequate ear training and articulation exercises ), pronunciation; if they are unduly postponed, there is a possibility of the pupils chafing at the delay and having their ardour damped. The skillful and sympathetic teacher, however, will generally be able to keep his silent class of pupils alert and interested for at least six months.

Postovsky (1971) in his first major experiment using the delayed oral response approach, discouraged speaking for about 120 contact hours. The success of this experiment encouraged him to design another in which oral response


33 H.E. Palmer, 1925. op. cit. pp. 70-71.

was discouraged for 180 hours, and then speaking was introduced only gradually—no more than 25 minutes out of a six hour day at first, and finally up to 90 minutes out of a six hour day at the end of course.

In the intensive Russian Language Course at Michigan State University, the students first began to speak spontaneously in Russian after about 40 hours of instruction in listening comprehension. The instructors of the course allowed the students to use Russian when they wanted, but they did not encourage or expect all of the students to speak in Russian until after the first term or about 90 classroom hours of instruction.

In addition to such anecdotal information, there also seems to be some value in examining the question from a theoretical point of view. In a seminal paper, K. Pike (1960) introduced the foreign language teaching profession to the concept of nucleation. Pike used the concept of nucleation, which he borrowed from physics, and by analogy applied it to foreign language teaching. It is a concept which seems central to the question of how long one should wait before encouraging productive use of the language. Pike applies the principle of nucleation to language


36 F. Ingram, J.R. Nord and D. Dragt, 1975. op. cit.

learning as follows:

As it is difficult for the first few molecules to cluster together in physical nucleation, so it is difficult for a person learning a foreign language to learn his first few words... Some persons memorized long lists of vocabulary items, and even extensive rules of grammar, without being able to speak the language. One might say that their learning is in a supersaturated condition, without nucleation. That is, though they have many of the elements necessary for a conversation, they cannot in fact handle these. Specifically, they lack the structure, the "crystallization"—which gives a characteristic patterning to sentences and conversations...

Psychological nucleation in reference to language would seem to be accompanied by a feeling of "naturalness" of language use. An individual with psychological language nucleation does not have to be instructed to "think" in the language—he is already thinking in the language the moment he has nucleation. Nucleation here is not at all dependent upon the extent of the vocabulary which he has mastered, nor accuracy, but upon the capacity to use a small set of forms in a natural way automatically in a natural context.

Belasco (1965) using Pike's concept of nucleation to language learning tried to make the concept more explicit.

The student is never a nucleated language student until he has completely mastered the sound patterns, the sandhi variation patterns and basic syntactic patterns... When he can reconstitute acceptable utterances based on these patterns so that they are readily understood by a native speaker, then he has reached the nucleation stage for speaking. When he can understand at normal speed any recombination of these verb forms and vocabulary items in the same (or similar) syntactic structures he has learned to control orally, he will have reached the nucleation stage for audio-comprehension.

Belasco was of course speaking from the audio-lingual position of the times, putting speaking first, and relating nucleation for audio-comprehension to nucleation for speaking. Because of his experience with the lack of transfer from speaking to listening, he seemed to feel that each skill

must therefore have its own nucleation point or procedure. Yet he still was open minded enough to raise the question about the potential of nucleation for listening comprehension transferring to speaking. Belasco (1965) put it this way.

It would seem then that each skill must be developed separately. Nucleation for speaking does not guarantee nucleation for audio-comprehension. Whether the converse is true still has to be determined by controlled experimentation.

It is with the converse assumption that nucleation for listening comprehension can transfer to the other performance skills that the research on the "listening first" approach is all about.

D. The Effects of Delaying Oral Response

The research cited so far all tends to provide confirming experimental evidence that the development of listening fluency does transfer to other skills. It would appear that once nucleation has occurred for listening, then it also seems available for speaking. Postovsky (1971) discovered this when he was first involved with a Russian course for stenographers. The course was primarily one of listening to Russian and writing down what was said. While the teaching itself required no speaking, Postovsky was surprised near the conclusion of the course to discover
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that the "stenographers" could not only listen to and write Russian, they could also speak it even though they had never "practiced" it. What startled Postovsky the most, however, was that in conversations between the "stenographers" and the students from his audio-lingual class, the "stenographers" often spoke Russian with better pronunciation and with fewer grammatical mistakes than the members of his regular audio-lingual class who had been practicing speaking from the very first day. It was largely as a result of this experience that Postovsky began his experiments in delayed oral response.

Postovsky set about to test the effect of replacing oral response with written response during first four weeks of the Defense Language Institute's Russian course. Students were tested for language aptitude and matched in random pairs between an experimental group and a control group. All told, there were about 100 experimental students and 100 control students, none of whom had any previous exposure to Russian. The sole difference in the experimental procedure was to delay the introduction of oral practice until after the fourth week. During the first three days the experimental students were provided some pronunciation practice to establish the association between Russian sounds and symbols, but commencing with the fourth day all students responses were in writing. Instead of pronunciation practice, instead of memorizing daily dialogues
for oral recitation, and instead of engaging in oral pattern response drills, the experimental students responded during the four-week pre-vocal phase entirely in writing.

The development of writing skill from the very beginning of the course was considered important for two reasons. First, it provided students with a meaningful mode of response during the pre-vocal phase of instruction; and second, it was believed that there is a high degree of positive transfer from writing to speaking since both skills are productive.

The contact hours were approximately 120. The same audio-lingual materials and essentially the same cycle of instruction was followed in both the control group and in the experimental group.

