

# THE ORTESOL JOURNAL

EDITOR

JOE E. PIERCE

EDITORIAL BOARD

Edwin Cornelius James Nattinger

JOURNAL OF THE OREGON TEACHERS OF ENGLISH TO  
SPEAKERS OF OTHER LANGUAGES



## Stay In Touch with Longman

- **In Touch** is a three-level series for young adults in beginning to pre-intermediate classes.
- **In Touch** follows a functional approach, with priority given to basic communicative goals.
- **In Touch** teaches students how to make English work for them; to communicate their needs and feelings, to express likes and dislikes, ask for and give information, make suggestions, apologize, and so on.

**In Touch** consists of: **In Touch** will be balanced by LIFE STYLES, a three-book series for intermediate to high-achieving students. Together, **IN TOUCH** and **LIFE STYLES** provide a six-level series of language instruction.

**Longman** PIN PI 19 West 44th Street  
New York, N.Y. 10036

## ORTESOL STYLE SHEET

All manuscripts should be typed on regular 8 1/2 by 11 inch typing paper and double spaced. Punctuate in such a way as to help your reader in his attempt to read what you have written. Excessive punctuation adds to the cost of typesetting, so do try to keep it to a minimum. Margins should be at least one inch on all sides and somewhat more on the lefthand margin. Footnotes should come at the end of the article, preferably on a separate sheet of paper. In typing the footnotes, type first the author's name at it would appear on the title page of the work, i.e. , NOT last name first. Immediately following the name should be a comma, and ed. if he is the editor as opposed to being the author of the work. Follow this with a comma and the title of the work, If this is an article in a journal or a collection, enclose it in quotes. Place a comma inside the quotation mark and follow this with the name of the publication in which the article is to be found. Underline the title of the basic source whether this be a book or a journal. This should also be followed by a comma and the volume and number of the journal, each followed by a comma. Optionally, the location of the publisher . After the location of the publisher, if included, put a comma followed by the publishers name and the date of publication. These should be separated by commas. Finally, after one more comma, place the page number for the reference, Some authors will normally want to include additional bibliography. Label this as "Other Sources Consulted," and draw up the references just as for the footnotes. These \_\_\_should. be listed alphabetically 1.4 author's last name.

Copyright: The Oregon Teachers of English  
to Speakers of Other Languages  
1980

Printed by and available through;  
THE HAPI PRESS  
512 SW Maplecrest Drive  
Portland, Oregon, 97219

new mold in which to place old material. We know they have fully mastered one system; and we are asking them to transfer all their skill and mastery to a new one.

Reading and writing are secondary language skills: they are not naturally acquired. They must be taught and painstakingly learned, even in the native language. All over the world there are millions of adults who cannot read or write at all, and still more millions whose skills only match what is necessary for their survival. Indeed, it is common enough for college freshmen to find difficulty in writing coherent, thoughtful and well-organized papers, as much recent public lamentation has pointed out. The skill we are asking our students to learn in writing class, therefore, is one in which we cannot assume they have full competence in their native languages.

There is, in addition, a further complication. Methods of organizing a body of thought in standard English carry their load of cultural information as well. It is true that the common European tongues, with which we share an intellectual tradition, organize information in much the same way as standard English. But this must not blind us to the fact that other languages, with more foreign intellectual traditions, accept systems of organization which reflect these differences in culture. An ESL student may have achieved competence in such a system, only to find that his essays, while well-organized in his native language, seem unclear or even chaotic to his teacher reading them in English. He must learn a new system. Even a language as closely

related to English as Spanish is can tolerate vastly different limits on something as simple as sentence length.

Teaching writing in a foreign language class, therefore, is a twofold problem. One must cope with the problems of learning a foreign language, and one must cope with the problem of learning writing itself; the organization. Neither area can be sacrificed for the other, although remember that classes in grammar or conversation are almost entirely devoted to the structure of the foreign language. The teacher should bear in mind three questions. What help does this student need from me as a foreign language speaker? What help does he need from me as a writer? And, finally, what does he know already, by virtue of his mastery of his native language?

Starting from this last point, the student's position of strength, can be of great help to him. What is the student's position of strength? What can we assume to be basic to the process of writing and speaking in any language?

The purpose of both is, of course, communication. Uppermost in a writer's mind, when he sets pen to paper, is what he wants to say. He may not know how to organize it, what words to use, nor even what tone to adopt, but he knows what he wants to say. In addition, he will know if he is going to write a conversation or a description, a story or an explanation, an excuse, an argument or a poem. Here is his point of strength, and a curriculum organized around these lines will be of maximum help, buttressing his own inclinations.

We may start from the communicative objectives listed above, then, to explore the structur-

ing of a writing syllabus around this idea.

Interest in notional, or communicative, syllabus has been a growing concern in ESL in recent years.<sup>2</sup> It certainly is an approach which is compatible with the teaching of writing, as I hope to show in this paper. Indeed, certain texts have already admirably exploited this approach, most notably Lawrence's texts,<sup>3</sup> which she explains, are based on the theories of cognition and instruction of Jerome Bruner.<sup>4</sup> How, then, does one learn to write, in one's native or in a foreign language?

One cannot possibly supply, or even attempt, a complete answer to this question in the scope of so brief a paper. Indeed, the answer is not fully understood, nor is it likely to be for many years. One aspect of the answer is certainly quite bound up in the processes of thinking; another aspect must certainly be concerned with the urge to express oneself, which is natural to almost every child. These topics have already been dealt with by many others. One further aspect with which I would like to concern myself for a moment is the use of models.

The use of model essays to teach writing is a method which has recently come under attack. One common criticism of the method is that it puts too much emphasis on the finished product, and not enough on the process of writing itself. Traditionally, this may have been so, but it need not be. Models need not be polished essays; they can be used to illustrate any step of the process, from sentence-writing through the construction of various kinds of paragraphs to organizing and rewriting a composition.

There is another, more serious, objection to the method of using models for teaching writing. This is a method with a long tradition in both native and foreign language instruction, and this tradition has, perhaps, given it an aura of the old-fashioned. It is too associated with the rigid, copy-and-translate instruction of Latin and Greek. It also smacks too much of the conventional, grammar-based structural curricula for teaching writing. Indeed, the method may be felt to be too akin to the method of the grammar class, in which the use of model sentences is mandatory. Therefore the recent stress on communicative curricula, on what is natural in language use, has tried to quell it. As Lawrence says, in the teacher's manual for her 1975 text:

The imitation or adaptation of model compositions as a writing method, however, has one major disadvantage: it is unnatural ... Ask yourself, do you follow a model when you write? Do you look for one? It is scarcely credible that professional writers write that way.<sup>5</sup>

But the questions as Lawrence puts them are highly misleading. Certainly one does not consciously hunt for model stories every time one begins a research paper. But instead, ask yourself, could you write a research paper if you had never read one? How competent were your first attempts, as an undergraduate? How many papers in professional journals had you read before you shaped your first professional-sounding paper? If you have ever written fiction, how

many stories had you read before your first attempt? Did your style not mature as your reading broadened? When a writer begins to work, how many models does he unconsciously call up to help him shape his thoughts and frame his sentences? As Donald Hall, poet and professor of creative writing at the University of Michigan, says:

I suspect that a writer's ear is his most subtle, and possibly his most valuable piece of equipment. We acquire a good ear by reading the great masters until their cadences become part of our minds. The stored memory of a hundred thousand sentences becomes the standard of the writer's own ear.<sup>6</sup>

For whatever reasons, therefore, I believe that this attack on the method of model use is wrong. Someone writing in his native language does not need a model in front of him: for him it is indeed unnatural. His own reading experience provides him with his standard without any conscious effort. But the student attempting to write in a foreign language has no such wide experience to help him. It is our job to provide him with all the help he needs. It is not enough to simply hope that the relevant points will be noticed in reading class. Consistently, in all areas of ESL teaching, we help our students by bringing to conscious awareness points that native speakers assume as automatic. This is obviously true in grammar class, but also helpful to the writing student. Because, as said before, we do not

really understand the features of the process a native speaker undergoes as he writes, it is crucial to bring the model into the classroom, to dissect it, to point out all possible important features for the scrutiny of the students.

This discussion of writing in one's native language has led rather naturally into a discussion of the special needs of a student learning to write in a foreign language. I believe that the provision of models is important. But the foreign student has other special needs as well. Paramount among these is, of course, the provision of vocabulary.

