DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 428 579 FL 025 778

AUTHOR Tarnopolsky, Oleg
TITLE Teaching English Intensively in a Non-English Speaking Country: Theory, Practice, and Results.
PUB DATE 1999-00-00
NOTE 120p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Techniques; *Comparative Education; Curriculum Design; *English (Second Language); Foreign Countries; Instructional Materials; *Intensive Language Courses; Program Design; Program Effectiveness; Public Education; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Programs; State Regulation; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS *Ukraine; United States

ABSTRACT

The report describes the context for English language teaching in Ukraine, provides a case study on one intensive English program (IEP), and compares the program to an IEP in the United States. The first chapter discusses the circumstances of state-regulated and alternative English language programs, factors supporting English language teaching and learning, problems found in state-regulated programs, and the prospects for alternative program types. The second chapter outlines the theoretical foundations for designing an IEP for Ukraine, and the third describes one program, including three courses in the sequence. Outcomes of this program are detailed in the fourth chapter, noting the testing procedures used, selection of students for testing in this context, results, and students' evaluations of the program. The final chapter offers a comparison of the Ukrainian and American programs. Contains 166 references. (MSE)

# TEACHING ENGLISH INTENSIVELY IN A NON-ENGLISH-SPEAKING COUNTRY: THEORY, PRACTICE, AND RESULTS

by Oleg Tarnopolsky

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express his deepest appreciation of the J. William Fulbright Foreign Scholarship Board, the United States Information Agency, and the Council for International Exchange of Scholars since it is thanks to the support of these US institutions he, as a Fulbright grantee, was able to get acquainted with intensive English programs (IEPs) in the USA. It the knowledge of them and of relevant American literature that made this book possible as in it a Ukrainian IEP is described and compared to an American IEP. In this respect the author's greatest thanks are due to the State University of New York at Buffalo, to the Department of Learning and Instruction, and to the English Language Institute there, to the Director of the Institute and University's Vice-Provost for International Education Dr. Stephen C. Dunnett, to the Assistant Directors of the English Language Institute Barbara A. Campbell and Linda M. Silvestri, to many other people at the University, Department, and Institute mentioned above whose support and assistance during the author's work there as a Fulbright scholar were inestimable and instrumental for writing the book. The author thinks it to be his special pleasure to warmly thank Dr. Stephen C. Dunnett not only for support and assistance but also for the permission to describe briefly in the book that follows the IEP taught at the English Language Institute, and for Dr. Dunnett's valuable comments on the chapter where this description is given.

The author also owes his appreciation to many of his colleagues in Ukraine and Russia who encouraged and assisted him in his work of developing IEPs for Ukraine and introducing them into teaching practice. It is impossible to name all of them here personally but this fact in no way diminishes the author's gratitude.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

# PREFACE

In one of the issues of TESOL Matters there was a very characteristic editor's note to one of the articles (Burns, 1996: 11). It read: "When we think of "intensive English programs", we generally think of programs in English-speaking countries such as the US, the United Kingdom, or Australia. Yet, as English is used more internationally, intensive English programs can also be found in countries where English is not the lingua franca". The incorrectness of the assumption that in non-English-speaking countries intensive English programs are a rare phenomenon can very well be proved taking as an example the former Soviet Union. Since the 50s English has always been the most popular foreign language to be learned there. It is the language learned by the absolute majority of students at state-owned educational institutions though the outcomes of this learning have always been rather dubious as will be explained in detail in chapter 1.

Therefore, the desire of quite a number of people in the former USSR to acquire a really good practical knowledge of English together with frequent failures of state-regulated foreign language teaching/learning system became an impulse for creating intensive English programs (courses). One more impulse was the emergence in the 70s, after the Bulgarian researcher Georgi Losanov had triumphantly defended his doctoral dissertation in Kharkov (Ukraine) in 1970, of Losanov's method and system of intensive foreign language teaching. For years to come they became the source of intensive foreign language programs development, and this source has not been dried up even up to now. Thus, in the former USSR the development of intensive English programs (IEPs) started in the 70s and it has never stopped since that time being the most popular form of teaching English. Moreover, in the perestroika period and later after the disintegration of the USSR, the "boom" in the field of intensive English teaching/learning began and has shown no signs of decline since then. It is due to the fact that the disappearance of the "iron curtain" made many people really need good mastery of English to be attained quickly for various professional or personal reasons.

It is in this period that intensive programs of English started to flourish and spread all over the country. Many new kinds of such programs emerged. One of them was the combined intensive program of General English/Business English developed by the author of this book and described in it. Having been developed in 1992/1993, this program has been functioning quite successfully since that time in Dniepropetrovsk (Ukraine) ensuring very good learning outcomes for all students (meaning by good learning outcomes students' success in developing abilities to communicate in English but not their results in formal command of the language). This program, having quite a number of original features of its own, is at the same time in many respects typical for the countries of the former USSR as it is based on those general assumptions that are proper to the Soviet and post-Soviet methodology of foreign language teaching and on specific assumptions characterizing all sorts of intensive language programs there.

In this way the program is distinguished by learner and learner's needs centering; a communicative and interactionist approach in rational combination with language focusing whenever it may help communicative competence development; employment of cooperative learning; utilization of technical aids and other means of intensifying students' learning activities in classes; serious attention paid to creating favorable psychological environment in the classroom. All these and the other assumptions underlying the program, as well as the program itself,

were developed almost solely on the basis of the approaches existing in the former USSR both in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods and taking insufficient account of approaches typical for the West. It was quite natural because in the Soviet period professionals in the field of foreign language teaching could (though with considerable difficulties) get acquainted with the achievements of their Western colleagues, but this acquaintance could not be any other than fragmentary. The same holds true of the Western side where second language (SL) or foreign language (FL) teaching professionals know very little about what was or is being done in this area in the former USSR. There, after its disintegration, Western materials have become much more accessible but due to economic difficulties, their penetration into the former Soviet Union is rather slow, so it will take quite a long time before every Ukrainian or Russian FL teacher and/or researcher can get full access to all of them.

Having come to the USA in 1995 as a Fulbright scholar and having gained free access to the professional literature and materials inaccessible to him before, the author of this book was amazed to find how close many of the approaches developed in the former USSR were to what was and is being done in the USA. Having got an opportunity of an in-depth acquaintance with a typical IEP at the English Language Institute (State University of New York at Buffalo), he was amazed to find how close in its theoretical underpinnings this program was to his own IEP and to some other similar IEPs in his own country. Certainly, in its practical manifestations the American program was quite different from the Ukrainian one, but even these differences were caused by one common basic theoretical assumption - that of designing an IEP in full accordance with learners' needs and conditions in which they learned English. So, the differences in learners' needs (and consequently, in teaching goals), as well as in external circumstances, were instrumental in making two programs look different but the theory underlying their design was in many respects identical. Just the same was observed by the author in a lot of things connected with SL/FL teaching in the USA in comparison with such teaching in his own country.

It gave birth to an idea that both American and international readers, professional teachers of English as a second/foreign language, might be interested in the underpinnings and practical issues of intensive English teaching in the former Soviet Union (Ukraine is taken because it is the author's own country but the situation is practically the same all over the former USSR). This interest may be caused by the fact that such teaching there is designed in a way similar in theory to what is done in the West but different in practical applications of this theory because of different teaching goals and conditions. It should be taken into account that such interest may be not only theoretical but quite practical because with every year more and more English teachers (native speakers from the USA and Great Britain) come to the former USSR and other post-Communist countries of Eastern and Central Europe to teach English there.

To give readers a clear idea of similarities and differences mentioned above first of all it was necessary to draw a general picture of intensive English teaching in a chosen country and then to select a representative IEP (the author naturally selected the one of his own creation) for full description and detailed analysis of the underlying theory, practical implications, and learning outcomes. Finally, it was desirable to compare such an IEP to a typical Western (American) one to bring differences and similarities into light. It was just in this way that the book was designed. The author cherishes the hope that Western readers will find new and interesting information in it, especially useful to those who plan teaching English in

the former USSR. But one more thing is of the greatest importance to him. If he succeeds in proving his point as to the essential similarity and even theoretical identity of the American and Ukrainian approaches to intensive English teaching, it will be of the greatest use to his colleagues from Ukraine and the other former USSR countries. It will mean that they do not lag behind in what they do professionally, i.e. including them into the international family of ESOL teaching professionals and cooperating with them in various areas that are of interest to TESOL would not be a one-way traffic but can be mutually advantageous to all the parties.

# CHAPTER 1. STATE-REGULATED AND ALTERNATIVE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN UKRAINE

At present many people of different ages, occupations, and social status learn English as a foreign language in Ukraine. They include not only the overwhelming majority of secondary and higher school students but also thousands of adults and adolescents who try to master English in different commercial programs, employing private tutors, or totally by themselves (without using services of a teacher).

## 1.1. Auspicious Factors for English Teaching/Learning in Ukraine

English as a foreign language (EFL) and its learning owe their popularity in Ukraine to various reasons - economic, political, social, cultural and psychological. For one thing, it is the emergence of a new class of businessmen and entrepreneurs, the development of this class striving to establish stable contacts with foreign partners that makes acquirement of English as an international language of business absolutely necessary. Similar reasons underlie the English learning motivation of scientists, engineers, doctors, and other specialists who also strive to establish stable contacts with their foreign colleagues for getting opportunities of exchanging knowledge and information. For another thing, political reasons are of some importance, such as a popular wish of enjoying the same opportunities of freely traveling from country to country that are the inalienable right of any citizen in a developed democratic state. Social-cultural reasons are even more stimulating. They are embodied in many people's desire to travel or stay in developed Western countries for some period of time with the aim of getting to know their culture, history, way of life, to learn as much as possible about the most advanced Western technology, to study at schools and universities in the West, to look for new career opportunities for themselves. Shopping, sightseeing, and entertainment (different kinds of tourism) in developed Western countries are also very attractive. Finally, quite a lot of people would like to settle in the West for good due to the deep crisis Ukraine is in now.

All those who learn English because of the reasons enumerated above do it knowing that English is an international language and having learned it, they will be able to solve their communicative problems practically everywhere in the world. Psychological reasons should not be omitted either. For some people English-speaking countries symbolize democracy, advanced technology, prosperity, and well-being. Thus, learning English for them is a way of gaining access to those values. One more very important reason is that many organizations in Ukraine (especially private firms) offer very good job opportunities to persons with practical knowledge of English employing them for maintaining international contacts.

The combination of all the factors outlined above underlies the popularity and need of learning English felt by a part of the population in Ukraine - popularity and need that have never been so pervasive before, in the former Soviet Union.

The governmental language policy and planning are in principle propitious to satisfying that need and encouraging it. It is natural if viewed from the angle that the language policy is considered by Cooper (1989) and Tollefson (1995) as indivisibly connected to the distribution of political power and economic resources. At present the Ukrainian authorities set as their primary task for developing the independent Ukraine its integration into the world community, and first of all into the international economy. This is impossible without having many people with a good command of foreign languages, and especially English. The authorities'

increasing attention to foreign language (FL) teaching/learning can be proved by analyzing some recent documents regulating functioning of state-owned educational institutions.

Quite a number of such documents can be quoted. For instance, the state national program "Education (Ukraine of the 21-st century)" approved by the Ukrainian Cabinet's of Ministers resolution No.896 of November 3, 1993 declares the attainment of the qualitatively new standard of teaching basic academic subjects to be a priority in educational reform. Foreign languages are included into the list of such basic subjects. In the same Program in the section "Ways of reforming content of general education" (subsection "Humanitarian education") teaching/learning foreign languages is also set as a priority task. A possibility and rationality of starting to learn foreign languages even before entering the primary school, i.e. at kindergartens, are emphasized. For this purpose it is recommended to organize special groups of children for FL learning in state-owned kindergartens.

In secondary schools where a foreign language is a compulsory educational subject special optional groups are often formed for achieving better results in comparison with the requirements of the compulsory curriculum. Very popular are specialized FL schools where foreign language classes are started from the first or second year and are held much more frequently than in ordinary schools. Organization of such specialized groups or schools is envisaged both by the already mentioned program "Education" and by the Law on Education adopted for Ukraine by the Supreme Rada (Council) on June 4, 1991. It should be said that in specialized FL schools some subjects (for instance, history) are taught in the foreign language being learned. So, immersion is implemented in a manner similar to French immersion in Canada (Collinson, 1989; Netten & Spain, 1989; Safty, 1989). It is also worthy of note that more than 90% of all the specialized FL groups and schools are English-learning ones. Therefore, it is mainly EFL teaching that benefits from this form of attempt to improve and spread as much as possible learning of foreign languages in primary and secondary schools.