After four weeks the experimental group commenced oral drill and the methodology for both the experimental group and the control group was identical. At the end of six weeks and twelve weeks tests were administered to the students from both groups to measure the four basic skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. On the basis of these tests, Postovsky(1971) was able to make the following conclusions:

1. In learning Russian, adult students develop better overall language proficiency when oral practice is delayed in the initial phase of instruction, provided, however, that this pre-vocal period is devoted to training in aural comprehension and written practice from spoken input.

2. There is high positive transfer of learning from writing to speaking, provided again that written practice is from spoken input.

3. In the initial phase of instruction, when written practice from spoken input is compared with oral practice of the same drill material, written practice develops better control of grammatical structure.

4. Introduction of the writing system (Cyrillic alphabet) prior to intensive pronunciation practice does not create a greater problem of graphic interference than the reverse sequence of presentation normally creates.

The conclusions drawn by Postovsky are similar to those of the rest of the experimenters (Asher, Gary, Ingram, Winitz) who have focused on the delay of oral response at the beginning of foreign language teaching. Postovsky, however, used an entirely different response system; he used the response system in writing instead of oral response. How could we differentiate the relation between the response system in writing and in speaking? They have a strong correlation in terms of productive aspect of language. Precisely speaking, the response in writing would not be necessarily a way appropriate to delaying oral response.

However, there are some profitable aspects of the language instruction, as Postovsky proved, in the response system in writing. From the neurolinguistic point of view, the response system in writing may play a different part of the productive aspect, as Diller (1978) states that "it seems

clear that very different neural pathways and mechanisms are employed by students using different methods of language teaching."

No matter how different the response system is, at the point that both Postovsky and Asher avoided the oral response, they are coincidental. And the reports of Postovsky consistently come to the similar conclusion drawn by Asher. Listening transfers to speaking, and the speaking which results is generally better than that of those who practice speaking from the beginning. In addition, several studies document the transfer process from listening comprehension to reading (Asher, 1972, Asher, Kusudo and DelaTorre, 1974, Winitz, Reeds and Garcia, 1977).

Based on the concept of the delayed oral response, what response system should be considered next to validate the recognition instead of the oral response? The new methodologies with other response systems instead of the oral response will be described in the following chapter.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGIES BASED ON THE CONCEPT OF DELAYED ORAL RESPONSE

The concept of delayed oral response is described in the previous chapter with the research evidence which shows that in the initial stage of foreign language teaching discouraging oral response is effective not only for listening but also for the other skills. Based on this concept, two remarkable methods were advocated in the United States; one is "The Total Physical Response Approach" by James J. Asher of San Jose State University and the other is "The Optimized Habit Reinforcement" (its text is THE LEARNABLES) by Harris Winitz of the University of Missouri, Kansas City.

A. The Total Physical Response Approach (abbreviated to TPR)
A-1. Historical View of the TPR

In order to avoid oral response, Asher used physical response, while Winitz used pictorial response. From the methodological point of view, the physical response to the audio-stimulus could be situated in the stream of the audio-motor approach.


When we look back, the language-teaching methods from the viewpoint of the audio-motor approach, the Natural Method by Gouin, Berlitz, et al., the Oral Method by Palmer, and the Graded Direct Method by Richards (there are some others, but not worth touching upon here) would be included in the same category. It is evident that the so called "Direct Method" implied filling up the deficiency in the "Grammar-Translation Method", was based on the "Natural Method" advocated mainly by Francois Gouin (1831-1895) and Maximilian Delphinus Berlitz (1852-1921) in the nineteenth century. Among the advocates of a similar type of the language teaching method such as Henry Sweet, Otto Jespersen, et al., Gouin and Berlitz played the most important part.

The "Natural Method" advocated by Gouin has a number of controversial elements today. One of them is, as Palmer pointed out, that the "Natural Method" is not a method appropriate to the adult learners. But what both Gouin and Palmer shared was the contextual texts they used. That is, it could be observed that there was a strong correlation between the "Linguistic Series" asserted by Gouin and the "Action Chain" by Palmer. In addition to this, the point which we cannot disregard is that both of them paid
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attention to the idea of the demonstrations performed not only by the teachers themselves but also by the students. Although Palmer also paid attention to the demonstration, almost all the teaching materials chosen by Gouin were concerned with the demonstrations performed in the classroom.

Developing the idea of the demonstration, and based on the "Basic English" by C.K. Ogden (1889-1957), I.A. Richards cultivated the "Graded Direct Method" in this direction with the help of C. Gibson. A large number of audio-visual aids are also used in this method.

Following the "Graded Direct Method", a completely new method which primarily focused on listening comprehension with the physical response, not with the oral response, to the audio-stimulus, was advocated not by a linguist but by a psychologist. It is the "Total Physical Response" approach that is advocated by James J. Asher. The TPR is based on the data derived from the psycholinguistic studies and enough experiments, while Gouin Method was not. Thus, the stream of the audio-motor approach is succeeded by the TPR with the different response system from others.

---


A-2. The Method and Techniques

Traditional teaching methods do work if people stay in a program long enough, but they are highly stressful for all but the most linguistically gifted and highly motivated because the methods rely so heavily on verbal discourse, an instructional strategy geared to the left hemisphere of the brain. For example, in exercises designed to teach someone to speak a language the instructor might use such phrases as "Listen and repeat after me", or "Memorize this dialogue", or "Pronounce these words". All are excellent procedures for advanced students but traumatized most beginners so thoroughly that roughly 98 percent do not go beyond the first two years of study.