Special vocabulary relating to his subject, a student generally gets from a good bilingual dictionary. Indeed, many of the more advanced students often know more vocabulary relating to their special fields than their teachers do. It is the vocabulary of the structure, the masonry of the writing, that is bound to prove the most troublesome. Here is where a teacher must provide information on common expressions and how to use them, ways to cement information together coherently. The student usually knows what information he wishes to communicate. It is in its organization into coherent logical English where the trouble usually starts.

A curriculum based on the concept that a student knows what he wants to say will be of maximum help to him. In addition, the curriculum should provide models of good writing, a good bit of the structural vocabulary, and careful step-by-step practice in the process of writing to lead to a finished product with a minimum of anxiety.

What follows is an example of a writing curriculum based on these principles, which works at several levels at a time. First, each unit is based on one communicative objective, ranging from the simpler to the more complex. Each communicative objective is paired with certain structural information, information on the mechanics of writing which most naturally goes with it. A model is provided as a way to focus attention on the points to be taught. A certain vehicle is used to provide writing practice for the students. Two kinds of assignments are given. The first kind focusses on points taught in that lesson alone, while the second kind is cumulative: each assignment builds on the ones before and is aimed at producing a finished essay. The students write pieces of their essay a paragraph at a time throughout the course, and at the end, when they are told to produce their final essay, most of it is already written and need only be put together. Thus, focus on the process of writing yields a finished product without the anxiety-producing instruction to write one.

This is, of course, only a skeleton curriculum with room for much additional exercise. It is not meant to be complete: any class has its individual character which must necessarily dictate many of the activities in which it participates. But one important point about the models and the vehicles must be made here. As ESL teachers, we usually see intelligent and curious adults with full command of a cognitive system in their own languages. They are not children. Though the models must often be simple in their syntax and vocabulary, they, and the assignments they gen-

erate, must not be simple in their content. Their ideas must be challenging and complex: they must be capable of interesting an adult mind. We cannot be content to provide our students with fatuous stories of the happy daily lives of Mr. Brown and Mr. Green, but must instead show respect for their intellectual attainment by providing them with thought-provoking material that demands their participation.

The curriculum below is for intermediate to advanced students. It goes from the construction of a paragraph to organizing a composition: it assumes a good control of sentence writing, providing only one brief review.

Unit One is the review of sentence writing. The communicative objective is writing conversation. Structural information included in this is mainly punctuation: commas, periods, semicolons and colons, quotation marks, capital letters. In addition, students often have fun experimenting with different "said" words and adverbs. This is a good beginning because conversation will not be too different in its features from language to language, and so students need not cope with different cultural forms or organization at first, but may concentrate on content. Almost any model of a conversation may be used, provided it is suitably interesting.

For assignments, the teacher can provide the students with an appropriately ambiguous beginning of a conversation, and ask them to resolve it. Other exercises can include drawing two characters in some interesting situation and having blank balloons coming out of their mouths. One can even blank out the conversa-

tion in a Sunday paper comic strip and reproduce it, asking the students to fill in the balloons. This is a warm-up unit: no assignment toward the final essay is necessary

Unit Two begins work on the construction of a paragraph, focussing on topic sentences and on when to change paragraphs, Its communicative objective is description. Various kinds of structural information are compatible with description, prepositional phrases of location, the use of adjectives, and an emphasis on precision. Some useful assignments: describe the layout of your house (or one room) so that someone can draw it on the blackboard. Describe a local place familiar to the whole class so that they can guess where it is, Describe a famous person so that everyone can guess who it is. Pretend you are a Martian with only fifteen minutes on Earth, Describe what you saw (in one spot) so that the class can guess where you landed. Emphasis should be placed on each description being only one paragraph, and the students can suggest how each story might continue, if it were to. But they should not attempt too much. Topic sentences can be taught here, simply by emphasizing what one is describing (the class can write the topic sentence together after they have guessed the answer) . The class can attempt to write topic sentences for paragraphs without them — a very difficult task.

Here the teacher can introduce a running theme for the class. I have provided my students with a simple outline map of an imaginary Pacific island called Islandia. Then I tell them that it is located in the southern temperate zone, and ask

them, using their knowledge of the world, to briefly describe its geography the location of mountains, rivers, lakes, major cities, the capital., etc.

The assignment towards the final essay will be a simple paragraph of description. A topic I have found successful is a paragraph on "Your Country One Hundred Years Ago. " It is important to stress that in one paragraph they cannot do too much, and to avoid any temptation to compare - - yet.

Unit Three delves deeper into the internal structure of paragraphs, dealing with various kinds of supporting sentences, and with concluding sentences. Its communicative objective is narrative: story-telling. Further instruction in when to change paragraphs is useful here, also.

Structural information to focus on here may be how verb tenses relate to each other, a topic often neglected in grammar class. The class might also study prepositional phrases of time, a difficult subject in English. Almost any brief, simple narrative serves as a useful model here, as long as the students can pick out its chronological structure. It often proves useful to dissect the paragraphs in detail, identifying each sentence within them as topic, supporting (how? ), or concluding. Another useful exercise is for the students to find a story embedded in longer pieces of writing, for example, a letter, which is not organized chronologically and to restructure it so that the order of events is clear.

Helpful assignments for this unit might be to tell a joke, or to tell the class about a particular

event in Islandian history. This assignment will of necessity be more than one paragraph, and special attention must be paid to justifying each paragraph change.

Finally, the students can work toward their final essay by writing another paragraph on "My Country Today," with the emphasis more on events developing than on description. Again, a warning is necessary to discourage the students from attempting too much - a comparison, perhaps - in only one paragraph.

Unit Four begins work on the essay level. Its communicative objective is definition and classification. It focusses on defining one's terms, defining the problem under discussion, and deciding what parts it consists of. Breaking down a problem into smaller issues helps to make it more manageable: to this end the structural part of the unit concentrates on outlining. Ten or twenty sentences are taken at random from a long essay and scrambled. The students are asked to classify them into groups, logically. They then read the original essay to see how their logic compares with the author's. The students then read a shorter essay, are given the skeleton of an outline, partly filled in, and are asked as a class to complete it. Further individual work on outlining may be assigned.

Other assignments relevant to this unit might be to peruse an English-English dictionary for definitions of words like 'ketchup' or 'snow,' and then to give personal definitions of those words, discussing the differences. Students may, under cover of their 'foreignness,' ask American friends to define something, and then bring the definition

to class, determining if they are personal or dictionary definitions, and if they are adequate as such. Finally, the teacher may provide the students with a list of random economic activities engaged in by Islandians, and ask them to write a description of the Islandian economy, classifying the types of activities (e.g., trade, industry, agriculture) and specifying the details of each. They might be told to pretend to write it as a new encyclopedia entry and sent to the library to study other encyclopedia entries as models.

Finally, the teacher should use the introductory paragraph of one of the preceding essays as a model, showing how it defines and classifies what is to come. As their assignment towards the essays, students should write the introductory paragraph of their essays. An outline of their essays may also be assigned, but the teacher will have to spell out all the paragraphs to be included, since the students do not know what is coming.

The communicative objective of Unit Five is explanation. The student should learn how to explain clearly a process or point of view. Generalizations are discussed, and then different kinds of supporting arguments. Logic is stressed and, on the structural side, complex sentences with subordinating clauses beginning with words like "because," "although," "in spite of," "nevertheless," or "except." Work on outlining continues with the emphasis on logical progression, and then transition. Explanatory essays should be brought in as models, and the student should learn to identify where a thread of argument



breaks off, and how the writer smoothes the change.

In class, students can begin the following exercise on Islandia. Islandia is an island, and most of its people live on the coast. The interior has a backbone of mountains, and the people who live in them rarely leave. Are they different from the coast people? Most of the students will emphatically say yes. List a few of the differences in class, and then for homework have the students describe the differences more fully. Have them compare and contrast the two populations, and then analyze why these differences exist. Ask them to explain the reasons for the differences.

This unit has two assignments for the final essay. First, ask the students to write a brief transition paragraph between their two paragraphs, "One Hundred Years Ago" and "Today." Next, have them write a paragraph of comparison and contrast between these two.