As to institutions of higher learning, according to the "Regulations on teaching/learning process organization in higher educational establishments" approved by the Ministry of Education of Ukraine on June 2, 1994, all the academic subjects are divided into normative and optional ones. The normative subjects are listed in the State Educational Standard and are compulsory for all the institutions of higher learning. These institutions are not entitled to reduce the academic time set aside by the Standard for studying such subjects. Foreign languages are included into this compulsory subjects list, and one more document of the Ministry of Education of Ukraine No. 1/9-18 (February 18, 1994) "About the development of educational-professional curricula of higher education according to relevant professional orientation" sets aside 324 academic hours for compulsory FL teaching/learning. It is more than for any other humanities studied at higher schools. (These and other figures concern only FL teaching in non-linguistic institutions of higher learning. The linguistic ones, for instance, those where FL teachers are trained, are not considered or mentioned in this book). Besides, higher schools are encouraged to organize different optional courses after the compulsory course.

Thus, foreign language has been made a compulsory educational subject for practically all levels of education where it is taught for at least 5-7 years in secondary schools and for at least 2 years in higher schools. Since not less than 3/4 of secondary and higher school students learn English, it cannot but be considered an auspicious factor for disseminating English in Ukraine. This factor is all the more

auspicious as, besides the compulsory course, the education system in state-owned educational institutions includes various optional FL courses where students can reach a more advanced level of language command if they wish.

All the documents quoted above confirm the assertion that in their language policy the Ukrainian authorities attempt to do their best for creating favorable conditions conducive to successful FL (and particularly English) learning at state-owned educational institutions. This policy, combined with the population's requirements described earlier, should in principle form the most important prerequisite for getting good teaching results. But there is one more very important favorable factor worthy of separate analysis.

### 1.2. EFL Teaching Standards as a Favorable Factor

EFL teaching standards are rather high in Ukraine, Russia, and some other former Soviet Union countries. In many state-owned educational establishments such high standards are the result of the generally high level of FL teaching methodology development reached in the former USSR[1]. It has not been reached after its disintegration but before it. So, speaking about the modern state-of-the-art and methodological achievements, common methodology of FL teaching, as it has been developed in the former Soviet Union, is meant because there is no separate Ukrainian or Russian methodology. This common methodology is being preserved and further elaborated now both in Ukraine and Russia (as well as in some other countries) though in the course of time differences may and probably will appear.

The methodology in question has for many years already been distinguished by its communicative nature, orientation towards developing learners' communicative skills, communicative competence (in the sense this competence is understood by Canale & Swain, 1980). The communicative approach began to be most intensively developed in the West in the late seventies - early eighties when in the works by Brumfit (1984), Johnson (1983), Munby (1978), Strevens (1977), Widdowson (1978), and quite a number of other authors some of its principal propositions were formulated. In the very same period similar propositions could be found in the works by Kitaygorodskaya (1982), Leontiev (1986), Passov (1977, 1985), Zimniaya (1978) from Russia; Skalkin (1981, 1983) from Ukraine, and numerous other researchers from the Soviet Union[2]. The principles and methods of teaching language for specific purposes set down in books and articles by Robinson (1980, 1991), Coffey (1983), Hutchinson & Waters (1987), Kennedy & Bolitho (1984) had their parallels in the books by Artemov (1969), Salistra (1966), Serova (1988), Tarnopolsky (1989, 1993). The same can be said of learner-centered approaches, computer-assisted language learning, employing different technical appliances for it, organizing pair or small group work and cooperative learning in general, applying role-playing, simulations, and drama techniques to foreign

[1] Weng Xianzhi (1996) blames the methodology borrowed from the Soviet Union for being the source of purely formal and non-communicative teaching of English in present-day China. Indeed, this kind of methodology based on grammar-translation method existed in the USSR but only in the 50s, and as early as the sixties it was rejected even officially. So, it is hardly fair to cite as the source of such a traditional and ineffective sort of teaching the country where it has not been used for almost forty years.

[2] The last names of Russian and Ukrainian authors used in the text are given in Latin alphabet. In References the names of those authors and the titles of their works are given in the language of the original at the very end of the References list. But parallel translation of the titles into English is supplied (in brackets), as well as parallel spelling of authors' names in Latin alphabet (also in brackets).

language teaching, and many other advances in methodology. There is not a single promising trend in modern Western SL/FL teaching/learning that is not in some manner reflected in research and practical work of professionals in the FL field from the former USSR countries.

Moreover, their research and practice have been distinguished by the "principled pragmatism" (Kumaravadivelu, 1994) that is now being paid some attention to the world over. It is easy to be convinced that such "pragmatism" has always been present in the former USSR if one gets acquainted with the books by the Russian and Ukrainian authors whose names were mentioned above. Its essence is in rational combination of different approaches, primarily the communicative and cognitive ones, i.e. in reinforcing unconscious language acquisition with conscious focusing on language structures. In recent years quite a lot of authors in the USA and in the West in general insist on the necessity of just such an approach (Bley-Vroman, 1990; Herron & Tomasello, 1992; Lightbown, 1990; VanPatten & Cadierno, 1993). Even Ellis (1986; 1990; 1994) who is very cautious about admitting the positive role of formal instruction points out that it enhances the second language acquisition by accelerating its process. EFL teaching in Russia and Ukraine has for many years been following the road of combining unconscious language acquisition and formal instruction, and has never used the extreme forms of the communicative approach where only the richness and variety of comprehensible input are taken into account (Krashen, 1982; Terrell, 1982).

The reason is that in the former Soviet Union learners were deprived of opportunities of receiving comprehensible input in a foreign language outside the FL classroom. At the same time classroom hours for language learning were limited and often insufficient (as will be discussed in greater detail further). As a result, the situation of comprehensible input deficiency inevitably emerged - the situation where the communicative approach in its pure form does not work (see the description of a similar situation in the article by Bahloul, 1994). The solution could be found only in the preservation of the dominantly communicative approach, as the only one suitable for communicative competence development, but combining it with the advantages of consciously learning language structures for compensating deficiencies in the volume of comprehensible input. It was just this solution that had been adopted. Therefore, in the former Soviet Union a very serious attempt has been made to practically realize the trend towards integration of approaches that is finding more and more partisans among SL/FL teaching professionals the world over.

The inference from everything said above is that the approach to EFL teaching adopted in Ukraine and some of the other former USSR countries is quite in line with modern advances in the field. The fact that just this approach is actually being implemented in the majority of state-owned educational institutions is due to its being followed in centrally developed curricula. They were obligatory in the Soviet Union, and in many cases remain so now (or at least, they are strongly recommended). So, if the curricula and syllabuses are designed on the basis of the communicative approach, the teaching/learning process will be aimed at communication too. The Ukrainian "Comprehensive secondary school curricula: Foreign languages" may be cited as an example of communication-orientated curricula. They enforce the principles of communicative teaching/learning and set communication in a foreign language as the goal of instruction. But the communicative approach is combined with the cognitive one by focusing on quite a number of language forms.

So, there are quite sufficient grounds for assertion that English and other foreign language teaching methodology adopted in Ukraine and broadly used in practice due to the impact of centrally developed curricula is one more favorable prerequisite for successful FL teaching/learning. Therefore, it may seem that such teaching/learning in state-owned educational institutions is "doomed" to be successful because public needs coincide with auspicious governmental language policy, and all this is reinforced with advanced methodology of teaching. But in practice the learning outcomes for very many students are directly opposite, i.e. very low.

### 1.3.Causes of EFL Teaching/Learning Failures in State-Owned Educational Institutions

There are no sound published statistical data concerning the fact of frequent failures in FL teaching outcomes in state-owned educational institutions either in the former USSR or in the countries it consisted of. But this fact is so well-known and these failures are such a common occurrence that they have given birth to quite a number of popular jokes. Both the public in general and FL teaching professionals are well aware that only a small minority of students from state-owned educational institutions really practically benefit from compulsory EFL courses. This popular opinion was confirmed by my own questioning of higher school graduates in the city of Dniepropetrovsk conducted during 1992-1994. Of 300 persons questioned only 62 (20.7%) admitted that their learning English in secondary and higher schools had given them some kind of mastery of the language that could really be put to practical uses (reading professional literature, contacting English-speaking people etc.). All the others (79.3%) asserted that they had no communicative competence worth speaking about after 9-10 years of learning the language. These data fully coincide with the information given in the article by Kuzovlev, Korostelyov, & Passov (1987: 4) published in the Soviet times. There it was shown that of 920 people who learned foreign languages at schools and universities only 2%, according to their own opinions voiced during questioning, could fluently read original English texts for professional purposes. 36% of the persons questioned said that they absolutely did not know the foreign language they had been learning for many years. What are the underlying causes of this situation when directly opposite results could reasonably be expected?

Quite a number of such causes should be listed. The first one is as follows. Though the need in FL learning is rapidly spreading now, it cannot be said that the majority of population actually feels it. Many people (hardly less and probably much more than two thirds of the population) are absolutely indifferent to that learning. The reason is quite obvious. The financial situation of many people in the conditions of economic crisis is such that they cannot even dream of going abroad and putting the knowledge of a foreign language to their own use. So, they see no vital necessity of learning it. Therefore, despite the efforts of the educational authorities, the phenomenon of language policy and planning failure takes place in full accordance with the rule formulated by Cooper (1989: 185), "Acquisition planning is unlikely to be effective if the language in question serves no useful function for the target population".

These assertions were proved true in my interviewing in 1993 one hundred inhabitants of Dniepropetrovsk (18-40 years of age) - representatives of those strata of society whose incomes and social status cannot be considered as high in to-day's circumstances in the country (students, industrial workers, engineers, low rank

employees, and others). They were asked if they were ready to spend much of their time and effort learning English, and whether they thought they could turn the acquired mastery of the language to their own benefit. The answers to both questions were negative in 69 cases out of 100 with typical explanations something like, - "I do not have enough money to go abroad, and I do not need English here" (I.B., 36 years of age, an industrial worker). So, people of this kind who are in absolute majority, have no personal reasons for English learning.

Such attitudes of the majority of population naturally find their reflection in all the state-owned educational institutions. Quite a number of students doubt the practicality of learning foreign languages because of lack of opportunities for using them (first of all for contacting native speakers). For instance, such doubts were expressed by 154 out of 200 students of Dniepropetrovsk State Technical University of Railway Transport interviewed by me in 1991/1992, 1992/1993, 1993/1994 academic years. If FL learning is compulsory for everybody and the majority of students do not think this learning to be practically useful, it means that in any FL classroom only the minority learns the language because learners want to or feel the need of it. All the others do it because they are made to, i.e. without real positive motivation. The absence of motivation inevitably impairs the performance and even predetermines failures for those particular students who are in the majority. But the performance of highly motivated students (the minority) also highly suffers in such a case because teachers have to concentrate their attention on lowly motivated learners just to make them work. So, it is the compulsory nature of FL language learning that is to blame for such an outcome.

There is an indirect confirmation of what is said above in the well-known fact that at the same state-owned educational institutions FL learning outcomes are in general much higher for those students who after the compulsory course get enrolled for some additional but strictly optional FL courses. Here the results are not always what is expected either, but after optional courses learners usually acquire some kind of practically applicable communicative competence - that being far from a common occurrence after the compulsory course. It is not the supplementary time for foreign language learning that is at the bottom of optional courses' success (as a rule, this extra time is not very great), but the fact that only highly motivated students, feeling a personal need to learn a foreign language and interest in its learning, work in optional courses at higher schools and in specialized FL groups in secondary schools. Thus, it may be safely concluded that FL learning is mostly unsuccessful in the conditions under discussion because in these particular conditions the compulsory nature of FL courses is inseparable from low learning motivation of the majority of students.

The second cause of failures is the obligatory nature and centralized development of FL curricula and other regulating documentation for state-owned educational institutions. As a result, such curricula are the same for all the higher and secondary schools of one and the same type. It does not favor the learner-centered approach in Nunan's (1988) interpretation of it, or taking into account specific learning conditions, or designing process-oriented and task-based syllabuses. The absence of precise analysis of particular learners' needs and lack of due regard for those needs substantially lowers the level of even initially highly motivated students' motivation - and learning outcomes with it. It also results in losing balance between process and product in learning - that balance that is so strongly insisted upon by Hyland & Hyland (1992).