That trauma, he has discovered in his research, is unnecessary if students learn a second language the way infants learn their native language. As early as 1929, psychologists observed that infants will not talk before they are ready and that no amount of coaxing, rewarding, or teaching by the parents will help. Yet, for many months before infants talk--while they are still mute except babbling--they have constructed an intricate map for understanding the noises they hear from people.

Jean Piaget suggested that infants internalize a


map of how their language works by constructing reality through such motor behavior as touching, reaching, grasping, and crying. He believes that if adults (and children, too) want to acquire a second language without stress, they should construct a reality in the new language parallel to the one they created as infants. This parallel reality is created when an instructor speaks the foreign language to direct physical responses: "Stand up. Walk over to Nancy, and dance with her." The physical behavior seems to be governed by the right hemisphere of the brain.

Asher calls this right-brain learning the Total Physical Response approach to acquiring another language. The TPR's sensorimotor method seems to work for both adults and children, and for all of the languages.

With most methods of language instruction, teachers communicate the meaning of a foreign word or phrase by explaining it in the native language. That creates a problem: if students hear the instructor explain that "stand up" in English means "tate" and "sit down" means "suware", do they internalize the meaning of the words?

For most students, the answer is definitely "No". There are a number of complex reasons for that, but one of the strongest is that students have already stored thousands of experiences that contradict the teacher's assertion that "sit" means "suware", "stand up" means "tate", and "run" means "hashire". The students know from long personal experience that "suware" means "suware", "tate" means "tate",
and "hashire" means "hashire". What is more, everyone else in the room believes that those are right words for describing those actions.

The student will understand what was said for a moment, especially if the teacher points to objects or translates, but the memory is short term. There will be no long-term memory for most people because the utterances are not believable. The critical thinking of the left hemisphere, he believes, evaluates the utterances as noises that have no validity. Therefore, there is no reason to store them in long-term memory.

With the TPR approach, students reenact the developmental stages that an infant experiences in acquiring a first language, but at a speeded-up pace. For example, if the target language is English, the students construct their reality in English by being silent but following directions uttered by the instructor in English.

Most books written for students learning another language begin at a rather high level of abstraction. For example, they may start with such conversational phrases as, "Good morning. It's a beautiful day today. How are you feeling?" Although such sentences seem simple and transparent to the native speaker, the learner finds them quite abstract and difficult to understand. It is also better to delay teaching abstractions such as liberty, honor, or justice until students have achieved a firmer grasp on the structure of the language by using concrete
words: "chair", "table", "paper". With that done, abstractions can be taught as vocabulary, using flash cards with the foreign word on one side and its Japanese equivalent on the other.

Another method is to delay the abstract concept until a more advanced stage of training, when it can be understood in a specific context. A third method is to test understanding of an abstract concept by making it contingent upon a physical action. The mistake is to introduce abstractions too early. If a word is not learned in a few trials, students are not ready to learn it.

A session starts with students seated on either side of the instructor. The instructor says "Stand up" and stands up, as do the students; then the instructor says "Sit down", and everyone sits down. Next, "Stand up" again, everyone stands. Likewise, with the instructor as a model, the students walk, stop, turn, and run. Afterward, each student individually has a chance to perform in response to directions uttered in English. The directions begin with one-word utterances such as "Stand up", "Sit down", "Run", "Stop", and "Squat", but within minutes a skillful instructor can achieve near-perfect long-term comprehension for utterances such as "Stand. Walk to the chalkboard and write your name," or "Walk to me. Give me the chalk, return to your seat and sit down."

Since use of the imperative makes second-language acquisition accessible and enjoyable for both children
and adults, Asher calls it the "golden tense" and uses it whenever possible. He has found that most of the grammatical features of any language can be nested in the imperative.

At later sessions, students expand their comprehension of the new language as the patterns become more sophisticated. Within 20 hours of such training, most students are ready to reverse roles and begin to speak the language --to utter English commands to manipulate the behavior of the instructor and other students. Their pronunciation is far from perfect. As with an infant learning a first language, there will be many distortions, but gradually pronunciation improves. In that respect, children have the advantage over adults; studies have shown, for example, that Cubans who immigrated to America before puberty were likely to eventually acquire a near-native pronunciation. Cubans who entered at a later age rarely did so, no matter how many years they lived in America.

A-3. The Results of the Experiments

Dr. Asher's experiments on his TPR approach show us some of the effectiveness of learning through so called 'speech activity':

- Experiment 1 -

The subjects were 36 volunteer college students who had no prior training or exposure to Russian.

The experimental group (N=18) was taught Russian through the TPR approach, while the control group (N=18), which was significantly higher at the 0.05 level on the Otis Mental Ability Test, watched the teacher's demonstrative actions while listening to Russian produced on a tape recorder. The learning time was the same for both groups. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit I</th>
<th>XE</th>
<th>XC</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Recall</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>19.37</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.77 NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-Hour Recall</td>
<td>30.57</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>0.68 NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit II</th>
<th>XE</th>
<th>XC</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Recall</td>
<td>47.44</td>
<td>42.39</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48-Hour Recall</td>
<td>49.61</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit III</th>
<th>XE</th>
<th>XC</th>
<th>OE</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate Recall</td>
<td>64.83</td>
<td>56.53</td>
<td>8.65</td>
<td>11.65</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Week Recall</td>
<td>94.89</td>
<td>81.47</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>15.38</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E = experimental group  C = control group
Unit I = short and one-word sentences
Unit II = such sentences as "Pick up the pencil and the book."
Unit III = mainly longer sentences

Another experiment following the same method in which Japanese was used as a target language also shows the high efficiency of this approach.