Unit Six's communicative objective is argument and persuasion. This unit continues work on logic, but also goes into opinions and emotional language. This can be a lot of fun. Structural work can concentrate on the connotation of words, using word-pairs like "stubborn" and "persistent." This close attention to words can lead into poetry, if the class is interested. Or students can bring in magazine ads to discuss their vocabulary, or watch television commercials and discuss the methods by which they try to change the viewer's behavior. They might also bring in examples of political propaganda. Closer examination of this topic with advanced

students might examine ways to emphasize or to minimize the importance of some key points in an argument, ways of expressing one's own opinions to sound reasonable and attractive, and of distorting a contrary opinion.

In class, the teacher can set up the following situation. All radio contact with Islandia is lost for thirty-two hours. Finally, the world re-establishes contact, and hears the announcer speaking. What happened? Situation number 1: Islandia has suffered a terrible earthquake. There is widespread panic. The announcer is trying to persuade people to behave in a calm and orderly manner. Write what he is saying - include details. Situation number 2: There has been an attempted coup. The radio station has been taken over by revolutionaries, and the announcer is trying to persuade the people to join the forces of the rebellion. Write what he is saying - include details.

Finally, the students will write a paragraph of analysis to add to their essays. It should continue from the comparison and contrast paragraph, giving reasons and showing results. Then a conclusion paragraph should come, summarizing, giving the students' opinions of the whole thing, and predicting future trends. The entire essay should be reworked, if necessary, and handed in for the last time. Having written and corrected most of it previously, the students should find this a fairly painless introduction to the term paper. He cannot but feel proud at having written a completed essay, perhaps three to five pages, in a foreign language, and the teacher should stress this point.

The above was one example of a writing curriculum based on communicative objectives. It goes from the simpler to the more difficult forms of writing, beginning with a brief review of sentence writing and then focussing on paragraph construction and the organization of an essay. It uses models to point up structural features important to the objectives, and unobtrusively provides students with the masonry of the form which could be troublesome to him. This is certainly not the only possible curriculum of this sort: the teacher may alter and adapt the idea to suit the skills and goals of each individual class. This step-by-step approach, however, allows the students to reach mature writing skill with a minimum of anxiety and a focus on the actual process of writing.

- <sup>1</sup> R. B. Kaplan, "Cultural Thought Patterns in Intercultural Education," Language Learning XVI, Volume 1, pp. 1-20, 1966.
- <sup>2</sup> D. Wilkins, Notional Syllabuses, Oxford University Press, 1976
- <sup>3</sup> M. Lawrence, Writing as a Thinking Process, University of Michigan Press, 1972.
- <sup>4</sup> J. S. Bruner, Toward a Theory of Instruction, W. W. Norton, Inc., 1968,

M. Lawrence, Reading, Thinking, Writing, University of Michigan Press, 1975.

6 ID, Hall, Writing Wells Little, Brown and Co., 1973.

## CREATING AN ESL READING LAB

Merritt W. Stark 3r.

Oregon State University

The following report is an attempt to trace the development and organization of the Oregon State University Language Institute Reading Laboratory.

## WHY DID THE READING LAB DEVELOP?

In May 1977 the English Language Institute voted to establish a committee specifically concerned with examining the curriculum of the Institute's vocabulary and reading classes, and the reading test utilized in the placement of students into levels.

A consensus developed that while the foreign students attending the ELI were receiving quality instruction in their regular vocabulary and reading classes, their progress in reading was slowed by several factors. Some students could not organize their daily activities to ensure that they had sufficient time to read by themselves. Others had weak or had not learned the prerequisite study skills essential in providing them with the confidence and en-

thusiasm necessary to begin reading independently with the assistance of a dictionary.

The committee concluded that the needs of the students could be met by adding a reading lab to the ELP's curriculum. The primary goals of the lab were to:

- Provide an additional period of two hours per week for all students to read in a quiet, comfortable atmosphere..
- B) Provide the students with an opportunity to practice the reading skills they had learned in their regular vocabulary and reading classes using materials specifically written for individual use,
- C) Make available the assistance of a reading specialist to guide the students in selecting materials of interest and at an appropriate level of difficulty,
- D) Help students determine and chart their own progress with regard to reading rate and comprehension.
- E) Provide individual assistance to help each student with specific study and reading skills.

The committee felt that it would need to develop, in advance of the actual scheduling of students in the lab, the diagnostic tools with which to determine each student's reading level and interests.

### CRITERIA FOR MATERIALS SELECTION AND ACQUISITION

The committee established seven criteria in selecting the materials for the lab.

- A) High interest - low vocabulary.
- B) Tailored for individual self-instruction.
- C) A wide range of topics in various content areas.
- D) Established readability levels.
- E) Graded levels of difficulty (1-13).
- F) Cost.
- G) Integration into ELI Reading Program.

The following is a brief description of the series and kits acquired and used in the lab.

#### I. TIMED READINGS, Jamestown Publishers.

This series consists of eight graded books, each containing fifty 400-word selections followed by questions. The books are designed to increase student speed in reading factual material while not neglecting comprehension.

The fifty reading selections in each book are all 400 words in length and deal with factual information on a variety of subjects. The identi-

cal word length facilitates timing by either student or teacher.

The reading selections are graded. Starting at grade six each book advances one grade level, ending at college level. Readability of the selections was assessed by applying the Fry readability formula using two examples within each selection. The questions accompanying the selection were constructed only to demonstrate that the student has read the passage and that he has achieved sufficient comprehension for his reading rate to be valid. In this regard the questions may be considered comprehension checks rather than comprehension tests. A mix of question types is used five fact-recall and five thought questions. An introduction, instructions on faster and better reading, answer key and progress graph are also included in each book.

#### II. MULTI - READ 2: A MULTILEVEL READING KIT, Science Research Associates Inc.

This series includes 12 work-type supplementary readers of 32 pages each. They are designed to meet the special needs of adults who are learning to read. The readability levels of the 12 books are as follows:

- Step One (four books) - Upper grade 1 and 2.
- Step Two (four books) - Grades 2 and 3.
- Step Three (four books) - Grades 3 and 4.

The vocabulary has been checked against the Thorndike-Lorge word list in The Teacher's

Word Book of 30,000 Words and against the Adult Elementary Word List by An g etic a W. Cass. Readability levels have been verified by application of the Wheeler-Smith and the Spache Formulas. The articles have also been pre-tested for reading interest and difficulty with both adults and adolescents of known reading ability levels.

Brief exercises for developing comprehension and word-attack skills follow each study selection. The Reading Skills Charts on pages 12-14 of the thachert s manual indicate the point in the series at which each s skill is introduced or developed.

### III. Science Readers. Readers Digest Services.

The Readers Digest Science Readers is a series of seven books, which presents scientific information in a popular - yet completely thorough and accurate - style to insure immediate interest. The seven books range in reading levels between grades 3- 6. These include simple science experiments, weather forecasting, observations, etc. In addition, many articles are followed by suggestions for further readings. Finally, 16 pages of duplicating masters have been provided for each book, which emphasize the reading skills needed for science, as well as other subjects. The duplicating masters focus on the critical and practical skills needed by the student for the as

of information and the application of ideas. All major stories and articles are covered on the dittos. The exercises include corn-

prehension tests, writing assignments, experiments and puzzles.

### IV. Social Science Readers. Readers Digest Services.

This series is designed to reinforce reading skills while involving and interesting students in their social and natural environments. The seven books are arranged from level to level in a "strand" or theme approach - with the selections organized under the heading of "Family, " "Community, " "Nation, " and "World. " In addition to these strands, each book concentrates on a specific subject area:

- Book 3 United States Urban Life
- Book 4 United States and Europe
- Book 5 United States History
- Book 6 United States and Canada
- Book 7 United States and South and Central America
- Book 8 United States Modern History
- Book 9 The Non-Western World

The range of genre within a book is wide - stories, poems, plays, factual articles, letters, games and even recipes.

The series contains excellent visual aids and each book has a set of duplicating masters.

### Miscellaneous Materials.

The reading specialist has established a small library of books which are checked out to

the students for their reading pleasure at home. In addition, the reading lab is equipped with a wide variety of popular magazines, dictionaries, and new News For You, a high-interest, low-vocabulary newspaper for people with a low literacy level by Laubach Literacy International, is a particularly popular and useful publication.