All this, as is the case with the first cause, explains why in the same state-owned educational institutions optional FL courses are usually more successful than

the compulsory ones. For optional courses there are less centrally imposed restrictions and limitations; any university is authorized to develop its own curriculum for them taking full account of all the peculiarities of the given educational institution and/or of specific students' needs.

The third cause is the fact that under centralized FL teaching planning and in conditions of compulsory FL courses, the centrally developed curricula are bound to allocate insufficient academic time for language learning (mostly one, sometimes two classes a week of not more than 90 minutes for every class). Otherwise, there would be too little time left for studying other (also compulsory) subjects, often of more immediate importance for students. Consequently, FL teaching/learning drags on for many years but every week there are few classes, and the intervals between them are too long. Meanwhile, effective FL teaching requires the situation to be reversed - a comparatively short course with many densely packed classes every week because if there are less than 4-5 hours of them a week, the learners' results fall off disastrously (Strevens, 1977: 29).

Numerous other causes of failures can be named. For instance, it is not uncommon that teaching materials content is not sufficiently informative for students. Sometimes the materials are simply boring despite all the methodological postulates to the contrary admitted and declared by all the FL teaching professionals. It is the vestige of the former ideology permeated approach to such materials' subject matter selection. This approach has not been quite got rid of, all the more so that some of the older materials are still in use.

Economic difficulties caused by the economic crisis in Ukraine should not be omitted - such as the deficiency of good and new teaching materials, technical teaching aids, and other indispensable things that educational institutions are often unable to purchase because of financial problems. Of extreme importance is the problem of skilled FL teachers' salaries. In state-owned educational institutions they are low. Inadequate salaries are the lot of all the teaching profession and as a result, it has started rapidly losing prestige. At the same time people with a good command of foreign languages (especially English) are in great demand in the commercial sector of economy; there they can earn much more than in the state sector. So, quite a lot of experienced and skilled FL teachers and young promising specialists in this field are willing to change their employment and get jobs of translators or interpreters for commercial firms. There is no need to prove the negative effect on FL teaching when many (and sometimes the best) teachers are lost for the profession.

Many other causes of failures not mentioned above could be discussed. But of those causes already given, the first three seem to be of the greatest interest because they prove a very important point. All these causes are the direct consequence of state regulation in FL teaching/learning in state-owned educational institutions. It should be admitted that it has a negative effect as it makes practical teaching less effective than it could be. Therefore, state encouragement of FL learning may become an impediment to success if this encouragement takes the shape of state regulation.

### 1.4. Alternative Forms of FL Teaching/Learning and Their Prospects

The failures of state-regulated FL teaching system and the loss of its popularity as a direct consequence, as well as the growing need of FL (in particular, EFL) learning, have generated the alternative forms of teaching. They are commercial while in state-owned educational institutions FL language teaching is as a rule free (even the

optional courses). There are two principal alternative forms. The first is individual private tutoring. A private FL tutor works with one, sometimes two learners on the basis of an agreement with them (or their parents if learners are children or adolescents). The agreement concerns the goals, methods of teaching, desirable learning outcomes, frequency and duration of classes, payment etc. This form has been in existence for many decades already but it most probably does not have any brilliant prospects for the future. On one hand, it is very promising from the point of view of taking into account specific learner's needs and adapting teaching to his/her individual peculiarities. On the other hand, such adaptations of methods and teaching materials to every particular student requires a very high tutor's qualification and his/her serious concern about the teaching results which is far from always being the case.

The incompetence of private tutors and their interest only in pecuniary gains are not infrequent because their skills and the quality of their work are never checked by other professionals. So, the above mentioned advantage of individual tutoring (one-two learners) is often lost. Besides, it should not be forgotten that in the absence of a group of learners, an individual learner is deprived of intra-group FL communication. The tutor is the only interlocutor (when there are two learners for one tutor the situation is slightly better but not much).

But the most important reason why this form of teaching is not very promising is the high price charged for it - only the smallest part of the population with high incomes can afford it in the present economic situation. For instance, in 1995-1996 in big Ukrainian cities individual private lessons of English were charged the equivalent of $5 for one academic hour of 45 minutes. Since then this average price has almost doubled. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that this form of teaching was, is, and will remain the form for the select few. It will continue to exist because many people are convinced that if they employ a tutor just for themselves and pay good money for her/his services, excellent learning results are guaranteed. But since very few people have enough money to pay for such services, individual private FL tutoring will hardly ever play a significant part in satisfying the growing need in FL (and EFL in particular) learning.

The situation is different with commercial FL programs, very popular nowadays. First such programs started to be organized more than three decades ago in the former Soviet Union. Just like individual private tutoring, they were and are mostly designed for teaching English. Practically all of them began and go on developing as intensive programs, i.e. short ones (not longer than of one year duration) with many class hours every week - not less than 6-8 of them a week, and up to 12 and even more hours. One of the pioneers in intensive FL teaching and intensive FL programs in the USSR was Kitaygorodskaya (1982; 1986) who developed an original methodology based on Losanov's Suggestopedia (for analysis of Suggestopedia in professional literature in English see Bancroft, 1978; Blair, 1991; Larsen-Freeman, 1986). This methodology, as well as some theoretical fundamentals of intensive FL teaching/learning developed by Leontiev (1982), are still in use in the majority of existing commercial programs. Naturally, such programs are all different, but they have some common characteristics, some common theoretical and methodological fundamentals - in general, quite a few common features. Those of them that are at the bottom of their success and popularity are listed below.

The first and one of the most important of them is the fact that, as distinct from the state-regulated and compulsory language learning, only those people get enrolled for intensive programs who are really eager to learn L2, and are in great

need of it. No special proofs of this assumption are needed since readiness to pay for FL classes means high positive motivation. This motivation by itself can ensure success - so, one of the principal causes of state-regulated teaching failures is totally eliminated. Besides, people who know very well what to do with their English (or any other foreign language they are learning) after acquiring it, usually get enrolled for intensive commercial teaching. There is as a rule no problem of effective utilization of learning results for them - a fact also having great importance for enhancement of positive motivation.

The second feature is the absence of any restrictions whatsoever imposed on commercial programs by centrally developed curricula approved by the state educational authorities. In this respect such programs are freer than even optional FL teaching at secondary or higher schools. Therefore, if commercial programs are developed and organized by highly-qualified professionals, they can be made really learners' needs-centered and process-oriented. It also gives an opportunity of developing numerous alternative intensive programs permitting learners to choose what is most suitable to their particular needs.

Of extreme importance is the third feature. All the programs under discussion are really intensive, i.e. they are distinguished by concentration of many class hours per week during a comparatively short period of time. Programs of 3-4 months duration are the most popular and spread. This time concentration is natural for commercial programs as it is more convenient economically and financially, and program organizers do not need taking into account other academic subjects as is the case in state-regulated system of education.

But such designing of the teaching/learning process is not only more effective pedagogically than extensive many year-long programs with few class hours per week. It is also much more popular with students. For instance, in all kinds of interviewing done by me and mentioned above there was one more additional question, "How would you prefer to learn English - for many years with 2-4 hours of classes per week or for a few months but with many (up to twelve) hours per week?". The answer was almost unanimous. Though some of the people who were questioned were afraid that intensive learning of English could seriously interfere with their work or studies, practically everyone said that if s/he chose to learn, s/he would prefer to do it intensively. Only very few persons (even less than 1%) voiced a different opinion. Thus, intensive short-term teaching/learning is also conducive to commercial programs' success and popularity.

A serious advantage is the fact that the commercial nature of programs under discussion provides a sound financial backing for them. As a result, they can often obtain the newest and the best teaching materials, technical teaching aids, and other necessary things. They do not lack highly qualified teachers because of higher teachers' salaries. High earnings (together with the general popularity and good prospects of intensive commercial programs) are also attractive to specialists in developing teaching materials. The FL teaching professionals employed in such programs do not work in a kind of vacuum as is the case with individual private tutors (see before). The quality of their work and their qualification are checked by the program's administration, they can discuss their problems with colleagues teaching in the same program etc. So, the disadvantage of individual private tutoring is also eliminated.

Commercial intensive programs always try to introduce the newest developments in the field of FL teaching. It is the matter of survival for them because of competition. As any commercial program is based on enrolling a group of students (10-12) who learn English or any other foreign language together, it

gives good opportunities for organizing cooperative learning (Kessler, 1992), continuous intra-group communication in the target language with frequent changes of communicative partners. So, the kind of disadvantage characteristic of individual private tutoring, when only the tutor is a learner's interlocutor, is absolutely unthinkable.

All the favorable circumstances discussed above are a kind of guarantee for attaining positive learning results. So, when an intensive program is organized professionally, it is usually a success (proofs of it will be given in chapter 4). The teaching/learning success is the main reason underlying these programs' high popularity. The financial reason is of vital importance too. Learning in intensive programs is as a rule cheaper than using services of an individual private tutor (though prices vary greatly). At any rate, quite a number of people can afford being taught in such programs - they are financially accessible to a substantial part of population. As a result of popularity, the number of commercial intensive programs and the number of their students keep growing.

For instance, the Intensive Program of Oral Business Communication in English taught in Dniepropetrovsk (Ukraine) and described in detail in the following chapters of this book had about 100 students enrolled during 1993/1994 academic year - the first year of its functioning. In the next 1994/1995 academic year the same number of students was enrolled in the first two months (September-October). Very characteristic is the fact that during both academic years about half of all the learners were secondary and higher school students, those who at the very same time were learning English as a compulsory subject at their schools - and free of charge! It is not only an indication of deep disappointment in the free and compulsory state-regulated EFL teaching system, in its ability to give highly motivated students what they want and need. It is also a confirmation and manifestation of people's trusting intensive commercial intensive EFL programs, of their believing that there they can get desired results for their money.

Everything said shows that hopes of considerably expanding effective and successful teaching/learning of English in Ukraine should primarily be placed not in the state-regulated compulsory and free EFL system but in intensive commercial programs. Though optional EFL courses in state-owned educational institutions are also promising, but their scope is not great and they are not free of different restrictions. Besides, optional courses are designed only for secondary and higher school students and for no other category of learners - and there are numerous other categories of people eager to learn English. Since individual private tutoring is no real solution of the problem, it is the intensive commercial programs that are to find this solution in their everyday functioning.

**Summary**

State-regulated EFL teaching in Ukraine, though having a number of advantages, is as yet incapable of ensuring acquisition of communicative competence in English by the majority of students. Among many shortcomings leading to failures are the inability to make students highly motivated and to make teaching adequately learners' needs-centered; insufficient learning time despite long courses (because of little concentration of weekly class hours); financial difficulties limiting access to the newest and the best teaching materials and equipment. The principal shortcomings often are the direct consequence of state regulation and compulsory nature of EFL learning in state-owned educational institutions, i.e. the regulation itself entails failures. On the contrary, commercial EFL teaching in intensive

programs is totally free of such shortcomings and restrictions making an obstacle to success - due to absence of state regulation. This freedom, as well as other advantages (the first of them being intensive, as opposite to extensive, learning), is at the bottom of commercial EFL programs' achievements and popularity. As there are no grounds to believe now that the state-regulated system of EFL teaching will seriously change in the near future, commercial intensive EFL teaching has somewhat better prospects in Ukraine than extensive and free of charge learning of English at state-owned educational institutions. Quite probably, it is just in such programs that teachers and other EFL teaching professionals of the highest qualification will be employed, the most interesting research work done, and the greatest contribution made towards spreading English as an international language in Ukraine.

Certainly, now the intensive commercial programs in question can in no way be compared in scope to the state EFL system. But if the preceding tendency to mushrooming of these programs and the number of their learners hold on, they may well become one of the principal forms of English language teaching/learning in Ukraine - and a most effective of the forms at that (though the possibility of a radical change in their role and prospects in case of change in economical and political situation in the country cannot be excluded).

To ensure a favorable position for intensive commercial programs, their theoretical foundations, practical implications, teaching materials, and everything else necessary for their effective functioning should be developed. It was my task in developing what was to be a sample intensive EFL program for Ukraine. The theoretical foundations of this program are the subject matter of the next chapter. It should only be kept in mind that the program was aimed only at adults and adolescents not younger than 13 as potential learners.