Judging from the data mentioned above, we notice that the more complicated the sentences, the more effective this approach is; and it effects a longer retention than the non-physical response methods.

- Experiment 2 -

A comparison of the 'speech activity method' with the traditional one is reported in "Children's First Language as a Model for Second Language Learning" (1972). The experimental group (N=11) consisted of adults aged 30 through 60 years, who learned German through the TPR for 8 weeks (about 40 hours). Control group 1 (N=13) consisted of university students who learned in regular university classes for a year (about 54 hours), and control group 2 (N=13) was composed of students who followed a two-year university course in German (more than 80 hours). In spite of the fact that the experimental group was inferior to the two groups in the results of the Modern Language Aptitude Test (95:104, 95:126), and besides the disadvantages mentioned above, it showed a higher efficiency in mastering aural comprehension at the 0.01 and the astonishing 0.0005 level than control group 1, and at the 0.005 level than control group 2 (Table 2 and 3). As for reading ability, although the experimental group had not been taught systematically, that group's aural comprehension ability was apparently also transferred to reading. (They used only cards, on which German words were written together with their meaning, in place of using real things and models during the learning through the TPR approach.)
Table 2  Comparison with Control group 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_E$</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_{C1}$</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_E$</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_{C1}$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>48.15</td>
<td>43.46</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>31.09</td>
<td>30.92</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listening 1 = Aural comprehension test on 58 unknown separate items (true-false type), but words were known.

Listening 2 = Aural comprehension test about an unknown story (testing items = 10, true-false type).

Reading = Reading test on 37 unknown separate items (true-false type).

Table 3  Comparison with Control group 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_E$</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_{C2}$</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_E$</th>
<th>$\bar{x}_{C2}$</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>57.91</td>
<td>48.77</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>64.85</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests were given on 7 unknown stories for both listening and reading. Testing items were 70 for each (true-false type).

- Experiment 3 -

Contrary to general opinions, the audio-motor method has proved to be effective with adults as well as with children, or more favorable in the case of former. A study by Asher and Price(1967) shows that adults can achieve a significantly higher score than children at the 0.005 level. In order to explain a well-known fact that children abroad are better than adults to learn a foreign language,

many psychologists have quoted the theory of "imprinting" (Hess, 1958) or neurological differences between adults and children (Penfield and Robert, 1959), but Asher, as another possibility, suggests the facts that children unintentionally use the technique of a total physical response while their parents do not.

A-4. The Efficiency of the TPR Approach

In order to reveal the reason why the TPR approach is effective, we have to consider the relation between the listening comprehension and the physical response to the audio-stimulus.

As for the listening comprehension process, Pimsleur (1971) postulated a tentative model of sentence perception, based on the contributions by Broadbent, 1958, Denes, 1963, and Fodor & Bever et al., as follows:

---


1. Sensory Input
2. Filter Device
3. Echoic Memory
4. Analysis-Synthesis
5. Rehearsal
6. Short-Term Memory
7. Permanent Memory

The idea of the listening comprehension stages advocated by Rivers (1970) also seems to be included in this model of listening comprehension process postulated by Pimsleur. Since these experimental studies mentioned above suggest that, contrary to the traditional idea, the primary units of speech perception are phonemes, listening is an active process: we perceive speech by actively generating a parallel message and matching it grammatically with the auditory input.

Recent neurolinguistics is revealing the fact that there seems to be a correlation among listening comprehension, rhythmic units of speech, and rhythmic movement of muscle (Allen, Donovan & Darwin, Lehiste, Studdert-Kennedy, 1979). Turvey (1980), for example, states in the research on signed and spoken language that "the form of both movement and language may rest with common physical

---


principles." But further studies are required to prove it. The student's body movement in the audio-motor approach is also an active work. And it will be possible to think that, being synchronized with the language input, the body movement accelerates the chunking process, and promotes the assimilation of cognitive map of the linguistic code of the target language.

The efficiency of the TPR approach, as Asher himself and other researchers state, is that it has the learners

1 concentrate on listening comprehension by the avoidance of oral response,
2 escape from the psychological task-overload,
3 reinforce the analogy,
4 increase the amount of association,
5 deepen the cognition, and
6 expand the span of retention.

Another important reason is that even slow learners positively participate in an English class, in other words, the learners can be highly motivated by this approach.

B. The Optimized Habit Reinforcement (OHR)

This approach is another one which avoids oral response in the initial stage of language instruction, and stems from the appreciation for child language studies, and the psychology of acquisition and retention. A set of principles developed by Winitz, et al. will be summarized

---

as follows:

B-1. Comprehension

Mothers do not expect their children to speak in sentences or even single words as soon as they show the slightest glimmer of understanding. Rather, mothers are happy that their children understand simple instructions and commands, often demonstrating comprehension with non-verbal behavior, and accept the fact that interesting conversations are a long way off. The research evidence by many suggests that language comprehension precedes language production, but not necessarily because these two processes reflect different grammatical functions. In speaking, retrieval from storage is more complex than in comprehension: speech production appears to be a recall function, whereas speech comprehension implies a recognition. As the research of Asher (1972) indicates that speaking is not required until a high degree of comprehension is achieved, this program requires no drill in speaking or reading.