#### THE DEVELOPMENT OF DIAGNOSTIC TOOLS TO EVALUATE READING ABILITY

The diagnostic tools used to evaluate student interests and reading ability were the cloze procedure, Informal Reading Inventories (IRI) and a questionnaire designed to elicit information about educational background and major field of study.

For inclusion in the battery of tests administered at the beginning of each term to place students in one of the ELI's five levels, a cloze test utilizing a passage with a second grade readability level was chosen. Not only would the cloze test provide data from which to place students, it would also enable the reading specialist to make a preliminary evaluation of a student's reading level. By considering the results of a cloze test, the reading specialist can determine whether a particular passage is at the student's independent, instructional or frustration level. These terms were originally used with regard to the results of criterion reference tests or informal reading inventories. Atkin explains the meaning of the terms used fully.

At the independent level the student can handle the material independently from the classroom or the teacher. A book with a readability rating at this level may be suitable for leisure reading. This range of scores on an overall language proficiency test would indicate that the student would likely experience successful communication in similar circumstances outside the classroom.

When functioning on the instructional level the student can manage to cope with this material with guidance or assistance from an instructor. A book on this readability level would be suitable for a supplemental reading activity after an explanation or discussion to introduce the content. This score range on a language proficiency test would indicate that the student would need some form of supplemental second language instruction at a level depending on his actual score.

At the frustration level the student cannot understand the material. A book rated in this score range would be much too difficult to understand. A score in this range on a language proficiency test would indicate a need for some basic, intensive ESL instruction. (p. 63)

A 90-100 percent score on a criterion referenced test indicates that the material is at the student's independent level. A 75 - 90 percent

score suggests that the material is at his instructional level.

Atkin compared the results of doze tests for native speakers and doze tests for ESL students with the 75% and 90% reference points.<sup>2</sup>

Close Test Percentage Scores  
Comparable to 75% and 90%  
Criterion Multiple-Choice Scores

Criteria	Bormuth (1967)	Berrnuth (1968)	Culhane (1969)	Anderson (1971)
75%	38	44	41	44
90%	50	57	61	53

Aiken believes that Anderson's equivalent for 90% criteria is too low, and suggests that it should be closer to Bormuth's.<sup>3</sup> These scores are not precise and indicate a need for additional research. Nevertheless, the preceding figures can serve as an indicator in helping the reading specialist guide ESL students in selecting individual reading material.

The reading committee is working to develop graded individual and group informal reading inventories in the content areas of science, business and engineering. As Ahrendt<sup>4</sup> suggests:

A reading or learning center should have a file of informal group inventories in each of the content subjects normally taken by freshmen and sophomore students. The administration of these tests can give the

reading specialist a diagnostic picture of a student's specific areas of weakness in content subjects. (p. 39)

The reading committee is following the model suggested by Ahrendt in determining the ordering and significance of comprehension questions.'

Finally, a questionnaire to elicit student interest is an essential aspect of the process to provide each student with material that he will enjoy reading and that will challenge him intellectually. Therefore, a questionnaire designed by the reading committee requests that each student supply information about his educational background and future academic and career plans, as well as information regarding the languages he speaks, and the number of years that he has studied English, for use in developing the program for each student.

1 Kenneth G. Aitken, "Using Cloze Procedure as an overall Language Proficiency Test," TESOL Quarterly, Vol. 11, No. 1, March, pp. 59-67, 1977.

2 Ibid., p. 63.

3 John R. Bormuth, "Comparable cloze and Multiple-Choice Comprehension Test Scores," Journal of Reading, Vol. 10, pp. 291-98, 1966.

<sup>4</sup> Kenneth M. A r e n d t, Community College Reading Programs, International Reading Association, New a r k, Deleware, P. <sup>3</sup>9, 1977.

<sup>5</sup> Idem.

#### Some Additional Related Bibliography

Jonathan Anderson, "Selecting a Suitable Readers' : Procedures for Teachers to As-  
ses Language Difficulty, " RELC Journal 2,  
pp. 35-42, 1971.

Patric Finn, "Word Frequency, Information  
Theory, and Cloze Performance, ' Reading  
Research Quarterly, Vol. XIII, No. 4, pp.  
508-537, 1977.

Kenneth Goodman, "Psycholinguistic Uni-  
versals in the Reading Process, " The Psy-  
chology of Sec ond Language Learning,  
Cambridge University Press, pp. 135 - 142,  
1971.

Eugene Jong s ma, "The Cloze Procedure:  
A Survey of the Research," Occasional Pa-  
pers in Reading, Indiana University Press,  
1971,

John. 011er, "Scoring Methods, and Difficulty Le-  
vels f or Cloze Tests of ESL, " Modern  
Language Journal, 56, pp. 151-158, 1972.

Earl Rankin, "Comparable Cloze and Multiple-  
Choice Comprehension Test Scores, " Journal  
of L924)22E13, pp. 193-98, 1969.

Timothy Standal, "Readability Formulas: What's  
Out, What's In?" The Reading Teacher, Vol.  
31, No. 6, pp. 642-46, 1978.

Joseph Stubbs, "The Cloze Test as a Measure  
of English Proficiency, " Modern Language  
Journal 58, pp. 239-42, 1974.

Wilson Taylor, "Cloze Procedure: A New Tool  
for Mea suring Readability, " Journalism  
Quarter1E 30, pp. 414-38, 1953,

THE HAPI PRESS would like to bring to your  
attention some books that should be of in-  
terest to ORTESOL MEMBERS.

THE NATURE OF NATURAL LANGUAGES, paper,  
162pp, \$6.95, Joe E. Pierce, 1979

LANGUAGES AND LINGUISTICS, paper, 188pp,  
\$10.95, Joe E. Pierce, 1980

A LINGUISTIC METHOD OF TEACHING SECOND  
LANGUAGES, paper, 145pp, \$6.95, Joe E.  
Pierce, 1973

HOW ENGLISH REALLY WORKS, paper, 235pp,  
charts, spectrograms, bibliography, and  
index, \$9.95, Joe E. Pierce, 1979

THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LINGUISTIC SYSTEM IN  
ENGLISH SPEAKING AMERICAN CHILDREN, pa-  
per, 24714), \$7.95, Pierce & Hanna, 1978



## THE GELP IN TURKEY

Joe E. Pierce

GELP was the official designation for the Georgetown University English Language Program in Ankara, Turkey. It functioned from 1954 through 1962 and was an extremely effective program, as second language programs go. It trained several dozen Turks who began without having heard a word of any language other than Turkish and trained them to the point that they could successfully complete CIA programs in various U. S. universities. This is perhaps not surprising, but the surprising thing is that many of these people studied as apart of the program for only three to four months. In addition, hundreds of other Turks were trained from various starting points up to a competence which enabled them to function in a variety of positions in the U. S. A. Some of the elements in this program might be useful in programs in the Pacific Northwest, and some of the specifics might help any of you improve the performance of a particular class.

First, this program was rather unusual in that it had only a single "native" language group. All of the students spoke Turkish in their homes. When a student was enrolled, he was tested as to

his competence. This was done by having four instructors listen to him answer questions and rate him separately on his fluency, phonology, grammar and vocabulary. The new students were divided into "competency levels" as sharply as was possible, depending on the number of students and the range of competencies in the group. We had as few as four competency levels at times and as many as twelve at other times. A student could be moved at any time from one of the levels to another, if he appeared to the teacher to be too good or too poor for his group. This enabled each student to progress at his own pace regardless of the speed at which any class was progressing, because he could move up from one class to another, spending only a few days in each class, if he were capable of so-doing. The normal situation was for a student to be put into a class, and, as a rule, he remained in that class for some time, but occasionally, he would immediately be raised to the next level or lowered to the next level and remained there for several weeks.