# CHAPTER 2. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF DESIGNING AN INTENSIVE ENGLISH PROGRAM FOR UKRAINE

## 2.1. Communicative-Analytic Production-Based Approach and its Significance for Creating an Intensive English Program

One of the most controversial issues in the field of ESOL in the conditions of communicative approach domination is the question whether this approach is compatible with formal instruction in grammar as a specific aspect of language and with focusing learner's attention on language forms. On one hand, there is the purely communicative approach that, as Fotos (1994: 323) remarked, is based on giving the learner a rich variety and the greatest possible amount of comprehensible input while totally omitting the teacher-fronted grammar instruction. This kind of approach is proper to the second language acquisition (SLA) theory called "creative construction" (Lightbown & Spada, 1994). The most vivid manifestation is the Natural Approach (Krashen & Terrell, 1983). All the other comprehension-based methods (the term used by Blair, 1991) may be placed under the same heading since all of them do not admit the necessity and usefulness of formal grammar instruction. A good example may be the Total Physical Response method (Asher, 1988).

On the other hand, the cognitive theory of SLA represented, for instance, in the works by O'Malley & Chamot (1990), Chamot & O'Malley (1994) is based on the belief that language acquisition presupposes constructing a knowledge system where first attention is paid to language aspects, and then appropriate skills become automatic (interpretation given by Lightbown & Spada, 1994). This theory requires methods where formal grammar instruction occupies some place in language acquisition.

One more controversy is the respective parts played by comprehension (reception) and production in language learning and acquisition. The above-mentioned comprehension-based methods consider only the comprehensible input as the principal factor (Krashen, 1985). On the contrary, in a whole range of methods, such as the Silent Way (Gattegno, 1963), sheltered language learning and explorer classroom learning (Freeman & Freeman, 1991, 1994; Peregoy & Boyle, 1993), language experience learning (Dixon & Nessel, 1983), comprehension is inextricably linked to some kind of production, and comprehensible input requires some sort of learners' comprehensible output. The role of production, or comprehensible output, was emphasized by Swain (1985) who claimed the insufficiency of comprehensible input alone. The cognitive approach admitting the importance of grammar instruction is also production-based because skill development in the framework of this approach is attained by practicing, i.e. production. That is why Spolsky (1989), who tries to take account of different theories, approaches, methods, and make use of their advantages for formulating optimum conditions of second language learning and acquisition, names opportunities for practicing among such conditions.

Production is also central for the intreactionist view of SLA. In this view, that Lightbown and Spada treat as a theory of its own fully interpreted by Long (1983b, 1990), the importance of comprehensible input is in no way doubted but attention is focused on how input is made comprehensible. According to the interactionist theory, it is achieved through interaction in conversation of native and non-native speakers (learners), i.e. through production. Interactionism is not as adverse to language form-focusing as the creative construction approach (see Long,

1983a, 1988), and classroom instruction in general is thought to be instrumental in organizing task-based language teaching (Long, 1985).

Thus, of the three basic SLA theories analyzed by Lightbown & Spada (1994) - cognitive, creative-construction, and interactionist (the fourth, i.e. behavioristic theory represented primarily by the audio-lingual method, may be safely excluded from further discussion due to its relatively obsolete character), only the creative-construction theory tends to neglect both the role of production and the role of grammar instruction. The other two agreeing on the importance of production and admitting the necessity of instruction differ as to what part it should play. None of these two theories rejects the necessity of focusing on language forms in this instruction, but only the cognitive theory considers it as absolutely indispensable for second language acquisition.

But it should be pointed out that the latter view is gradually gaining more and more partisans not only among conscious followers of the cognitive approach but even among those who hold different views. Ellis (1990, 1994) has already been named in the preceding chapter as one of such authors. Rutherford (1987) who developed the theory and practice of students' consciousness-raising as to grammar forms has always been one of the most ardent proponents of the idea that language focusing is inevitable in SLA. Quite a number of other authors supplied data (often experimental) supporting the need of some kind of formal instruction as an inherent part of teaching for facilitating acquisition. Together with the works to that effect cited in chapter 1, one can mention articles and books by Bialystok, 1988; Celce-Murcia, 1991; Corder, 1988; Doughty, 1991; Smith, 1988; Spolsky, 1989: 197; some other articles (besides those mentioned earlier) by Bley-Vroman, 1988; Tomasello & Herron, 1989, and quite a number of other works. In general, the data confirming positive effect of formal instruction in SLA keep coming in despite the contrary results of some experiments concerning this issue - such as the well-known experiment by Pienemann (1984). This positive effect is widely admitted by practical teachers, and that can be seen from their materials edited by Pennington (1995).

Consequently, in advanced teaching practice and theory of second language acquisition the view that limited grammar instruction is conducive to this acquisition is gradually gaining prominence. Since any kind of learners' consciousness-raising as to language forms requires mental analytic activity bound up with focusing attention on these forms and isolating them (to a greater or lesser degree) from the context they are introduced in, the relevant approach may be called "***communicative-analytic***". The first part of the term ("communicative") seems to be indispensable because none of the authors recalled above and supporting the view that grammar instruction may be beneficial for SLA doubts the principal propositions of communicative language teaching and the necessity of absolute domination of the communicative approach. Therefore, there is no danger of sliding back to the more traditional language teaching and learning pattern when grammar with different drills for mastering it was the focal point of teacher's and students' efforts.

As it has already been mentioned, all the SLA theories admitting the usefulness of grammar instruction are production (and not only comprehension)-based. It does not mean that whatever doubts are voiced as to importance of rich and variable comprehensible input and its leading role in initiating the acquisition process. Yet, such theories support the notion that without production and constant practicing in it, the SLA process is much slower and less effective (though there is a great variety of views as to what forms of practicing in production are most

efficient). So, as all the SLA theories without exception emphasize the role of comprehensible input, some of them may be called production-based (as distinct from comprehension-based) if it is admitted that the role of production, comprehensible output is not less vital. Taking into account everything said above, it is quite admissible to speak about the existence of *communicative-analytic production-based approach in SLA.*

If such an approach is gaining prominence in teaching a second language, when students acquire it in one of the countries where it is spoken by the majority of the population, this approach is all the more needed in foreign language teaching/learning. Foreign language teaching/learning means that L2 is not used as one of the primary means of communication in the country where it is learned, i.e. there is reference to the speech community outside this country (Berns, 1990b; Paulston, 1992). In other words, we speak about EFL when English is taught in countries where it has little or no internal communicative function or sociopolitical status (Nayar,1997: 31), it is just a school subject with no recognized status or function at all (Richards, Platt, & Weber, 1985).

There are authors (Savignon, 1990; VanPatten, 1990) who hold to the opinion that second language acquisition data are fully applicable to foreign language learning. Yet, many others support the notion that the two processes do not coincide. For instance, Seliger (1988: 27) points out that, despite the universality of manner and order of acquiring the L2 by speakers of different first languages, there are no data to disprove the possibility of different effects for first language transfer in contexts where learners have little or no exposure to the second language outside the classroom, and where all the other students speak the same first language. Wildner-Bassett (1990) sees a clear-cut distinction between a second language setting where native and non-native speakers communicate for real communication purposes and a foreign language setting where only artificial communication is possible. Though this author ascribes different discourse patterns more to classroom - non-classroom differences than to FL/SL differences, these dissimilar patterns are quite real and objective. That is why Kramsch (1990) is justified in saying that a separate agenda is necessary in foreign language learning research as distinct from second language acquisition research.

All in all, it may be said following VanPatten & Lee (1990) that there is no unanimous opinion concerning the relationship between second language acquisition and foreign language learning. But the opinion that the two processes are different at least in some respects and therefore should be treated differently is quite founded and matches a lot of empirical data. This difference is especially vivid when discussing the necessity of explicit grammar instruction. In the preceding chapter the comprehensible input deficiency inevitable when English is taught as a foreign language with little or no exposure to it outside the classroom has already been mentioned. There it was said that in such a case there should be some sort of compensation for this deficiency that can hardly be found anywhere else but in integrating some sort of formal instruction into the teaching/learning process. This view can be supported by the opinions of a number of authors. For instance, Chaudron wrote, "Instruction will especially be valuable when other naturalistic input is not available, as in a foreign language instruction contexts, or when learners are at a low level of proficiency and not as likely to obtain sufficient comprehensible input in naturalistic encounters" (1988: 6). Such a proposition is shared by McDonough & Shaw (1993: 35) who point out that "... a more grammatically oriented syllabus is to be preferred in a context where English is a foreign language and where learners are unlikely to be exposed to it".

Therefore, the analytic approach to FL teaching/learning, i.e. explicit grammar instruction, is hardly avoidable. But it is even more important in these conditions to provide *the domination of the communicative approach* than in the SLA process. Whatever the conditions, modern language teaching has one and the same set of objectives - not the discrete linguistic objectives, but the communicative goals (Savignon, 1983). Those goals mean developing students' communicative competence, as well as the linguistic one (Paulston, 1992), and its development is possible only through communicative performance (Savignon, 1983). That is why the communicative approach to language teaching/learning is indispensable, especially if it is a foreign and not a second language because in this case, unlike SLA, there is no opportunity for students to be engaged in communicative performance and interaction outside the FL classroom. So, the approach to FL teaching can only be communicative-analytic with absolute communication domination, while analysis is used only as a means of facilitating communicative development.

This approach in the conditions under discussion can also be production-based only. Employing any of the comprehension-based approaches is hardly admissible because of the same inevitable comprehensible input deficiency. So, only by continuous practicing in production can experience in language and communication in it be obtained to ensure the learning process. In this way the situation of comprehensible input deficiency may be compensated for by learners' attempts to actively use whatever input they have got for producing their own comprehensible output in interaction with the teacher and their peers. Due to such interaction, learning/acquisition is achieved not so much thanks to richness and continuity of input as thanks to learners' own active attempts and efforts directed at mastering it. In this respect, the view of Long & Porter (1985) is worth mentioning as they maintained that classroom group activity in negotiation work is a viable substitute for individual conversations with native speakers. The data given by Pica, Lincoln-Porter, Paninos, & Linnell (1996) should also be remembered. Their experimental research has shown that learner - learner interaction certainly cannot equal learner - native speaker interaction in amount and quality of modified input and feedback. And yet, L2 learner - L2 learner interaction can address their input, feedback, and output needs. So, if no learner - native speaker interaction is possible, there is no other alternative but communication of learners themselves.

The general conclusion from everything said above is that the communicative-analytic production-based approach, quite possible and even gaining popularity in SLA, is practically the only one admissible for FL teaching. It is especially true for such countries as Ukraine where opportunities of contacting native speakers of the language being learned and to be exposed to this language outside the classroom are scarce.

### 2.2. Implications of Communicative-Analytic Production-Based Approach for Creating an Intensive English Program

As it must be clear from the above, the main issue in realizing the communicative-analytic production-based approach is striking the proper balance between communication and analysis, comprehension (comprehensible input) and production (comprehensible output). This balance, on one hand, should provide for communicative approach domination - so that favorable conditions for learners' communicative competence development could emerge. On the other hand, in situations of comprehensible input deficiency, the introduction of the analytic

approach cannot mean only consciousness-raising as to grammar forms (Rutherford, 1987) with the aim of intake facilitation, as structural syllabuses are called upon to do in SLA (Ellis, 1993). If opportunities for getting input are scarce and limited to FL classroom, there are no ways of developing grammar skills indispensable for communication only in communication proper without activities designed specifically for learning them. The reason is that involvement in genuine communication of FL learners cannot even be comparable in volume to the involvement of SL learners who acquire the target language in the country where it is spoken. It is to compensate for that lack of involvement (which alone can provide for skill development by its sheer volume, as it happens when a child is acquiring her/his mother-tongue), that special skill training activities are needed. But if a classroom activity is designed specifically for training a grammar skill, it cannot fully model genuine communication but will always be drill-like to a greater or lesser degree because only drill-type learning activities are known to do this specific job in the absence of sufficient involvement in real communication.