B-2. Chunking

The classic work of Miller (1956) shows the short-term memory of humans to be 7 ± 2 units. Short-term memory is a critical component for decoding language. Without any


acquaintanceship with a foreign language, the short-term memory would be restricted to about eight units. With the basic finding of Miller, this program restricts the length of the sentences to no more than eight words until all of the base structure (Chomsky, 1965) are understood well. The vocabulary items included are perhaps about 3000 content words and all function words. The only deviation from base structures will be the following: w-questions, prepositional phrases, conjunctions, pronoun substitutions, and adj. + N.

B-3. Pronunciation

Vernon (1970) takes the position that deaf children whose hearing is so poor as not to permit the reception of auditory signals, develop little speech, especially if non-oral training methods are denied. This position holds that children who hear only an impoverished set of language stimuli, as may be the case for children with severe hearing losses, are unable to learn complex grammatical rules, and that speech will not develop adequately until after language becomes internalized. Based on Vernon's position, pronunciation is avoided until syntax and semantics are well learned in this program.


B-4. Problem Solving

Language improvement programs which may be involved in the altering of dialects and clinical language programs which have as their goal the upgrading of structural competence, stress little an ingredient essential to learning language. The ingredient is called problem solving. Problem solving in this program refers to the induction of grammatical rules. Induction is accelerated by providing students with minimal differences in sentence structure or grammatical markers. The scheme, therefore, is to provide the student with a great number of minimal contrasts, and he must learn to associate picture with grammatical marker. As he is doing this, he is not asked to speak, only to understand the grammatical markers.

B-5. Reinforcement

There are many theorists, McNeil (1970) among them, who believe reinforcement has little or no effect on language acquisition. This is because reinforcement has been viewed in terms of what mothers say to their children and not how they act to their children. Mothers tend not to correct their child's speech, but they do react in other more meaningful ways (Winitz and Reeds, 1973).


Until the role of reinforcement in native language acquisition is more fully understood it is important to recognize that second language routines and clinical programs based on the premise that speech is essential to the learning of language usually result in high error rates. However, the experiment with second language teaching, in which speaking is avoided, indicates that the error rate is less than 5%. Surely such a low error rate, which results in considerable reinforcement is a vital contributor to rapid language acquisition.

B-6. Techniques

The learner is asked only to look at pictures and listen to sentences. Initially, single words are taught, then short sentences are introduced through careful sequencing of sentence patterns. Each sentence corresponds to a picture, as illustrated in the textbook entitled THE LEARNABLES.

By examining these two approaches above mentioned through experiments conducted in Japan, it will be discussed whether they share the same result with those in the United States or not in the succeeding chapter.
CHAPTER IV

THE EXPERIMENTS

The data described in the previous chapter was obtained in the United States, and suggested that TPR and OHR were effective. In order to obtain a clue to establish a program of listening comprehension skill building in the course of foreign language teaching in Japan, they have to be examined as to whether or not they are effective also in Japan.

The following experiments described in this chapter were conducted for the purpose of

1 establishing a listening comprehension program in Japan,

2 obtaining a methodological clue for listening comprehension, (EXPERIMENT 1 & 2)

3 checking how chunks or pauses work on listening comprehension, (EXPERIMENT 3 & 4)

4 proving that TPR and OHR are effective in regular junior high school classes in Japan, while almost all the experiments previously reviewed were conducted in the intensive style of the course in the United States.

- EXPERIMENT 1 - ...conducted in Kinryo Junior High School

The subjects were 82 junior high school students who had exposure to English for one year in regular junior high school classes. The experimental group (N=41) was taught English through the TPR approach, while the control group (N=41) was taught through the traditional one.
No significant difference between the experimental group and the control group was seen by the Kyodai NX Mental Ability Test ($E = 108.15$, $C = 108.19$). The learning time was the same for both groups (10 hours). The teaching material adopted in this experiment was the "passive voice". The result is shown in TABLE 1.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>$\bar{X}_E$</th>
<th>$\bar{X}_C$</th>
<th>$\bar{G}_E$</th>
<th>$\bar{G}_C$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>11.85</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>NS(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit I</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>NS(0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit II</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit III</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>8.76</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>NS(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit IV</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>NS(0.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unit I = Comprehension test about the situation in which the form of the passive voice is available. (multiple choice type, choosing 6 items out of 10)

Unit II = Aural comprehension test on 8 separate items. (multiple choice type)

Unit III = Reading test on 11 separate items.

Unit IV = Writing test on 11 separate items such as translation type and writing-about-picture type.

Judging from the result of the experiment which was carried out in Japan, we noticed that the experimental group showed a higher efficiency in aural comprehension at the 0.05 level than the control group, while reading and writing, and in total items it also showed favorable results.

As for the reason why the TPR approach is effective, as previously mentioned, it has the learners reinforce the analogy, increase the amount of association, deepen
the cognition, expand the span of retention and positively participate in.

- EXPERIMENT 2 -

The following experiment was carried out aiming at
1 revealing the fact that forcing the learners to repeat right after hearing, results in detrimental effect in listening comprehension,

2 seeing how THE LEARNABLES work over the students who have not been exposed to English, after they have the regular English class in junior high school. (a follow up survey is going on)

The subjects were 16 six-year-class boys and girls in elementary schools. "L" group (N=8) was given an instruction not to repeat after listening to the sound of English, but to concentrate on understanding what was said. "L+R" group (N=8) was told to repeat in a loud voice. The material used in this experiment was THE LEARNABLES (from Lesson 1 to Lesson 10). The result of the experiment is shown in TABLE 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tests</th>
<th>1st</th>
<th>2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>4th</th>
<th>5th</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L group</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L+R group</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1st test = Lesson 1 & 2, 2nd test = Lesson 3 & 4, 3rd test = Lesson 5 & 6, 4th test = Lesson 7 & 8, 5th test = Lesson 9 & 10

All were aural comprehension tests with multiple choice type. Judging from the data mentioned in TABLE 2, it is apparent that the longer sentences they hear, the more detrimental is the effect of immediate repetition.
One of the interesting findings from this data is, if the sentences (or words or phrases) they hear are short enough to cope with, the well-known fact that speaking right after hearing has a detrimental effect was not proved by this experiment.