Each class, i. e., competency level, was given a specially prepared program of study which was felt to be suited to its needs. We had a series of textbooks; SPOKEN ENGLISH FOR TURKS, by Joe E. Pierce, for beginners; CONVERSATIONS IN ANKARA, by Eliose Enata; for intermediates; and AMERICAN CONVERSATIONS, by Winfred P. Lehmann, for advanced students. Any class could begin at any point in any one of these and move forward from there. The starting point was determined by the staff after testing. In addition,

we had a collection of about 120 grammatical drills prepared especially to aid Turks with their problems, both phonological and grammatical. When a teacher had trouble with a particular feature, e. g., 3rd person pronouns, he or she would go to a file and pull out copies of one of several drills prepared especially to help Turks with that problem. Since Turkish has only a single pronoun which means he she or it, this was a recurrent problem for all the students,

Each "competency level" had in it a maximum of 15 students, and we strove for an average of 12. Each class was taught for three periods each morning and three periods in the afternoon. Professor Leon Dostert, Director of the Institute of Languages and Linguistics, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., during the 1950's, once took two classes, one of which was given 10 minutes of class and 50 minutes of break and another class which was given 50 minutes of break and 10 minutes of class time studying French. At the end of the first year of study, the two classes were at the same level. By that he meant that there was no statistically significant difference between the test scores of the two classes. This indicates that much of the class time is wasted in most classes because the students are saturated beyond their ability to learn after a very short time. Because of this study, we shortened our periods from 50 to 45 minutes, and the performance of the students improved significantly. The only reason that we did not shorten the periods more was the insistence of the Turkish government that the students were

being paid their regular salaries and could not be allowed to just relax. It seemed clear from our experience that the relaxation actually improved their ability to use English, but this information had no effect on the bureaucrats in either the American or the Turkish governments,

Each class had four hours of instruction during each class day and two hours laboratory. The class sessions and laboratory sessions were rotated from day to day, but an attempt was made always to have each class vary its program as much as possible from hour to hour. For example, a certain class would have a phonological drill of one sort or another at 9:00 o'clock, go to the laboratory at 10:00 and back to the classroom for a conversational drill at 11:00. In the afternoon, they might have a conversational drill,

e., a situation with a canned conversation prepared especially for them which they memorized, acted out in the class and then attempted to vary lightly. At 2:00, they would go to the audio-visual room, a room setup with various American items so that they could become familiar with the things they would have to deal with once they got to the USA. Finally, the last hour might be back in the classroom for another phonological drill, a grammatical drill or back to the laboratory. Each class had a different teacher each hour. The purpose of this was two-fold, i. e., to vary the dialect heard and make the classes less boring.

At this point, because the laboratories have taken such a beating in the literature recently, I should describe these for you and explain how

they were used, because they were effective. We, at first, imported expensive laboratory equipment similar to that in many American schools today. However, that did not seem to be helping us very much, so we went to a very simple "listening laboratory." These consisted of a single tape playback attached to several headsets, as many as 50. In the laboratory, the students were never given any material that they had not been drilled on in class with a living native-speaking teacher. The laboratory was treated as an extension of the teacher and was supervised at all times. The advantage of the laboratory was that the students could hear and attempt to repeat many times the same sentences that they had attempted to learn in the classroom, and the laboratory supervisor moved about the room, stopping students who were clearly making gross errors and helping them by drilling them individually. The lab could accommodate about fifty students, or three and sometimes four regular classes, so one instructor was actually handling three to four sections at one time and at the same time giving some students some personalized attention. This seemed to us to be a marked improvement over the usual laboratory situation. The beginning students were carefully supervised and helped, and some advanced students could check out tapes of novels and just listen to them to improve their comprehension. In all cases the instructor was there if students needed help.

The instructional materials were presented in a rigid, orderly manner, designed to present all of the English language. Many of the more recent

studies seem to indicate that perhaps this is not wise. However, we found that it worked very well, especially since no two of our students had the same goals. We had to teach more or less general English, something that would help anyone who wanted to use the language. Generally the program began with structural items which were similar in the two languages, e.g., the present progressive forms in English and Turkish are utilized in almost exactly the same way. The usual definition of the -ror forms of verbs in Turkish is that they are used to express an action that is in progress at the time one is speaking, and in general, English uses the -Lag forms with to be the same way, or at least if the Turk would use his own -ilöz: form, he could use the English present progressive. In Turkish, you would say "lokuyorum," and in English you would say, "I am reading." The only problem with this was that there are about six verbs, such as, want, where Turks use the progressive form when we use the simple present. They say, "I am wanting some bread" and we say, "I want some bread," but these are simply learned as exceptions to the rule.

We did something that seemed to us to work exceptionally well, and that was spend considerable time at the beginning with specific phonological drills. The usual problem with phonological drills is that they are misused and as a result achieve very little. We started with phonology, as with grammar, with sounds that were so similar in the two languages that the student could use his own sound and produce a recognizable English word. For example, the word cape has sounds

that are such that a Turkish speaker can produce it in easily recognizable form with little or no distortion of the sounds, and we began drilling with a group of words all of which were similar to this one. This taught the students some vocabulary and gave them a feeling that this new language really was not as difficult as it might be. From this simple beginning, we worked on phonological drills almost exclusively the first day or two, teaching no grammar at all if the students were absolute beginners, gradually working in more and more sounds that were difficult for Turkish speakers to produce. Of course, this did not work perfectly, but it seems to me that it worked far better than any other system that I have seen tried anywhere else.

One misnomer in linguistics is the label "minimal pair," People in the field know what is meant, but outsiders keep thinking that it means "pair," and it does not. It means something that shows a minimal contrast, and in English, for example, if you wish to teach a Turk the front vowels, you have to use sets of five-way contrasts, i. e., beet-bit, bate-bet and bat because if you do not, the Turk will slip from one of these to another one, since he has only two vowel qualities in the front region of his mouth in his native language. Minimal pairs have been misused by more language teachers than about anything that I know of, because they will try to teach the pair beet-bit and the Turk simply slips from bit down to bet, each time, but if he knows that he is dealing with five different tongue positions, he learns fairly quickly what is expected of him. The real

problem is that with pairs he really does not understand the nature of the difficulty, because he says bet and thinks that he has said bit, since the teacher has made it clear to him that he must not say beet.

To show a little more clearly how this worked, we would first teach the English words beet, bate and bet, all of which the Turk can produce so that they are clearly understandable by English speakers. The Turk's fey/ is really an fey/ glide, whereas the English speaker's fey/ may well not be glided, but still it is easily distinguishable from the other two English sounds. Once the student has mastered these three words, then the five-way contrast was introduced; beet, bit, bate, bet and bat. At this point he had established three cardinal distinctions and all he had to do was to work in a couple; one between lit and /ey/, i, e. between beet and bate, and add one lower down in his mouth, i. e., bat, which has a tongue position below that for bet. In Turkish, the range of the phoneme /e/ covers both the range of /e/ and /ae/ in English, so this is somewhat of a problem. Here, the Turk's native language helps out, because he has no difficulty making a distinction between /e/ and /a/. His problem is telling the difference between /e/ and /ae/. This being the case, the five-way contrasts worked very effectively, despite the fact that at first if you said to your student, "beet mi bit mi?" in Turkish, which means, "Was it beet or bit?" he would usually look very puzzled and respond with "yes," because he clearly could not hear the difference between the two for some time during the

early stages of the course.

Needless to say, it is impossible to describe in detail all of the steps in the program in a short paper, but we worked from the sounds that were similar in the two languages to those that were more difficult for the Turk. We taught a lesson on phonology, and as the course progressed, we returned to redrill these phonological drills periodically, so that the students would gradually be able to improve their ability to produce good English sounds. We worked from clusters (sequences, such as *sti*) which occur in Turkish, but which do not occur in Istanbul, but it never occurs

initial position, so that words like *Easter* are very easy for a Turk to say, except for the final *r*, but a word like *stop* is almost impossible. He says */Istopi*, parallel with *Istanbul*. He also can hardly produce three-consonant clusters, so these have to be taught rather rigorously, else the Turk will simply drop one of the consonants or add a vowel somewhere in the sequence. For example, an alternate pronunciation for *street* often used was */sItriti*, because they could generally handle two-consonant clusters not in initial position.

With one class we spent the first five days strictly on phonological drills and vocabulary building. We taught over 500 words so thoroughly that it was almost impossible to trip up the students on the words taught. After that, these words, were used to build grammatical drills in such a way that a student was faced with only about three new words in an hour class. This one class was far more successful than any other

group ever run through the program, but. I was forced to drop it and go back to the one outlined below which had been established by faculty conferences.