Paulston (1992) wrote that there was nothing intrinsically wrong in using drills for language teaching if drill were not mechanical but communicative. What are the typical features of a communicative drill? Paulston gives as an example of such a drill learners' truthful answers to teacher's questions concerning some personal information and requiring using gerund in all the answers. So, gerund is drilled while participation in some sort of communication is ensured. It is only a "quasi-communication" since the communicative situation in these circumstances can be nothing but artificial, and a long string of grammatically and structurally identical questions and answers is hardly possible in genuine communication. And yet, the basic feature of any genuine communication is modeled - which is the communicative purpose on the part of the speaker (in this case supplying truthful information about herself/himself in answer to teacher's questions). Such a feature of communication is combined with the most characteristic feature of any drill, i.e. the programmed (algorithmic) nature of speaker's answers as to their language forms. In some of such drills even the content of what is said may also be programmed, for instance, if learners are asked to disagree with all the statements of their teacher that are not true to fact. In this communicative drill the speaker's communicative purpose is negative reaction to false statements while negative verb forms are being drilled simultaneously thanks to multiple uniform using of them in everything the speaker says (programmed, or algorithmic nature of using language forms). The content is also programmed (algorithmic) because teacher's statement disagree with the information that is in learners' possession - so, negation is inevitable.

Therefore, a drill may be considered as a communicative one if it combines the following features:

1) learners' activity has some explicit communicative purpose (supplying information, negating something, agreeing to something, asking for some information), and this purpose governs the activity;
2) language forms (and as a rule the content, too) of what is said by learners in the framework of this activity is uniform and programmed, i.e. algorithmic, thanks to instructions preceding the activity, the language form and content of speech stimuli that these learners get, different prompts etc.;
3) the implicit (unlike explicit) purpose of the activity is mastering some language form(s) that is being drilled.

Due to such features, this drill-like activity may be called a *"communicative-algorithmic"* one. So, in the communicative-analytic approach

analysis should be realized primarily through using communicative-algorithmic activities for teaching/learning grammar. Naturally, such activities may be preceded or followed by analysis proper (using for it some explanations by the teacher or learners' grasping the meaning of a grammatical structure inductively), but both students' explicit consciousness-raising and communicative-algorithmic activities together constitute the analytic unit in the communicative-analytic approach.

If communicative drilling of the kind described above may be called communicative-algorithmic, those activities in the classroom that fully model real-life communication should best be termed *"the communicative-heuristic activities"*. It would reflect the nature of genuine interpersonal communication. The language form and content of what is said in it are determined mostly internally, i.e. heuristically (by speaker's own communicative goals, his/her judgments concerning the actual communicative situation, his/her appraisal of interlocutors etc.), and not externally when this form, and often content too, are fully programmed by pre-activity instructions and/or prompts. The distinction between the fully programmed (algorithmic) and heuristic nature of different types of activities is at the bottom of the difference of drills (whether communicative or not) in the teaching/learning process and communication proper that must absolutely dominate this process if the approach is to be communicative at all.

But communicative-heuristic activities in FL teaching/learning can also be of two kinds, or rather of two levels. At both levels such activities should model genuine communication as faithfully as possible[3], but at the lower level some artificial "supports" for comprehension or production of speech may be used for facilitating these processes (occasional prompts, not programming the form and content of what is said but just aiding the expression of learner's own thoughts, key-words that may be either used or not used by learners for the same purpose, bits and pieces of written texts employed as "props" for speaking or for listening comprehension etc.). At the lower (or initial) level of using communicative-heuristic activities such artificial supports are admissible - all the more so that they occasionally happen even in natural communication, especially if it is a non-native speaker - native speaker communication since the latter often strives to elicit meaning from the former by supplying some kinds of prompts (negotiation of meaning). But it is reasonable to call these lower level communicative-heuristic activities *"communicative semi-heuristic"* ones because learners' communication is partially "aided" and facilitated.

All modern communicative methods widely employ such activities in FL/SL teaching. For instance, very typical for Hutchinson's Project English (1994: 78) is the task where students listen to a text or a tape-recorded conversation and then make conversations of their own using what they have just heard as language form or/and content supports and prompts for speaking. This is a clear manifestation of communicative semi-heuristic activities while conversations "on the spur of the moment" are communicative-heuristic activities proper where only the real (or described) communicative situation and/or the past experience with no direct additional aids or prompts urge learners to speak. An example of communicative-heuristic activity may be taken from the same Project English by Hutchinson (1994:

[3] It is better to speak about modelling genuine communication because it is incorrect to call communication in a FL language classroom absolutely genuine as there are no native-speakers to talk to. Talking to fellow students or the teacher in the target language will always remain an artificial kind of activity, however closely we approach the real-life communication in all its essential features. It is because in a FL classroom as a rule both the teacher and all the students share the same mother-tongue - so, only it can be quite a natural instrument of communication for them.

18), "Work in your group. Think of a rescue story you heard, read or saw on TV or in the cinema. 1. Tell each other your stories". These 2 examples give an idea of the basic difference between 2 levels of communicative-heuristic activities - availability of direct additional prompts and supports (language and/or content ones) on the lower level, their absence on the higher level.

The next issue to be discussed is what should be the interrelations of all the 3 types of activities and how they should be positioned in the teaching/learning process. Communicative-algorithmic activities and the analytic phase as a whole cannot be placed at the beginning of any teaching/learning unit in this process. They should be used only after learners have observed language forms that are new to them in communication (comprehensible input) and made attempts to use them in their own speech without any preliminary conscious analysis. In that case consciousness-raising as to these forms (analysis) and their mastering in communicative-algorithmic activities will become communicatively meaningful for learners. This is important for preserving the overall communicative orientation of teaching/learning necessary for developing students' communicative competence.

In the phase preceding analysis in every teaching/learning unit new language forms should be first introduced and observed synthetically, i.e. in the integrity of the communicative context in which they are fed to learners (comprehensible input). Taking into account what was said about the importance of production in the FL teaching conditions under discussion, such an input should immediately be followed by learners' comprehensible output in the framework of the same phase. So, from the beginning learners are fully "immersed" into communication as its active participants, and in this way opportunities are created for compensating through production the inevitable deficiencies in the volume of comprehensible input.

Both input and output in this first phase of any teaching/learning unit are hardly possible without supports and prompts facilitating comprehension and production. Otherwise, new language forms may either be not comprehended in the input or avoided in the output. But relevant communicative activities using facilitating supports and prompts (aids) are just what has earlier been called the communicative semi-heuristic ones. They are ***synthetic*** (no analysis of new language forms, only comprehending and using them in communication) but, from the point of view of faithfully modeling genuine communication, they are at the lower level of such modeling because of language and/or content "aids" facilitating them. That is why the first introductory (***primary***) phase in every teaching/learning unit where such activities prevail may best be called the ***primary synthesis phase***.

But if the ***analysis phase*** follows the primary synthesis phase, then a higher synthesis should follow analysis. Otherwise, there will be no communicative end-piece to a teaching/learning unit, no outcome for it in genuine communication or in its most authentic modeling. That is why the third phase is necessary that may be called the ***communicative synthesis phase*** because at this point using communicative-heuristic activities becomes not only possible and rational but obligatory. They are made possible thanks to all the previous activities when new language forms are first unconsciously processed and partially acquired by comprehending and using them in communication facilitated by different aids (primary synthesis), and then they are more or less consciously learned in communication-orientated algorithmic activities (analysis). Communicative-heuristic activities are made obligatory in the third phase since no other activities model FL communication to that degree of authenticity where the final acquisition of language forms can really happen - not as linguistic units but as elements and

tools of speech and communication synthesized within its context and interpersonal interactive situations. The proposition concerning the ultimate role of just such a type of learning activities is at the basis of communicative approach - whatever are the particular interpretations of this approach (Brumfit, 1984; Ellis, 1986; Finocchiaro & Brumfit, 1983; Johnson, 1983; Krashen & Terrell, 1983; Richards, 1990; Rivers, 1972; Widdowson, 1978, and many others).

Thus, a definite pattern for designing teaching/learning units within the framework of the communicative-analytic approach to teaching EFL in such a country as Ukraine is outlined. ***This pattern includes primary synthesis (communicative semi-heuristic activities) - analysis (communicative-algorithmic activities) - communicative synthesis (communicative-heuristic activities) as 3 phases of any such unit***. The pattern has a number of distinct advantages:

1. Language is mainly learned in communication and through communication since 2 of the 3 phases and 2 of the 3 activities more or less fully model it, thus providing for subordination of the linguistic system and rules to be learned by students to the communicative system and rules. According to Searle (1972) and Wunderlich (1979), the communicative system rules belong to the highest level, and they incorporate the linguistic system rules of a given language. So, if a language is learned in communication and through communication with communicative (not linguistic rules) dominating the process, students' communicative competence as the goal of language instruction gets ample opportunities to develop - whatever interpretation of this competence is accepted (Bachman & Palmer, 1982; Canale & Swain, 1980; Paulston, 1992; Savignon, 1983). Therefore, the approach described above provides for the required domination of communication over cognition since the former occupies about 2/3 of every learning unit. Even the analytical part (cognition) in it, that is supposed to take not more than 1/3 of every unit's time, is communication orientated and makes some imitation of communication due to the nature of communicative-algorithmic activities used.

2. Thanks to these activities, the balance between teaching fluency and accuracy is maintained - the balance that Brumfit (1984) so strongly insisted upon. At the same time there is a clear-cut distinction between fluency and accuracy practices (Lewis & Hill, 1985). Maintaining fluency/accuracy balance is essential since if accuracy is neglected, the main disadvantage of purely communicative methods, such as the French immersion in Canada, becomes prominent. It is abundance of errors in learners' speech, fossilization of these errors, frequent curious blending of L1 and L2 in what they say (Safty, 1989). On the other hand, if the accuracy practice becomes too prominent, the fluency practice and the communicative approach as a whole tend to be neglected. But if the proposed communicative-analytic approach is followed, both pernicious tendencies may safely be avoided.

3. The pattern "primary synthesis - analysis - communicative synthesis" helps balancing comprehension and production in learning. This pattern in its interpretation given above makes clear the necessity of comprehensible input in the primary synthesis phase at the beginning of every teaching/learning unit. Supplied there, comprehensible input makes foundation of all the further communication in the target language within the unit as it provides all the language material and basic content required for it (see 2.4.). In all the other parts of a given unit the teaching/learning process requires learners' production (or reproduction) in communicative semi-heuristic, communicative-algorithmic, and communicative-

heuristic activities. But since that production (reproduction) is performed within the framework of interpersonal communication in communicative semi-heuristic and heuristic activities, it is permanently intertwined with comprehension because speaking to interlocutors (for instance, some other students in a group), a learner has to listen and understand what they say in their turn. Similarly, in communicative-algorithmic activities (if they are done in the way outlined above) learners speak reacting to some speech stimuli, i.e. on the basis of comprehension. In this way, all the teaching/learning process becomes the process of interaction in the target language where:

1) due to continuous active production, deficiencies in sheer volume of communication and/or comprehensible input (unavoidable in FL learning) may be partially compensated for because of intra-group communicative activities since "... communicative interaction in group work may provide as much, and probably more, appropriate corrective feedback to learners as teacher-fronted classroom tasks" (Chaudron, 1988: 152);

2) thanks to continuous communicative interaction and intertwining of communication and production in it, the situation somewhat similar to immersion education is created where students in a FL classroom are in a position resembling in some respects L1 acquisition, i.e. they are exposed to L2 in its natural form and socially motivated to communicate (Wallace & Lambert, 1984: 11);

3) by providing production in interaction, i.e. without neglecting comprehension, and by supplying massive amounts of comprehensible input at the start of every teaching/learning unit to make a source and basis for further production, the interactive teaching system is developed. According to Rivers (1986), it is indispensable in teaching speaking. Unlike Krashen (1982, 1985), this author maintains that speaking skills cannot come by themselves out of listening comprehension. Abundant practicing in speaking is required with production and comprehension combined, Just this effect is achieved if the suggested approach is followed.

The communicative-analytic approach does not mean that the analytic link is needed during all the course of learning. As analysis is subordinated to communication, it is rational to drop it out as soon as learners master a sufficient minimum of language forms to make a foundation for unconscious acquisition of new forms. ***It makes possible the introduction of a purely communicative pattern of "primary synthesis - communicative synthesis" at advanced stages with the intermediate analysis link excluded.*** As a result, 2 main stages in teaching/learning process organization under the communicative-analytic approach may be outlined: the stage during which this approach proper is used, and the advanced stage that is totally communicative (no analysis of language forms).