- EXPERIMENT 3 -

It is not definitive but considerably well-documented that the unit of speech perception is not a phoneme, but a much longer chunk; say, a unit of phrase structure or the immediate constituent of a sentence. Taking this evidence into consideration, the following experiment was attempted in order to obtain an insight into the grading system in listening-skill building.

The 120 subjects divided into four groups were chosen out of 169 so as to form the same group in quality. Every group (G1, G2, G3, G4, N=30) was given an aural comprehension test about an unknown story (testing items = 5, answering in Japanese). The unknown story was presented to each group by separate type of reading as follows:

1. Type 1 = 1/2" pauses at every phrasal boundary, and every sentence repeated twice each.
2. Type 2 = 1/2" pauses at every phrasal boundary, and merely core word or phrase in each sentence repeated.
3. Type 3 = 1/2" pauses at every phrasal boundary, and no repetition.
4. Type 4 = no special pauses except natural ones, and no repetition.

---

The results are shown in TABLE 3, 4, and 5.

**TABLE 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 1</th>
<th>Type 2</th>
<th>Type 3</th>
<th>Type 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(G1)</td>
<td>(G2)</td>
<td>(G3)</td>
<td>(G4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\bar{x}) : 2.93</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 : 1.06</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4** Comparison between Type 1 and Type 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\bar{x}_2)</th>
<th>(\bar{x}_1)</th>
<th>82</th>
<th>81</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>NS(0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 5** Comparison between Type 3 and Type 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(\bar{x}_3)</th>
<th>(\bar{x}_4)</th>
<th>83</th>
<th>84</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judging from the data obtained from this experiment, repeating the conception with pauses showed the highest efficiency. In comparison between Type 1 and Type 2, Type 2 showed a preferable result, though there is no significant difference between them. But in comparison between Type 3 and Type 4, Type 3 showed a higher efficiency at the 0.05 level than Type 4.

- **EXPERIMENT 4** -

The subjects were 90 junior high school students chosen out of 128 so as to form the same group in quality. They were divided into two groups. Each group (G1, GII, N=45) was given aural comprehension tests about four unknown stories (testing items = 20, answering in Japanese). The four unknown stories were read separately as follows:

1. Unknown story A = 1/2" pauses at every phrasal boundary, and every sentence repeated twice each.
(2) Unknown story B = 1/2" pauses at every phrasal boundary, and merely core part repeated.

(3) Unknown story C = 1/2" pauses at every phrasal boundary with no repetition.

(4) Unknown story D = no special pauses except natural ones with no repetition.

This set of aural comprehension tests was given to GI, and another set of sequences shifted from A, B, C, D to B, A, D, C, with the same way of reading mentioned above was given to GII. The results are shown in the following tables.

TABLE 6 (GI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>65.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>23.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7 Comparison between A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XB</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>NS(0.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 8 Comparison between C and D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XD</td>
<td>14.79</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>6.46</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>NS(0.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9 (GII)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GII</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>20.56</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>65.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GII</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>20.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 10 Comparison between B and A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>20.56</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11 Comparison between D and C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>D</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>14.83</td>
<td>13.44</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>NS(0.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data obtained from EXPERIMENT 4 showed almost the same result with EXPERIMENT 3. In these experiments also, it was proved that the evidence which indicates that the longer the processing of the information received takes, the greater the comprehension is. In addition to this, one of the interesting findings is that repeating the core word or phrase facilitates listening comprehension more effectively than repeating the whole sentence.

- Conclusion -

In order to find the clues to build the listening comprehension skill, the two approaches recently advocated in the United States were examined whether or not their efficacy shares also in Japan. As the result of the experiments, the present paper could conclude that:

I. from the methodological point of view, both the Total Physical Response Approach and the Optimized Habit Reinforcement showed their efficacy even under the condition of the regular junior high school classes in Japan.

II. as for the audio-presentation, the following four steps were set up as a hypothetical grading,

1. repeating the core word or phrase with pauses at "chunk",

2. repeating the whole sentence with pauses at "chunk",

3. no repetition with pauses at "chunk",

4. natural form.
CHAPTER V

A PROGRAM FOR LISTENING-SKILL BUILDING

Based on the data derived from the experiments and evidence advocated by psycholinguistics or neurolinguistics, a tentative program for listening-skill building will be described in this chapter.

The present program is for building listening-skill to the initial grade students of junior high school who do not know English at all. Vocabulary, grammar, and sentence structure were selected according to the Suggested Course of Study of Junior High School by Ministry of Education. As for the teaching method, the present program is mainly based on TPR and OHR, and is designed for the use at the very beginning stage, right after the entrance into junior high school (following the Conclusion I on page 55). The audio-stimulus is presented largely based on the findings of EXPERIMENT 3 & 4 (Conclusion II).