From the beginning, after a day or two of vocabulary building and phonological drills, grammar and phonology were inter-mixed. Every utterance that the student was taught to say, he had written on a printed page before him in phonetic transcription, standard orthography and a Turkish cultural equivalent. Not a translation, but whatever the Turk would be likely to say, if an American would say what he was being taught in that situation. For example, Americans say, in response to "Hello, how are you?" "Oh, fine, thank you," but Turks just say "thank you. Later, the students were told what "I'm fine, meant, but at first they learned what to say in English instead of what they normally said in Turkish. Grammar went from the present progressive mentioned earlier, to noun plurals, then to the past tense, then to future time and back to the present tense, because the Turkish present is not used in the same way as the English present. The Turkish present can be used both in the past and future time, because it has no real time referent. It means anything that is done over a period of time or as a general rule and does not mean, "now." We often translate the present tense in Turkish into "used to in English when it is used in the past time, so this posed a little more complicated problem than did the simple present progressive, simple past and simple future tenses.

There is one more extremely important point which many language teaching programs appear to ignore completely. Forgetting is a function of learning. This is a mathematical function, and the only way to counter it is to go back over old lessons or carefully work reviews into the materials that you are presenting. Many teachers seem to think that once something has been taught, it can more or less be forgotten, and nothing could be further from the truth. The Japanese Mombusho sets a pace in the public schools which absolutely prevents the learning of English by the Japanese student, because he moves so fast into new materials that he is learning and forgetting at the same rate. As a result, the student knows about as much when he finishes high school as he did when he completed his sixth grade. That is, about enough to starve to death in a candy store.

To teach or not to teach writing, has been a big question in many language teaching situations. However, for most students, learning to read is as important, or perhaps even more important, than speaking the language. The problem often is that traditionally people have ignored the spoken language and that left the student unable to speak. The basic point is that to read, you must practice reading. To speak, you must practice speaking, and to write, you must practice writing. The average student needs to read, speak and write in a wide variety of situations, so English for Special Purposes does not appeal to me, except in a very few limited situations. Learning any part of a language is an enormous

amount of work, and most people would like to be able to watch TV, read a book and talk to people as well as write letters to friends in the language they are taking the time to learn. As a result, no matter what anyone says, when you get right down to the problem of teaching second languages, you have to teach the whole language and you have to teach all aspects of it.

In the GELP we worked writing in from the very beginning, but in a very unobtrusive way. As stated earlier, we always gave the student anything that he was learning to say in the written form on the same sheet of paper with the transcription. We tried to explain the problems with English spelling and encouraged them not to pay too much attention to the writing at first. Gradually, we worked in simple spelling exercises which forced the students to learn to spell the words that they had mastered a vocabulary item. Then we asked them to write "compositions," but these were not what the average English teacher would think of as a composition. A composition in this context could be five sentences; sentences which the student had learned to say and needed to be able to read and write. To a large extent, we felt that this did, indeed, prevent the writing system from rinning the student's pronunciation up. Until the student was well along in his learning of the language we did not allow him to go off on his own and try writing things that he had not already learned to say. As a simple example, we would tell the class, shortly after the students had been drilled extensively on the past tense, to write up in ten sentences, which

they knew, what he did last night. The composition might well look something like this

I went home from school® I ate supper. I read book. I played my son. I took bath. I washed hair. I went to a movie. I came home® I go bed.

This is not a reasonable composition in the eyes of any English teacher, and it was not meant to be, but it did give the students an opportunity to write out some of the words that they had been learning, and it gave the teacher some ideas as to where more drill was needed; in the example given above, on prepositions, articles and pronouns. It also insured that the students thought about English at least a tittle outside the classroom. These brief essays would be collected, corrected and returned to the class. Errors made consistently by most of the class members would be redrilled and discussed, but no one expected a good clear exposition from students at this point in their program of study.

As the program moved on, the tenses were introduced, in order of difficulty for the Turkish students, vocabulary was increased, attempting always to stick within the English words that were used with very high frequency. We wanted to give the student the maximum chance to have the vocabulary he needed, and since so much vocabulary is situationally determined, we could not predict what he would need. However, if you stick with words that have a generally high frequency, there is a pretty good chance that the average student

would need these no matter what situation he found himself in.

As stated earlier, we presented material in a carefully controlled manner. For the first four weeks, the student did not get to see or work with anything grammatically that he had not been taught in class® That is, we did not give the students complicated conversations which they were asked to memorize. We did give them a few very simple ones without grammatical explanations so they could learn a few of the meaningless formulae that we use in social interaction, but not much. Then, after the basic grammatical structure had been presented, i0 e., all of the verb tenses, about 1, 000 words of vocabulary, pronouns, noun pluralization, conjunctions and so on, we began to practice conversations and to use the language in a real situation. Eliouse Enata prepared some of the most natural conversations that I have ever read, and we published them under the title, CONVERSATIONS IN ANKARA. These would probably not be useful to other teachers, because they take place in Ankara, Turkey and were especially appealing to tho Turks. This means, logically, that until the student had a pretty good mastery of the basic grammatical structure, he was given simple conversations which would help him understand how to use this language that he had spent so much time learning®

At about the same time, we began to give the students an hour of reading from simplified English books. There is a lot to be said against the simplified form of any language, but in realistic terms, they are the only things that beginners can

really grasp, and they have the enormous advantage that if the vocabulary in the books is parallel with that that has been taught in the classroom, the students are not discouraged by having to look up every other word in a dictionary. It is very heartwarming for a beginner to be able to read a page, any page, and only have to look up one or two words on a page. He really feels that he is learning something, and this is important. The student is likely to be discouraged enough without adding to his woes by giving him something that he cannot possibly read without looking up every third word in a dictionary.

By shortly after the end of the second month, at six hours a day, the student was seeing a lot of English which was not presented in an organized manner. In terms of a normal school year, where a student studies English one hour a day, this would be the equivalent of about the end of the first year. That is, in the second year of study the student could be presented English without worrying too much about trying to do it in an organized, systematic fashion so long as it was simplified and contained a lot of review of lessons taught the year before.

Then as we progressed through the third and fourth months of the course, the complexity increased, the vocabulary was increased, and more and more difficult readings were assigned.

At the end of the four month course, the average Turk was able to come to the USA and do quite well. For those who were expected to do graduate level work in American universities, we tested these students, and if they failed to get above a

certain score on the test, they were held for another two months. This "advanced course," (we did not call it that) consisted of completely uncensored English. We took college textbooks, extremely complicated grammatical drills which showed how to construct very complicated sentences and played college level recordings in the laboratory, and wove these into a pattern with reviews of earlier materials in an attempt to remove chronic errors.

The interesting thing about this program was its success rate. The program ran for seven years while I was a part of it, and it expanded each year. Within a year after I left, it was faltering, and within two years, it had been abandoned. I talked later to some of my Turkish friends, and while they were very polite about it, they said in effect that the program simply did not work after I left. I do not for one moment believe that this had anything to do with me or my fantastic ability to teach, as some of my colleagues said at the time. My successors went to a more loose organization and utilized complex conversations from the very beginning. The problem was, basically, one that has plagued TESOL from its very inception, and that is, the idea that the second language learner must learn the same way that a child learns his first language. He must hear fully complex English sentences in normal situations and extract the structure from these. This, of course, is nonsense, because an adult is perfectly capable of understanding organized structures, and a two-year-old child is not.<sup>2</sup> The problem of presenting language ma-



materials in a "real" situation, instead of in a carefully organized manner, is that the student further confuses the structure of English with that of his native language, because, lacking a carefully structured organization, he lapses back into the only organization he can find, and that is the grammar of his native language, because he knows that this is a highly organized system and not a helter-skelter mass of utterances. Children learning their first language do not know this and have no structure to rely on.

To illustrate just how successful the program was, in 1956 I was given 12 young people, in their early 20's, typical of the students that we were given, except that they had not had one single word of English before coming into the program and most of our students had had at least some exposure to the language. Of these 12 students, three came to the US and received MA degrees with no problems, and one received some sort of honor along with the degree. All this with an English program which consisted of about 560 hours of instruction organized and presented as described briefly above.<sup>3</sup>

Joe E. Pierce, "The Problem of Teaching English in Japanese Schools," Bulletins of English Studies, Osaka Kyoikai Daigaku, Osaka, Japan, No. 14, 1969, pp. 28-36.

Joe E. Pierce and Ingrid Vanwaardenburg Hanna, The Development of a Phonological System in English Speaking American Children, Volume I, The HaPi Press, 1978.