Some considerations make it expedient to add one more very short stage preceding the first one. It should be preparatory (introductory) and largely analytic in its design. The need of such a stage, at any rate, in Ukrainian or Russian-speaking setting, is mainly psychological. Many EFL/ESL students all over the world believe that formal (analytic), i.e. non-communicative, learning activities are not less (if not more) effective than communicative ones (Green 1993). My experience in eliciting students' opinions (see 4.4) have demonstrated that such an attitude is quite characteristic of Ukrainian and Russian-speaking adult students learning English in their own country. To overcome this attitude, Nunan (1988: 95) finds it possible to begin with traditional learning activities, gradually moving learners towards the communicative ones. In the conditions under discussion, a short preparatory analytic stage devoted to forming English pronunciation skills is

best suited for this purpose. Ukrainian and Russian-speaking adult and adolescent learners tend to find English pronunciation extremely difficult and almost unanimously believe, as practical experience and questioning have demonstrated, that English pronunciation patterns should be carefully explained and drilled. In a short and intensive analytic phonetic course major learners' pronunciation difficulties can be eliminated or at least considerably reduced saving a lot of time and trouble in more advanced communicative courses. What is even more important, is the time and opportunities for the teacher to negotiate learners acceptance of transition to communicative activities.

Therefore, ***a three-stage intensive program*** of English is rational for the Ukrainian conditions if the communicative-analytic approach is followed:

1. ***A very short (not longer than a couple of weeks) preparatory course that is mainly analytic in character and serves both for developing English pronunciation skills and psychological conditioning of learners.***
2. ***The intermediate principal course where the pattern "primary synthesis - analysis - communicative synthesis" is strictly followed.***
3. ***The advanced principal course, totally communicative with no language form-focusing activities.***

For effective implementation of the communicative-analytic approach in the given conditions very important is the question of making input comprehensible - especially at the beginning of every teaching/learning unit when, as it has been said, massive input should be introduced to form the basis for further interpersonal students' communication. When input is rich and varied, it is made comprehensible thanks to context, gestures, commands, pictures, as in the Natural Approach (Terrell, 1982). But when input is limited, it will take too long to increase the meaningful complexity (for instance, introduce abstract words into it) if comprehensibility is attained mainly through non-verbal means. And time is precisely what intensive English programs in non-English-speaking countries are not very rich in because, as it was mentioned in the preceding chapter, intensivity presupposes many classes per week but comparatively short duration of the program as a whole. So, to attain input comprehensibility, limited recourse to the native language is inevitable. For instance, learners may receive auditory input only in English. At the same time they may be reading in English what they are hearing with parallel native language translation (partial or full), this translation providing for full comprehension of the auditory information. Another way of using the first language for making input comprehensible is making previews of content to be introduced in L1, as it is recommended in sheltered English (Freeman & Freeman, 1991). Such approaches seem to be quite acceptable, especially in view of the spreading belief that "English only" tactics in the classroom is more damaging than the limited use of learners' mother tongue where it may help (Auerbach, 1993).

The first language is hardly avoidable in the conditions under discussion where all the learners, as well as the teacher (who is not as a rule a native speaker of the language being taught), speak it. In this case the most favorable situation for L2 acquisition is absolutely impossible since it requires: 1) a great deal of oral language input not only from teachers, but also from native speakers of that language; 2) an opportunity to use L2 in meaningful contexts where feedback from native speakers is received (McLaughlin, 1985). So, it would not be reasonable not to use the advantages given by the common knowledge of L1. These advantages are in opportunities of turning to L1 in order to facilitate some specific difficulties of L2, and in using L1 for explaining some points that it would be hard to explain in L2

since such explanations could take too much time and effort. That is why Widdowson (1994) strongly objects to the assumption that a native-speaker is always better as a teacher of English than a teacher whose mother-tongue is not English. If English is taught as a foreign language in a non-English-speaking setting where all learners share the same first language, the teacher who speaks this L1 has some advantages. S/he is better prepared to coping with those specific problems of his/her students that originate from incompatibilities or differences in the target and native languages (Medgyes, 1983; Tang, 1997).

The view that native speakers are not always the best teachers of English is gradually spreading (O'Dwyer, 1996). It also finds support in the current opinion that different kinds of teaching materials are needed when teaching English in different countries - in Germany they cannot be the same as in Japan, and there cannot be one and the same teaching methodology for all the countries (Berns, 1990a: 104-105). If this approach is correct, participation of teachers and specialists in teaching English who are not native speakers of it in organizing and carrying out this teaching becomes indispensable, as well as making appropriate use of students' L1 in such conditions.

Worthy of consideration is the question of how grammar rules should be presented in the analysis phase. In that phase they are unavoidable when using the communicative-analytic approach. Otherwise, communicative-algorithmic activities will become meaningless. Rivers (1978) is quite right in saying that it is senseless trying to deprive adolescent and adult learners of grammar explanations and rules - they will start looking for them in old books due to their proclivity to reasoning and finding logic in everything.

Three ways of presenting grammar rules are possible: traditional teacher-fronted explanations (deductive presentation), explanations through guided induction (Herron & Tomasello, 1992), and deducing grammar rules by students themselves thanks to grammar consciousness-raising tasks (Fotos, 1994). The last way is the best because it integrates grammar instruction and communicative language use. But in this way communication is about grammar (Fotos & Ellis, 1991). In a non-English-speaking setting, when opportunities of communicating in English are limited to the classroom, it is hardly worthwhile to waste them, especially in an ESP classroom, on communicating about grammar, all the more so that it takes quite a lot of time. Therefore, the first two ways seem more suitable being more economical - especially when combination of deduction and induction is ensured (Corder, 1988). It does not mean that the third way should not be used at all but it is would probably be reserved for out-of-class students' practicing.

### 2.3. Materials/Content Selection and Preparation Procedures for Developing an Intensive English Program

There is no doubt about the necessity of making English programs (especially intensive commercial programs) learner and learner's needs-centered (Nunan, 1988) because without it there is no hope of enrolling students. It is possible to ensure such centering only through a long series of interviews with potential learners aimed at finding out what their wishes and needs really are. Such interviewing was carried out in the city of Dniepropetrovsk (Ukraine) during 1991-1992 with 300 people questioned - all of these people having expressed some interest in learning English intensively. Among those interviewed were representatives of different occupations and walks of life - government employees, businessmen, industrial

workers, engineers, doctors, researchers in various fields of science and technology, students of high and higher schools and many others. The interviewees' age range was rather broad - from 16 to 50 years old.

The first question to be clarified was whether potential learners were interested in all the 4 basic language skills (speaking, listening, reading, writing) or only in some of them. It turned out that 59% of all the persons interviewed were interested only in acquiring speaking and listening skills believing reading and writing to be of secondary importance to them. Of the other 41%, everybody without exception thought speaking and listening to be the most important skills, but they also named reading as hardly less essential for their personal needs. As to writing, it was mentioned only by 26% of potential students.

Such interviewing results are quite natural because in the given conditions people want to learn English primarily for making foreign trips, i.e. for oral-aural contacts with native speakers, while written English is not considered a vital necessity - all the more so that learners tend to believe that if they acquire speaking and listening, they will have no problems in acquiring reading and writing as "additional" skills. Reading, of course, is of greater significance to quite a lot of learners than writing because reading in English can be of some use to everybody but far from many people really need writing in English to meet some professional or personal goals. But even those who are eager to acquire reading and writing skills prefer concentrating on speaking and listening first - feeling the greatest need of them while, in their opinion, reading and writing could wait. That was the reason of developing an intensive program of oral (oral/aural) communication in English as the most attractive to the majority of potential students (just this program is the subject of the two following chapters).

The second question in need of clarifying was what kind of English was of greater use to potential learners - General English or some kind of ESP. It was found in interviewing that 70% of all the interviewees named some ESP as their ultimate goal. It seems quite plausible because people who would like to learn English for making foreign trips plan such trips for quite different personal reasons. As it turned out, it was only the minority that had just tourist or shopping goals in mind. The majority wanted to make these trips for establishing some contacts (professional, business, or other contacts), or for finding opportunities of cooperation in some field, or for getting acquainted with something professionally valuable, or, in general, for doing some business. It is probably the result of the current political and economic situation in Ukraine. In teaching ESP learners' needs-centering is even more important than in teaching General English because of ESP type diversity (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987). So, it was necessary to find out what kind of ESP the majority of potential learners wanted.

Interviewing demonstrated that 65% of potential students who were eager to have an ESP course preferred it to be Business English, i.e. a course of oral business communication in English for learning to hold different kinds of business talks with foreign partners. Therefore, the most rational solution was elaborating just such an intensive program - all the more so that in Ukraine and in other countries of the former USSR there is an obvious lack of materials for teaching Business English developed specifically for Russian (Ukrainian, Byelorussian)-speaking students learning English in their own country. Business English teaching materials developed in the USA and Great Britain cannot fill this gap because they are meant first of all for learning English in the country where it is spoken. So, in a non-English-speaking setting they cannot be the only kind of materials used since no account is taken in them either of learners' mother tongue or of specific needs and

conditions of learning (which is important if the communicative-analytic approach is used). Consequently, it was a kind of pioneering job to develop an oral course of Business English for Ukrainian/Russian-speaking students learning English in Ukraine.

But interviewing showed one more aspect of potential students' needs. However strongly the interviewees felt about their needs in some kind of an ESP program, all of them without any exception said that they wanted a course of General English as well (for oral communication only). It would be more correct to say that a course of everyday oral communication was wanted to provide for survival needs when on a foreign trip. Therefore, such a course ought to be an integral part of an intensive English program. So, a two-part combined program would be the most rational for the given conditions - the first part being a Survival (Everyday, General) English course, and the second part an ESP course (Business English in the case under discussion).

This division perfectly matches the stage-by-stage division discussed above as the most suitable for the communicative-analytic approach. The course of Survival English can fully take upon itself the first (after a short preparatory course) of the two principal stages - the intermediate one where the teaching/learning process is designed according to the pattern "primary synthesis - analysis - communicative synthesis". In this case the most important and basic language skills will be developed while students are learning General English. So, it is principally in the course of General English that language form focusing activities will be done. Then, the final stage can be designed as fully communicative ESP (Business English) teaching. Absence of language form focusing at this stage makes organizing effective content-based learning possible. Such learning is fundamental for any ESP course because any such course must meet the condition and requirement that are at the core of content-based instruction. It is the integration of particular content with language teaching aims (Brinton, Snow, & Wesche, 1989; Caprio, 1992). When teaching content is integrated with language teaching, the situation is favorable for immersion, just like French immersion is organized in Canada (Lapkin & Cummins, 1984; Swain, 1984). In this way teaching goes from language focused instruction (a short preparatory course) to communicative teaching/learning with language focusing as its integral but subordinate and relatively minor part (an intermediate General/Survival English course), finally, to immersion content-based education (an ESP course of Business English).

To make both courses of General English and Business English as learners' needs-centered as possible, it was necessary to find out in what situations people who make foreign trips from Ukraine need communication in English and what are the most frequent topics of oral communication in such situations. On the basis of situations and topics it was possible to model and select typical samples of communication (texts, conversations) using authentic materials as much as possible (including into them those samples of communication that are given in the materials selected and compiled by native speakers and used for teaching English as a second language). Such samples were needed for selecting vocabulary and grammar typical (frequent) and required for communicating in the given situations on the given topics. This, in its turn, was to serve for selecting and designing all the teaching/learning materials (printed, cassette-recorded etc.) and learning activities to be used in the program.

To select situations and topics of communication one hundred people from the city of Dniepropetrovsk were interviewed during 1991/1992 - only those who made frequent foreign trips on business or for different personal reasons. They were

asked to choose from a suggested list of situations and topics those ones that they believed to be the most important for such trips and to cross out those that could safely be excluded from instruction. They were also asked to add situations and topics of their own to the list if they chose. As a result, the following situations and topics (believed to be the most vital by 80% of all the interviewees) were selected for the course of General/Survival English:

1. Getting acquainted/getting introduced to people/getting to know some personal facts about them/supplying some personal information about oneself.
2. Communication and contacts with immigration and customs officers when entering or leaving the country.
3. Asking the way in a city, communication and contacts when inquiring policemen, passers-by etc. about the way.
4. Providing oneself with housing accommodations - communication and contacts when making hotel reservations, checking in or checking out, using room-service etc.
5. Providing meals for oneself - communication and contacts when making orders and paying checks at restaurants, choosing food there etc.
6. Communication and contacts when using public transport - paying fare, finding out where to get off, what transport to transfer to, the best ways of reaching one's destination by using public transport etc.
7. Communication and contacts when shopping (food stuffs, clothing, shoes, household appliances, audio and video appliances, computers, souvenirs etc.).
8. Communication and contacts when sightseeing, theater-going, visiting museums, different places of entertainment and such like.
9. Communication and contacts necessary for organizing and ensuring one's traveling in an English-speaking country or for leaving it - booking and getting tickets, contacts with different employees of air lines, railways, or coach service and such like.