There are 20 units in this program as tentative ones -- to be expanded to the appropriate units depending on the teacher's judgement -- each of which consists of Step 1, Step 2, and Step 3 (except for Unit 1). As for Step 1, teaching procedures are as follows:

1. Say the sentences indicated in the Action, or listen to the recorded sentences and at the same time act out the content of them.

---

2. After showing some models, let the students do the same actions with the teacher according to the same audio-stimuli.

3. After that, let the students do by themselves and check immediately.

As for Step 2, teaching procedures are as follows:

1. Say the sentences just as Step 1, and let the students listen to them without repeating out loud.
2. Show the picture appropriate to the audio-stimulus.
3. Repeat 1, again.

The intervals between 1 and 2, and 2 and 3 should be approximately 2 seconds.

As for Step 3, games and songs are contrived to develop the students' skill or knowledge more in a joyful manner, and this step is also provided for the further expansion such as speaking drill. With the combination of Step 1, 2, and 3, a general procedure is shown on page 58.

Following the general procedure, "A Teaching Plan" will be shown on page 59. The conclusion derived from EXPERIMENT 3 and 4 is applied to the process of the audio-presentation. (Unit 17 was taken up as an example.) In the teaching plan, as seen, core words or phrases are repeated by spiral approach. And as for the chunks, the sentences used here are too short to be effective.

2 H. Winitz, 1978. op. cit. p.3.
General Procedure

Step 1 (TPR)

- Review
  - Initial Demonstration
  - Demonstration with Students
    - Demonstration by Students

Step 2 (OHR)

- Aural check
  - Audio-Presentation 1
    - Visual-Presentation
    - Audio-Presentation 2

Step 3 (TPR)

- Aural check
  - Audio-Presentation
    - Demonstration by Students

Comments

- Check what they learned in the previous period through physical response to the audio-stimuli.
- Act out, saying the sentences, or listening to the recorded sentences.
- Demonstrations with a group consisting of 4 or 5.
- Repeat the Step 1 until all participate.
- Choose one student out of each group for checking. The rest of them could be judges.
- Using TR and OHP is indispensable.
- Intervals between the presentations should be approximately two seconds.
- Prepare the pictures appropriate to the audio-presentation.
- Audio-Presentation 1 and 2 are the same.
- Multiple choice type test choosing one picture out of three appropriate to the audio-stimulus.
- Basically repeat the Step 1.
- Available for further practice, for example, playing games, singing songs, and even expanding to the speaking drill.
A Teaching Plan

An Example of Contents
(Target: Progressive Form)

Teacher's demonstrations in response to the audio-presentation.

1. Walk. I am walking.
2. Walk slowly. I am walking slowly.
3. Walk fast. I am walking fast.
4. Now, Group A, walk with me.
   We are walking.
5. Now, Group B, run with me.
   We are running.
   You are walking now.
   She is walking slowly now.
8. Now, Group D, act out as instructed. "You are walking fast."

4. the park 5. Jane is walking in the park.

Student's demonstrations in response to the audio-presentation, repeating the Step 1 with further expansion,

1. You are walking in the park.
2. You are walking slowly.
3. You are running now.
4. You are playing tennis.
5. You are listening to the music.
6. You are making a cake.
As for the selection and the gradation in curriculum development, the following materials are based on the Course of Study. The 20 units (merely Step 1 is described as Action for convenience' sake) are as follows:

Unit 1. (aim = orientation to the English classes)

Unit 2. (aim = one word sentence)

Action:
1. Stand up.
2. Walk.
3. Stop.
4. Turn.
5. Walk.
6. Stop.
7. Jump.
8. Walk.
9. Sit down.

Unit 3. (aim = simple short sentence)

Action:
1. Stand up.
2. Walk to the door.
3. Touch the door.
4. Walk to the desk.
5. Pick up the pencil.
6. Put down the pencil.
7. Go back to your seat.
8. Sit down.

Unit 4. (aim = simple short sentence)

Action:
1. Stand up.
2. Walk to the window.
3. Touch the window.
4. Walk to the chair.
5. Touch the chair.
6. Walk to the table.
7. Pick up the book.
8. Put it down on the table.
9. Go back to your seat.
10. Sit down.

Unit 5. (aim = simple short sentence)

Action:
1. Stand up.
2. Walk to the blackboard.
3. Look at the map.
4. Point to America on the map.
5. Point to Japan on the map.
6. Point to England on the map.
7. Walk to your desk.
8. Pick up your notebook.
9. Put it down under the desk.
10. Sit down.

Unit 6. (aim = number)

Action:
1. Stand up.
2. Come to the table.
3. Take up a piece of chalk.
4. Write 1, 2, and 3 on the blackboard.
5. Make a box out of 1.
7. Make a guitar out of 3.
8. Erase them.
9. Go back to your seat and sit down.

Unit 7. (aim = number)

Action:
1. Stand up
2. Come to the table.
3. Pick up the Card 1.
4. Put it on the blackboard.
5. Pick up the Card 2, 3 and 4.
6. Put them on the blackboard.
7. Pick up the Card 5, 6 and 7.
8. Put them on the blackboard.
9. Pick up the Card 8, 9 and 10.
10. Give them to me.
11. Thank you; go back to your seat and sit down.

Unit 8. ( aim = alphabet )

Action:
1. Stand up and come to the table.
2. Pick up the Card A, and put it on the blackboard.
3. Pick up the Card B, C, D, E and F, and put them on the blackboard.
5. Pick up the Card L, M, N, O and P, and put them on the blackboard.
7. Pick up the Card V, W, X, Y and Z, and put them on the blackboard.
8. Listen to the ABC song.
9. Let's sing the ABC song together.