<sup>3</sup> For more details of the method, cf. Pierce, A Linguistic Method of Teaching Second Languages, The HaPi Press, 1973.

#### Additional Cited Materials

Eloise Enata, Conversations in Ankara, Georgetown English Language Program, Ankara, Turkey, 1958.

Winfred L. Lehmann, American Conversations, Georgetown English Language Program Ankara, Turkey, 1957

Joe E. Pierce, Spoken English for Turks, Georgetown English Language Program, Ankara, Turkey, 1957.

## BRIEF COMMUNICATIONS

## READING IN TEFL PROGRAMS:

## SOME USEFUL TECHNIQUES

David Wardell

Teaching reading to speakers of other languages requires different approaches for students at various levels. All too often it seems that texts prepared for intermediate and advanced learners do not differ radically from those addressing beginners. At the same time teachers do not seem to have a very versatile "bag of tricks" to use in challenging and assisting students through various levels of reading competence. I would like to suggest a few techniques that have proven successful for me which ought to be useful to other TEFL instructors.

Reading at all levels should be a three-part activity: (1) pre-reading exercises performed with direction from the instructor; (2) the reading itself, either in or outside the classroom; and (3) post-reading exercises that test comprehension and facility with the material. It is probably the first of these that is most frequently overlooked.

The problem with the format of many text books is that the authors presume reading competence

on the part of the student, and reading passages are presented with comprehension questions following, but with no instructions on how to learn or to teach reading.

Gladys G. Doty and Janet Ross recognize two learning skills necessary for correct reading, i. e. , vocabulary and structure. "The main barriers to fluent reading in a foreign language are vocabulary and sentence structure." <sup>2</sup> However, these two areas are addressed only by arranging selections as a series of graded readings. Presumably numbers and difficulties of lexical and structural complexities increase as the student moves through the text, but this is not explained. While Doty and Ross do provide vocabulary assistance exercises, both before and after the reading passages, they never directly provide any way for the students to learn how to unravel the structural difficulties contained in the passages.

Take, for example, a sentence from their selection, "Covered Wagon Days."

When we reached the Missouri River at Pierre, the ice was not strong enough to carry the heavily loaded wagons, so we waited about a week for it to get thicker, <sup>3</sup>

The structural difficulty here is locating the antecedent for the pronoun "it," Several possibilities exist - Missouri River, Pierre, ice and week. (I am giving the students the benefit of the doubt that "wagons" would not be given serious consideration because of the plural form, yet it has been my experience that some students do commit this error. ) It is apparent that an un-

derstanding of this example would most probably be clouded because of the structural difficulties rather than lexical problems.

Moving to a slightly different perspective, we find that John F. Povey concludes his essay on the use of literature in TESL programs with a comment that recognizes the problem of teaching reading to advanced students.

The linguists have established a very successful basis for the teaching of language at the elementary levels. Perhaps we can be equally successful at this more advanced level of language study in bringing to the foreign student... acquaintance with our extensive range of literature. <sup>4</sup>

His conclusion offers a possible solution without providing any explanation of tangible skills. It is, again, a case of knowing something is missing in teaching students to read advanced texts, but providing no clear way to bridge the gap.

There seems to be wide agreement that vocabulary and structure are the two essential skills required for reading. It is probably true that vocabulary represents the major stumbling block to understanding at the beginning level, since structures are very carefully controlled in elementary TEFL reading materials. A gloss can be an effective learning tool, but too many teachers err in generalizing that what is true at one level must apply to all levels. Many writers appear to believe that because vocabulary is critical for beginners, it is critical as well for inter-

mediate and advanced readers. But, is this really true?

As one moves higher up the ladder of reading competence, the balance between vocabulary and structural complexities, not vocabulary, deserves the major consideration, especially in the pre-reading sessions, because a small number of lexical items account for more than ninety percent of the words on any given page of text, and presumably the student should have learned these high frequency words in the new language already. Asking the students to answer content questions about the material read remains an effective post-reading activity for testing, but this is not a teaching tool.

Pre-reading instruction might begin with the process of embedding, which resides at the heart of transformational grammar, and this may provide some help for the TEFL instructor. By extracting the components in a complex structural form, students can be shown the relationship between various elements within the sentence. The following exercises, which I once used in teaching the "Neil Armstrong" passage in Lucette Kenan's Modern American Profiles will serve as an example of how this might be done.

First, explain to the students that simple sentences are not difficult to understand. Look at the sentences below which illustrate the point.

The three Armstrong children were brought up strictly.

They were brought up lovingly.

They were brought up by their mother.

Their mother was a serious woman.

Their mother had a fondness for books.  
She had a fondness for music.

While these sentences may not be difficult to understand, they all have the same "shape," and this fact makes reading boring. Hence a really good writer may want to combine all of the above sentences into one or two. This process has been labelled by scholars as "sentence-combining." Can the class do this? After some work, the students maybe able to create something approaching the following example from the text.

The three Armstrong children were brought up strictly but lovingly by their mother, a serious woman with a fondness for books and music.

With their appetite whetted for this kind of puzzle, the teacher might want to try several such examples. Below is another such exercise®

Here was their man.  
Their man would be the first human to disturb the lunar dust.  
Their man would sink in the lunar dust.  
Their man was our Hero.  
Their man was our Pride.  
Their man was our Explorer.  
Their man was a Pioneer of the Technological age.  
Their man was ready to launch into space.  
Their man had all the dreams of hu-

manity.  
Their man had all the fears of human-  
nity.

The above sentences can be compressed by the students into a single sentence which may resemble this complex structure from the reading passage.

Here was their man, who soon would be the first human being to disturb the lunar dust - or sink into it, our Hero, our Pride, our Explorer, the Pioneer of the Technological Age, ready to launch into space with all the dreams and fears of humanity.

Whether the students' construction is identical with that written by the author is not critical. What is important is that the students begin to see the internal relationship of the structural elements woven into a single language unit. This is the first step in providing an attack tool which can be used to unlock other structural complexities.

A basic understanding of the procedure described above will enable the students to begin the process of unravelling elements in complex sentences using guided exercises. Take for example the following sentence, and ask each student to write the same thing in a sequence of simple sentences.

He had not panicked in Korea, in the crashing Is M, o r in the burning

house, and he even kept a clear head in Gemini 8 when a wild thruster had made the capsule carrying him and David Scott tumble end over end.

The following worksheet should accompany the above exercise.

- 1, He had not panicked in Korea.
2. \_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5, In Gemini 8 \_\_\_\_\_
- 6, The capsule \_\_\_\_\_
7. \_\_\_\_\_

The completed worksheet might look something like the following list of sentences.

1. He had not panicked in Korea.
2. He had not panicked in the crash-  
L. M.
3. He had not panicked in the burn-
4. He kept head in Gemini 8.
5. In Gemini 8 a thruster was wild.
6. The capsule carried him and Da-  
vid Scott.
7. The ca\_p\_sule tumbled end over end.

Of course the instructor cannot hope to evaluate every sentence in a reading passage using this technique, but again it is an activity that provides an attack skill that the student can take away from the classroom and use when structural complex-

ities vex him.

Another pre-reading activity that can be useful is a capsule review of the passages to be read. This is particularly effective in assisting students to run the gamut of multiple meanings in English morphemes. The capsule review should not be viewed as a "give away" but rather a map that provides clues to the difficulties of the passage.

Once I was teaching waiter Van Tilburg Clark's, "Hook." This is an extremely difficult work for second language learners because the vocabulary is highly specialized, and the sentence structures are not simple. The story is divided into five parts which breaks the reading into fairly manageable units. For each of these sections, I prepared a capsule review. In addition, for the first part I provided a brief synopsis of each of the eleven paragraphs. Although this gave the students a great deal of information, it did not allow them to acquire all the details of the text without reading the story itself. The following paragraph is an example of data which might be (and in fact was) provided to assist the students with their reading.