The communication situations and topics chosen (following a similar procedure) for the course of Business English included:

1. Business interviewing - getting to know the structure of a firm or company.
2. Business interviewing - getting information about management in a firm or company and hierarchy in its governing bodies.
3. Business interviewing - getting information about firm's or company's production processes and goods manufactured by it (specifications etc.), touring a factory.
4. Business telephone communication.
5. Business negotiations - starting business contacts and stating purposes.
6. Business negotiations - getting and handling business information.
7. Business negotiations - coming to an agreement, making a deal, signing a contract, planning a joint project or venture.
8. Business discussion - discussing projects, budget, and finances.
9. Business discussion - discussing business strategy, business results, and competition.
10. Business discussion - discussing sales results and sales targets.

After selecting situations and topics, samples of communication in these situations were selected (or modeled), and from them the language material to be learned was obtained. As a result, a vocabulary of 1000 words and phraseology was

selected for the course of General English. All the grammar necessary for everyday oral communication was also selected. It included practically all the English grammar system necessary for any kind of oral communication, with the principal attention focused on the verb and exclusion of everything mainly typical of written communication and infrequent in the oral one. Patterns of behavior characteristic of English-speaking people in the situations named above were also analyzed and chosen for teaching, as well as realia and such like. In this way linguistic information was to be introduced in conjunction with cultural information.

The vocabulary selected for Business English course included about 1200 words and phraseology. About 60% were specific for oral and written communication in the area of business. All the others belonged to General English. There was no new grammar in this course since all the oral communication grammar had been concentrated in the preceding one.

On the basis of all the selections mentioned above, typical conversations (dialogues and polylogues[4]) were designed for both courses to serve as the core elements of all the teaching/learning materials and activities to be elaborated[5]. They were models of communication in the given situations where this communication concentrated around the given topics. Such models for the course of Business English included not only dialogues and polylogues but monologic texts as well for summarizing every communicative situation and topic. It was done to provide a preview of any model business conversation students were supposed to listen to (comprehensible input). It also served for giving examples of business monologic discourse that is quite as typical of business communication as dialogic or polylogic discourse.

Quite a different procedure was followed in selecting and designing materials for the short preparatory course. It has already been mentioned that its primary aim was students' psychological conditioning, making them psychologically ready to intensive communicative activities in the principal courses of everyday and business communication. It was supposed to be done by way of teacher's mainly using analytical teaching/learning activities, that students often expect and trust as the most effective (Green, 1993), while consistently negotiating transition to communicative activities (Numan, 1986: 95) and gradually, one by one, introducing them. During the period very limited language teaching aims were to be set (pronunciation practice, some elementary grammar skills practice, learning a very limited vocabulary), with communicative skills development even more limited. That is why this course was planned to be made not longer than two weeks since making it longer would damage the overall communicative nature and orientation of the program as a whole and disillusion learners. Though many of them think analytical activities in learning to be of the greatest importance, yet everyone, as was demonstrated in interviewing, expect and want results in enhancement of ability to communicate in the target language, and feel themselves deceived if they do not advance in communicative proficiency after about a month of having classes. The preparatory course of the kind under discussion cannot be expected to provide for communicative competence development. At the same time this course could hardly be made shorter than two weeks of intensive classes as time was needed for students to develop some skills in standard English pronunciation, to get used to their teacher and to each other, to start trusting and liking her/him (prerequisite for negotiation of transition to communicative

[4] Conversations where more than two interlocutors take part will henceforth be called polylogues to make a distinction from dialogues.

[5] These materials and activities for both courses will be described in detail in the next chapter.

activities), as well as the group-mates, so as to become totally responsive, relaxed, and unconstrained during classes.

All the language material necessary for developing such pronunciation (on the sound, word, phrase and discourse levels, including intonation patterns) was selected for this two week long course. As to grammar material, it was reduced to a minimum and consisted of such basics as the link-verb "to be", imperative mood of verbs, articles (very difficult for Russian or Ukrainian-speaking learners), personal, possessive, and demonstrative pronouns, prepositions, plural of nouns and a few other items. The vocabulary was also reduced to a minimum (a little over 100 words), to a large extent illustrating phonology and grammar. Since the principal kinds of learning activities were supposed to be different kinds of drills, language games, activities characteristic of Total Physical Response and such like (see the following chapter), no lengthy coherent texts were used.

It does not mean that teaching communication was totally excluded from the preparatory course. But it was confined to teaching and learning patterns of greeting, saying good-bye, thanking, apologizing etc. For acquiring such elementary communication cliches and formulas, communicative-algorithmic and semi-heuristic activities were used, but they did not take more than one-third of class time. All the teaching/learning materials for this course (described in the following chapter) were designed on the basis of the selected language material and learning activities, as well as communicative cliches and formulas chosen for learning.

As the result of all the selection and material preparation procedures described above the three-stage (course) intensive program acquired some definite stage-by-stage characteristics:

1. ***The first (beginner's) very short stage (course)*** became mainly language form-focused serving for giving learners some notions of the language system and preparing them psychologically to future activities directed at developing their communicative competence. However, communicative competence development was supposed to start even at this early stage, despite the fact that communicative practicing was to take not more than one/third of class time.

2. ***The second (intermediate) stage (course)*** was to be fully assigned to development of communication abilities. It was to be of a totally communicative nature and train students to be able to communicate in English in everyday situations during a foreign trip. At the same time language form-focusing (General English in this case) was to remain an integral and important part of teaching/learning activities serving the purpose of intake facilitation and learning the language material for which communication is the main source of acquisition. Analytic (form-focusing) activities planned for the course were not to take more than one third of class time as not less than two thirds had to be taken by communication in the target language.

3. ***The final (advanced) stage (course)*** was to be a content-based course of Business English with language teaching done through the content matter in the area of business, management, and marketing. No language focusing was to be applied - thus making the course fully communicative in all its manifestations so that new language forms (primarily the new vocabulary since grammar was to be concentrated in the preceding course) could be acquired only unconsciously in the process of communication.

## 2.4. Means of Ensuring Intensivity of an English Program

It is well known that an intensive program is a program with many class hours per week but relatively short in duration (a few months). So, designing such a program, it is first of all necessary to find out how many class hours a week are really rational and possible and what the exact duration of all the courses should be.

In the conditions under discussion it was impossible to design a program with classes held every day since potential students were not ready to interrupt their regular occupations (jobs, studies) for learning English. Interviewing showed[6] that potential students in an intensive program were ready to have their classes in the evening time or during week-ends but not oftener than three days a week. Learners agreed to having classes four days a week only for a very short period - from two weeks to a month and not longer. As to classes three days a week, potential students thought they could attend them for a period from six months to one year. But most preferable would be a course of three or four-month duration. As to the duration of every class (number of class hours for the day when the class is held), it cannot be made more than three hours long (four forty five minute academic hours). Taking into account that classes are mostly held in the evening after students' working day, longer classes are hardly permissible while the above mentioned duration coincided with what the interviewees themselves thought possible.

As a result, in developing the course 12 forty five minute academic hours were set as a weekly norm for all the learning period. They were divided into three classes a week (four academic hours per class) in both of the principal courses of Survival/General/Everyday English and Business English. For the two week preparatory course, the distribution was a little different - four classes a week with three academic hours for every class. The 12 hours a week norm stayed but classes were held more frequently because the specific aims of the course (students' psychological adaptation) required more frequent contacts with the teacher.

The duration of the two principal courses was set at 14 weeks. Thus, the preparatory course together with the first principal course of General English was to last for a little less than four months, and the second principal course of Business English was to last for three months and a half (a little over seven months for the whole program). Those learners who did not need Business English and confined their goals to mastering everyday communication could terminate their learning and drop out without any harm after the second stage. It also gave an opportunity to learn English to those potential students who could not attend classes for a period longer than three-four months. On the other hand, those persons who had a good command of General English (advanced students) and needed Business English, could attend the business course, that was made autonomous, without attending the two preceding courses. Finally, those who needed both General and Business English and had no previous knowledge of the language, could begin at the zero level (preparatory course) and proceed to the end through all the three stages.

In this way the optimum learning time distribution and duration meeting the requirements of potential students were achieved. At the same time maximum admissible (for the given conditions) intensivity of learning was made possible - if that intensivity is judged by such an indicator as learning time concentration. The intensivity caused by this concentration could be considered as very great even absolutely and not only relatively, i.e. if compared to concentration of learning time

[6] In all the interviews mentioned in this and the preceding chapter all the interviewees were asked questions concerning their opinions about learning English in intensive programs.

in state-owned educational institutions where not more than two-four academic hours are allocated to learning English per week. In the intensive program (12 hours a week) the limit was surpassed three-six times. So, in this respect good conditions were created for eliminating one of the principal shortcomings of the state-regulated system of teaching English (see the preceding chapter).

Intensivity from learning time concentration is certainly not sufficient for attaining desirable learning outcomes. Of even greater importance is the intensivity of students' learning activities because it is only them that can lead to communicative competence development and command of the language. As the principal students' activities under the communicative-analytic approach are the communicative-algorithmic, communicative semi-heuristic, and communicative-heuristic ones, it is just these activities that should be made as intensive as possible - ways of intensification depending on the type of activity.

The simplest task is intensifying communicative-algorithmic activities which means placing students in a situation where every learner in a group would have an opportunity and be bound to do all the amount of communicative drilling scheduled for the given period of time, while all learners work simultaneously. It is quite possible and easy to do using different types of modern technology - computers, language laboratory equipment and such like. This technology is perfectly suitable for performing communicative-algorithmic activities because, being algorithmic, they presuppose fully determined (in form and content) learners' speech acts. The learners are called upon to negate statements they have heard or to confirm them, to agree, disagree, or correct the information just received, or to do other similar transformations of what is heard into what is said. This predetermination of speech acts according to some pre-set pattern, or instruction, or prompts makes it possible to supply clues for learners to check their responses. The clues can be supplied both by computers and cassette recorders (language laboratory). The same holds true of stimuli for students speech reactions, instructions, and prompts they get. The screen of a computer or a cassette recorder can be as good a source of such stimuli, instructions, and prompts as a human teacher.

Both computers and language laboratories with audio equipment are not only suitable and even irreplaceable for drilling directed at developing grammar skills. They are best adapted to do that. Language laboratories were specifically created to do this job (Adam & Shawcross, 1967; Stack, 1969); and it was the reason of their broad utilization at the time of the audio-lingual method (Lado & Fries, 1958; Lado, 1964; Van Abbe, 1969). After that method had become a thing of the past, language laboratories started to be neglected and were out of favor for some period, but we are witnessing their coming to the forefront again. As Kelly and Vanparys (1991) point out they are unique as a place where receptive learning can be reinforced and activated orally. But to play such a role in teaching/learning process language laboratories should be used in a more creative way than conventional drills (Ely, 1984). Communicative-algorithmic activities (as they were described) meet this requirement because, when doing them, students face explicit communicative tasks (asking for information, agreeing, disagreeing etc.). Grammatical skill development tasks are more or less implicit, "hidden from view". The irreplaceability of language laboratories for such activities is due to the fact that every student there can work individually and independently of other students. Thus, every one of them can work simultaneously with the others in one and the same moment of time getting the full amount of drilling - the situation that is absolutely impossible when drilling is teacher-fronted.

Much of what has been said concerning language laboratories is true of computer-assisted language learning. Certainly, computers have a much greater range of possibilities than language laboratories, and that is why they are actively used now for various complex learning activities - much more creative and complicated than any kind of grammar skill practice, however communication-like it is made. Computers can be used not only for such practice, but even for simulations, to say nothing of different computer games when language learning becomes entertainment (Crookall, Coleman, & Verslius, 1990; Higgins & Morgenstern, 1990; Saunders, 1987; Underwood, 1984). And yet, it still holds true that the primary functions of computers in language learning are drills, training grammar and vocabulary (Higgins & Johns, 1984; Jones & Fortesque, 1987; Maddison & Maddison, 1987; Phillips, 1987). The reason of it, according to Garrigues (1992), lies in the fact that a computer cannot control the dialogue "human being - computer" in teaching foreign languages in the way to make this dialogue natural. Besides, as Garrigues points out, such a dialogue can still be presented only in the written form. That is why this author is sure that CALL should mainly be confined to controlling written production on the part of the students limited to a small number of alternative programmed responses. That is just the nature of communicative-algorithmic activities.