Unit 9. ( aim = alphabet )

Action:
1. Taro, stand up, and come to the table.
2. Take up the Card a, and put it on the wall.
3. Thank you. Go back to your seat and sit down.
4. Jiro, come here. Take up b, c, d, e and f, and put them on the wall.
5. Thank you, Jiro. Go back and sit down.
6. Ichiro, come here. Take up g, h, i, j and k, and put them on the wall.
7. Thank you, Ichiro, and now, Hanako, come here. Take up l, m, n, o and p, and put them on the wall.

8. Thank you, Hanako. Now, Tomoko, come here, and take up q, r, s, t and u, and put them on the wall.

9. Thank you, Tomoko. Now, Yumi, come here. Take up v, w, x, y and z, and put them on the wall.

10. Let's sing the abc song all together.

Unit 10. ( aim = this, that )

Action : (using two sets of the pictures of a face)
1. Stand up, Taro. Come to the table.
2. Take up the picture of a "Nose".
3. Show it to the class. T: This is a nose.
4. Carry it to that blackboard in the rear.
5. Put it on that face.
6. Come back here.
7. Take up another nose.
8. Put it on this face. T: This is a nose.
9. Point to that nose. T: That is a nose.
10. Good, sit down.

Unit 11. ( aim = these, those )

Action : (using the same pictures in Unit 10)
1. Stand up, Hanako, and come here.
2. Take up the eyes.
3. Show them to the class. T: These are eyes.
4. Put them on that face.
5. Come back here. T puts eyes on the face.
6. Touch the eyes. T: These are eyes.
7. Point to those eyes. T: Those are eyes.
8. Good. Go back to your seat and sit down.

Unit 12. ( aim = general question )

Action :
1. Tomoko, come to the blackboard.
2. Draw an animal on the blackboard.
3. Draw it step by step.
4. (using pictures) Is this a cat? (No.)
5. Is this a dog? (No.)
6. Is this a cow? (No.)
7. Is this a pig? (Yes.)
8. Is that a pig, Taro? (Yes.)
9. Is that a lion, Jiro? (No.)

Unit 13. (aim = What is this/that?)

Action: (using a TR and a recorded tape)
1. Yumi, come to the taperecorder.
2. Play it and listen to the sound.
3. What is this? (It's a dog.)
5. What is that? (It's a horse.)

Unit 14. (aim = have, has)

Action:
1. Stand up, Taro, and come here.
2. Take up a ball.
3. Now, you have a ball.
4. Throw it to me.
5. Now, I have a ball.
6. Stand up, Hanako. Catch the ball.
7. Now, she has a ball.
8. Hanako, throw it to Ichiro.
9. Now, Ichiro has a ball.

Unit 15. (aim = declarative sentence using general verbs)

Action:
1. Come to the table, keiko.
2. Take up the guitar.
3. Play the guitar.
4. Now, stop it. (to Keiko) You play the guitar.
5. Thank you, Keiko. Come to the table, Hirōmi.
6. Take up the flute.
7. Play the flute.
8. Listen to it. She plays the flute.

Unit 16. (aim = interrogative sentence)

Action:
1. Come to the front, A, B, C, D and E.
2. Now, A, take up two coins.
3. Hand the coins to B, or pretend to do so.
4. Now, B, to C.
5. Now, C, to D.
6. Now, D, to E.
7. (to A) Do you have a coin, A?
8. Open your hands. (No.)
9. (to E) Do you have coins, E?
10. Open your hands. (No.)
11. (to the rest of the students) Does B have coins?
12. Open your hands, B. Oh, here they are.

Unit 17. (aim = progressive sentence)

Action:
1. Walk. I am walking.
2. Walk slowly. I am walking slowly.
3. Walk fast. I am walking fast.
4. Now, Group A, walk with me. We are walking.
5. Now, Group B, walk. You are walking.
6. Now, A, walk slowly. She is walking slowly now.
7. Now, Group D, act out as instructed.
8. You are walking fast.
9. You are running now.

.
Unit 18. (aim = can)

Action:
1. Can you sing like a bird?
2. Yes, I can. T sings.
3. Can you sing like a bird, A?
4. Say, "Yes, I can." Try it.
5. Can you bark like a dog, B?

Unit 19. (aim = there is/are)

Action:
2. Point to it, and listen.
3. T: There is a book on the table.
4. Now, put two books on the table.
5. Point to them, and listen.
6. T: There are three books on the table.
7. This time, put your notebook on your head.
8. Now, touch it, and listen.
10. Is there a book on the table? (No.)
11. Are there three books on the table? (Yes.)
12. What is on the table? Point to them.

Unit 20. (aim = counting time)

Action:
1. Show the time using your hands.
2. It's three o'clock. Now, act out.
3. It's six o'clock.
4. It's nine o'clock.
5. It's twelve o'clock.
For Further Studies

Since the program described here is a tentative one, its output is completely subjected to further studies. Answers to the following questions will be expected to be found by further studies.

1. Does this program fully function in a one year curriculum course?

   --this program occupies almost one third of the estimated total amount of hours allotted to English (about 80).

2. Is this program effective enough to comprehend aurally the contents suggested in the Course of Study for the initial stage?

3. What is enough and what is short from the lexical, and grammatical point of view?

4. What should be improved from the methodological point of view?

5. How does this program transfer to the other three skills?

What should be assigned to the author next is, through continual experiments, to answer these questions which might help us to define what and how we are teaching when we teach listening comprehension.
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