Hook is a hawk. His parents made him leave the nest at an early age. Hook's life was not easy because he could not fly. Food was difficult to find, and he was often hungry. Later he learns to fly and kill animals for food. In the Spring he meets a female bird, He wants to mate with her, but first he must fight another male bird. They fight and Hook wins,

1. Hook' s parents abandon him because they cannot find enough food,
  2. Hook lives on the ground because he cannot fly. The weather is hot and dry.
  3. There are two sounds of nature. One is the sound of the wheat and the leaves. The other is the sound of the ocean. Hook' s main problem is to find food.
  4. Hook does not like the sea gulls.
  5. Hook kills a mouse, The taste reminds him of the food his parents used to bring him. Hook becomes a hunter,
  6. Hook learns to fly and learns to kill larger animals.
  7. Hook is flying. He moves through the air and watches his shadow. The shadow rises and becomes larger as Hook flies over a hill. The shadow sinks and becomes smaller as he flies over a valley.
  8. Hook wants to mate. He looks for a female and finally finds one. He tries to join with her, but she flies away.
  9. Another hawk arrives. This hawk and Hook fight. Hook wins.
- fight. Hook wins. Hook follows the female.
10. Hook mates with the female.
  11. Hook becomes an adult hawk.

Only in part I of "Hook" were the students given a paragraph-by-paragraph guide to the reading. The capsule review prior to each section became shorter and shorter as we proceeded from part

1 to part 5. However, the method of summarizing each portion of the story had been introduced and this proved to be a learning device which a number of the students used to organize their understanding of the text. This is, in fact, the first step in note-taking that can be applied to other areas of academic endeavor.

This brief article does not claim to provide a complete method for teaching foreign students to read. I have attempted only to provide a few practical techniques that can be used effectively to speed up the student' a learning in a TEFL classroom® Although most of these appear to be best suited for the intermediate or advanced levels, it is possible that beginners could benefit from some modification in the design.

The Whistler and Other Stories . Jean N. Dale and Willard D. Scheeler, English Language Services, 1973.

Little Stories for Big People, Sol Gonshack, Regents, 1976.

Modern American Profiles, Lucette Rolle t Kenan, Harcourt Brace Javanovich, 1975.

<sup>2</sup> Gladys G. Doty and Janet Ross (eds. Lan- and Life in the U. S, A . Vol. 2, Ha r - per and Row, 1975, p. 1,

<sup>3</sup> it ,, p. 60.

4 John F. Povey, "Literature in T S EL Programs: The Language and the Culture, " Teaching English as a Second Language, Harold B Allen and Russel N. Campbell, ( eds. ) , McGraw-Hill, 1972, p. 191®

#### Book Reviews:

Communicative Skill 2, Growing with English, John Crow and Nancy McLendon Strickland, edited by David Holdzkom, Institute of Modern Languages, Inc., Silver Spring s, Maryland, 1979.

This book is a one-hundred page 7 x 10 inch, workbook designed to be used to supplement the "Orientation in American English" series. The introduction states that it can be used effectively to enrich any ESL curriculum at the low intermediate student level.

The author s believe that the book can be adapted to any age group from teenagers on up. They say that when used in conjunction with "Level 2 Orientations in American English" it provides two or three hour s of additional study per lesson.

Each chapter revolves around a different aspect of living in the USA, L e., transportation, holidays, sports, credit, enrolling at a university, r e n t I n g an apartment, the department stores, etc. ( There are sixteen chapters. ) Each lesson introduces vocabulary appropriate to the aspect under consideration, includes from three to six grammar / structure points explained and simplified and is followed by structural practice exercises progressing within each lesson generally from more structured to less structured. Each chapter has one or two puzzles, a writing exercise and a community oriented exercise.

It is this reviewer' s opinionthat a teacher can benefit more than the students from this book. There are good ideas to borrow to improve on& s

teaching. The ten aspects covered are practical ones for late teenagers and adults. The idea of having puzzles to reinforce learning is useful and fun, and many of the community activities would make excellent group or individual projects for one's ESL students.

The reviewer's major concern stems from the fact that the student is repeatedly asked to draw on information which he has never been taught in order to do the exercises and puzzles. (Puzzle 1, Lesson 1, is unworkable as printed.)

Gwendolyn Pierce, Cleveland HS, Portland, Oregon.

New English Course: Edwin T. Cornelius, Jr., English Languages Services, Inc., 16250 Ventura Blvd., Encino, CA, 1979; six text books, six workbooks, tape recordings (open-reel or cassette), progress tests for each textbook, and six teacher's manuals.

English Language Service's New English Course by Edwin T. Cornelius, Jr. is comprehensive in the variety of learning activities it provides for the student of English as a Second Language and in the amount of instruction and support it offers the teacher. The tone and format of the program are also appealing. New English Course was written for use by teenagers and adults beginning at the upper-secondary level. It consists of six student textbooks with accompanying tape recordings and progress tests. The tapes

come in two versions, one for laboratory use or individual study and another for use in the classroom. I surveyed the first level student text, the teacher's editions for levels 1, 3 and 6 and corresponding workbooks.

Three features of this series encourage me to try it. First, there is an easy mix of more traditional, teacher-directed learning activities such as intonation patterns and substitution drills, with freer, more creative student-centered activities like play-acting and dialog writing. Secondly, there appears to be a very natural blending of the listening, speaking, reading and writing modes within the lessons. Thirdly, I like the fact that students using New English Course are not expected to learn passively. If all teaching suggestions are followed, students will confront numerous activities that require the application of basic language structures previously presented. I am encouraged because other texts I have used need to be constantly supplemented in order to achieve the same balance exhibited by New English Course in these three areas.

This series offers abundant help for the teacher. Instead of having manuals and texts printed under separate covers, the course sensibly offers annotated teacher's editions. This design is particularly effective with New English Course, since every page in the text is written as a self-contained mini-lesson. Notes alongside each page of the teacher's editions outline learning objectives, pinpoint new material and recommend ways to present and reinforce the material. The annotated editions also contain scope and sequence



charts,

Students should enjoy using this course. The student text I saw was filled with color illustrations, and the print was readable and easy to follow. Small cartoons in many of the lessons add humor and fun. Students should be pleased that no two consecutive lessons ever use the same format. Variety occurs within each book and between the books of the series. Students should also enjoy the themes of the lessons, many of which are functional in nature.

As a high school E. S. L. teacher, my biggest concern is that New English Course was written for upper-secondary and adult students, and it would be impractical for me to have different sets of books for the purpose of a grouping only. I can see that some topics in the series might pose a problem for younger students. For example, the early lessons discuss school in a university setting, and book six addresses some sophisticated topics like "Women and Mechanization." Other lessons, however, utilize common problems such as talking to a policeman when you've been stopped for a speeding ticket, and should hold the interest of sophomores who are taking Driver Education Courses.

New English Course is stimulating and well written. I would use the series as a basic text for mature high school students who have had a fair amount of academic experience in their native languages.

Valerie Ormont, Cleveland High School,  
Portland, Oregon

ESL Curriculum Guide for Young Japanese Students.; Weidie Hermanson, Susan Tennant, and Nancy Yildiz. Vancouver Community College, 100 West 49th Avenue, Vancouver, BC, Canada; 1979.

Let's Communicate contains 274 pages of ideas for developing "survival" communicative skills for junior students ranging in age from eight to fifteen years in the Summer English Language Program at Vancouver Community College. These Japanese pupils are at the beginning level and the course material is designed to facilitate the conversational needs of these students who have limited English ability. Thus, the focus of the activities is on skill-getting and the language required in the activities is minimal but relevant to the task.

The unit format includes the topics of Social Exchanges, Daily Activities, Sports Activities, Food, Shopping, Orientation to Vancouver and its Culture, Possible Problems and Other Teaching Suggestions. Each idea includes the level of instruction, the objectives and follow-up activities.

The guide is written in clear, easy-to-read style, and includes cross-references to other games and activities in the program. The language functions stressed are briefly summarized as follows:

- a stating/enquiring about likes/dislikes
- b formulaic expressions
- c identifying/naming items
- d accepting/refusing invitations  
describing/comparing items

- f expressing opinions
- g giving/following directions
- h making/ responding to suggestions

There are many varied language activities and games, and the teacher's role is eased by the inclusion of illustrations of all the materials, so that they can be prepared at home. The simple line drawings throughout the guide are easy to copy, and suggestions are included on how to make the games using readily available materials, such as postcards.

The underlying approach for this guide is "situational" with stress placed on the relevancy of the language learned by the pupils. The topics covered are representative of the situations the pupils will face during their stay in Canada and the United States. The suggested classroom activities are all oriented to action and fun.

4

Isabel Cole, UBC, Vancouver, BC, Canada

4