They also fall under the definition by Rivers (1990: 277) of what should be the principal domain of CALL

> ... knowledge of language through performing rules in meaningful material, with conscious focus on difficult areas. With thought and care the computer can be programmed for what is essentially individual effort on the part of the student (some assimilate this knowledge faster, some more slowly), thus liberating the classroom for more creative interactive activities that stimulate communication through language.

Therefore, whatever other utilization of computers in the conditions of intensive FL teaching/learning can be, they should certainly be used, together with the language laboratory, for organizing communicative- algorithmic activities aimed at students' grammar skill development. Just like the language laboratory, they enable all the students in a group to develop such skills working simultaneously but totally independently of each other and at the speed most suitable to the individual learning style of every learner.

The natural question is why use computers at all if they are employed to do the same thing that audio equipment is used for. The answer is in the very difference in the mode of performing communicative-algorithmic activities with the aid of computers and/or with the aid of cassette recorders. In the former case they are to be done in the written form due to the nature of working with computers (see above), while drilling with the aid of a cassette recorder is purely oral. Working with a computer gives learners time to think during exercising, whereas with a cassette recorders they are to say what they are supposed to in pauses in recording, and have to stop and rewind the tape if they cannot keep pace with it.

Consequently, the advantage of computerized communicative drilling is its ensuring better students' consciousness-raising as to language forms because of the written form of learning activity and the possibility of thinking over the language to be used in any piece (fragment) of communication currently processed. On the other hand, the advantage of working with a cassette recorder in a language laboratory is the oral skill development that is the overall goal of drilling because of the oral nature of the intensive program as a whole.

Besides, limited time for speech reactions in pauses on the tape develops the temporal characteristics of oral speaking indispensable for communication. Thus, both computer-aided and language laboratory-aided communicative-algorithmic

activities are necessary for grammar skill development in the analysis phase. But computer-aided activities should always precede drilling with the aid of cassette recorders. The written form and greater opportunities for thinking makes it expedient to use them at the very start of grammar skill development to lay a good foundation of these skills. In this case similar following activities with the aid of cassette recorders will serve to further develop them, make the skills more automatic by forming the required temporal parameters of relevant speech acts and, what is very important, will drill the language items for using in oral speech.

An essential question is when and how to perform computer-aided and language laboratory-aided communicative-algorithmic activities. As they are performed individually, computers and cassette recorders being the sources of teaching information so that the presence of a teacher is not required, the best way would be practicing outside the classroom whenever it is convenient to any individual student. Unfortunately, in the conditions under discussion it is seldom practicable or even possible. Students cannot practice at home because, though many of them have cassette recorders or players, very few possess personal computers.

As to giving students some fixed time alternatives for coming to a language laboratory or a classroom equipped with personal computers, it usually proves to be very inconvenient to many learners in a group. The reason is the above-mentioned evening classes. So, students cannot come and practice in the daytime. It turned out that the most practical solution was making one of the three classes per week in the intermediate course (where the pattern "primary synthesis - analysis - communicative synthesis" is implemented) a class totally devoted to performing computer and language laboratory-aided communicative-algorithmic activities. In this class, where the analysis phase is realized, presenting and explaining the new grammar (that students already encountered in the input and used in their own speaking during the preceding primary synthesis phase) will be immediately followed by practicing with the aid of computers. Cassette recorder-aided practicing will also be held during the same class, and it will complete the analysis phase for the given learning unit.

With this distribution of activities computer programs, as well as materials for practicing in the language laboratory, will be fully integrated into the general teaching program, and not stand alone as often happens. So, a very important requirement concerning the optimum use of technical teaching aids and computer programs in language teaching will be met (Clarke, 1989: 37).

It is worthy of notice that this mode of organizing communicative-algorithmic activities is desirable only for the above mentioned intermediate stage of the program. It is not necessary for the advanced stage (Business English course) because there is no analysis phase at that stage - so, no communicative-algorithmic activities are to be performed. As to the short preparatory course, the situation with it is different from both principal courses. In this course students' learning activities are mainly analytical. That is why communicative-algorithmic activities, language exercises, and different language games (such as described by Wright, Betteridge,& Buckby, 1991) are the principal forms of practicing - moreover, purely linguistic exercises, i.e. totally language form-focused and hardly communicative at all, are not only unavoidable but are to take quite a substantial part of class time. For instance, it is hardly possible to develop students' pronunciation stereotypes without making them simply imitate what they hear (words, phrases, text fragments etc.). All these activities certainly require using the language laboratory as the most important teaching aid for pronunciation skill development. But quite a number of

communicative-algorithmic activities, language games, non-communicative exercises should be made just teacher-fronted.

At this stage teacher-fronted activities are essential because one of the principal goals is psychological adjustment of students. It can be achieved only through continuous contacts of the teacher and his/her students, and it makes inexpedient prolonged interruptions of this contact for learners' individual work with machines. That was the reason why in designing the preparatory course the greater part of activities were planned as teacher-fronted, with only a few of them devoted to practicing in the language laboratory or in pairs (small groups).

No practicing with the aid of computers was planned because far from many students were familiar with them - so, adding the difficulty of learning to use computers to the difficulty of the new foreign language at the beginner's stage would be damaging to the process of psychological conditioning.

As to the issue of intensifying communicative semi-heuristic and communicative-heuristic activities, the first question to be answered is how to make them as close to natural communication in the target language as possible. But it should be kept in mind that, however closely these activities model such communication, the teacher should be reconciled to the fact that, when learning English in a non-English-speaking setting, learners' speaking in English is always artificial, not natural. It cannot be otherwise when the teacher and the students share one and the same first language, and only this language is spoken outside the classroom. So, even when the students are engaged in discussing in English some issue which is of vital interest and significance to them, the very fact that they are doing it in English makes the discussion unnatural, a kind of playing, because in reality it would be possible and natural for them to debate in their common L1. Therefore, in such conditions of intensive teaching of English as a foreign language all the communicative semi-heuristic or heuristic activities modeling genuine oral communication in the target language are inevitably to be organized as some kind of dramatizations or role-plays.

It does not mean that in every one of them learners will play some assumed roles, others than themselves, or will "perform" in some imaginary situation. But even when they are talking about some issue of common interest without assuming any roles, they are still "dramatizing" a discussion because in reality there is no communicative need for them to do it in English. To make this need real in the learning conditions under consideration is practically impossible, except those very rare occasions when learners have a chance of contacting native speakers of English who come to their country. Therefore, the features characterizing drama, dramatization, and role-playing in language teaching (Butterfield, 1989; Hawkins, 1991; Livingstone, 1983; Maley & Duff, 1988) are applicable to practically all the forms of communicative semi-heuristic and heuristic activities.

Certainly, such a form of role-playing as what Di Pietro (1987) calls strategic interaction is one of the most important, especially for communicative-heuristic activities, but it is artificial interaction all the same (students "play the roles" of English speakers) - so it can be included into the role-playing category. It should be mentioned that role-playing and dramatizations in their pure form are most characteristic of the Survival (General/Everyday) English course. For the course of Business English they take the form of simulations with their distinctive features (Crookall & Oxford, 1990; Jones, 1982).

Consequently, the issue of intensifying communicative semi-heuristic and heuristic activities actually boils down to finding ways of ensuring conditions for active and intensive role-playing, simulations, and dramatizations enabling all the

students in a group to participate in them simultaneously during all the class time allocated to such activities.

It has been known how to ensure such conditions for quite a while already. It is through task-based pair work and small group work, i.e. through cooperative learning. Such learning has a lot of advantages for language teaching, but in the context being discussed the most important advantage is the fact that cooperative learning, according to Olsen and Kagan (1992), is the source of increased active communication in the target language. In classroom FL teaching and learning it is practically the only form which can provide for simultaneous active practicing in oral communication for all students in a group. That is why pair and small group work is the principal form of organizing communicative semi-heuristic and heuristic activities within the framework of an intensive course.

Technical teaching aids such as computers and audio-visual equipment can be used for performing such activities but only as optional auxiliaries. In this case computers, for instance, are employed in what Garrigues (1992: 73) defines as their second function in language learning - that of stimulation of production. But it should be emphasized that in communicative semi-heuristic and heuristic activities the employment of any kind of technical teaching aids is not obligatory, as in communicative-algorithmic drilling. These activities on the basis of pair or small group work can be made very efficient even if there are no computers, cassette recorders, or video equipment used. There is only one kind of such a sort of activities where audio or video equipment is indispensable. It is when presenting samples of conversations, dialogues or polylogues, in the primary synthesis phase of a learning unit as it cannot be done in the classroom without using a cassette recorder. If using a video-tape is possible, it is even better because, according to Lonergan (1984) or Le Ninan (1992), video gives a unique opportunity of demonstrating complete communicative situations and visualizing them as well as the objects of discourse.

All the ways of intensifying the learning activities described above are nothing more than providing students with opportunities to be actively and intensively engaged in them during all the class time. But to make teaching/learning process really intensive and efficient, it is necessary to make sure that students do use these opportunities, are eager to work and do their best in class, to communicate in English there as much as they can. It is the question of their attitude, whether they feel themselves relaxed and comfortable during their classes or strained and frustrated. It should be remembered that positive motivation, eagerness to master the language are initially high with learners who get enrolled for a commercial intensive program. Otherwise, they simply would not come (see the preceding chapter). But high positive motivation can be changed to its opposite if a student is often frustrated, disillusioned, and uncomfortable in class or if s/he feels that her/his expectations are not realized.

That is why to make learners really active and permanently highly motivated, special measures should be taken to ensure relaxed and empathic psychological environment in the classroom, to eliminate students' self-consciousness and grounds for any feeling of frustration that could be caused by lack of success in target language communication. Malamah-Thomas (1991) emphasizes the necessity of paying much attention to making interaction in any classroom a positive state not fraught with tension. But it is all the more important for intensive teaching, being the only way of maintaining the initially high students' motivation.

Easy unconstrained empathic psychological environment in the class- room originates from friendly equal teacher-to-student and student-to-student cooperation, their mutually sympathizing attitudes. To achieve this the teacher is required to remove all causes for anxiety that learners can feel due to their inability to communicate in English at the early stages of learning (lack of words, fear of making errors etc.). For this purpose the teacher should encourage and acclaim every individual learner's success and advance. S/he should never interrupt a student to correct language errors because corrections can disrupt communication. Tactful prompts of correct versions would be much better, especially if students are made to understand that errors are a positive factor, evidence of learning taking place, external manifestations of hypotheses-testing in interlanguage development process (Ellis, 1986). In this way learners' fear of errors may be eliminated, and with it one of the greatest obstacles towards starting to communicate in L2. The teacher should also compensate for students' lack of words by being a constant source of prompts, a "live dictionary" for them at early stages.

Another important factor, as shown in the work by Wringe (1989), is making students enjoy what they do, stimulating their activities and encouraging positive attitudes. It requires taking into account the individuality of every student, his/her interests and inclinations when setting individual assignments, organizing class work. Such teacher's attitudes make teaching "positive" or "gentle" (Kelly & Strupek, 1993), learner-centered. In general, it means that humanistic education, where students' self-actualization and the affective part play a very important role, should be the basis of intensive teaching. Humanistic education, according to Moskovitz (1978), presupposes creating an environment in the classroom that facilitates achievement of learners' full potential, their personal (and not only cognitive) growth, increases their self-esteem. This author recommends a whole set of measures to this effect, and those measures are to be implemented in full in the intensive FL classroom.

Among the measures very important are those that are directed at creating good relationships between classmates (Moscovitz, 1978), and such relationships are of particular significance in the situation of intensive FL programs. The problem here is that it is inevitable to have very different people as students in one and the same group (different ages, occupations, outlooks, tastes etc.). If the teacher does not take measures to get these people better acquainted with each other and mutually interested, if s/he does not try to develop mutually sympathizing attitudes in the group and instill into all the students some feeling of belonging to this group (a kind of family feeling), conflicts will be hard to avoid. Very helpful is encouraging all kinds of mutual assistance in the group, not only in the form of joining efforts for acquiring English, but whenever and wherever students are in contact.

The teacher's job of creating the favorable psychological environment in the classroom along the lines mentioned above should be most thoroughly done during the short preparatory course which is specifically designed for it. But as this job is bound with keeping up, enhancement, and development of students' positive motivation, there can be no end of it until the very end of the entire program. It does not mean that motivation should be stimulated and developed by special "talks" of the teacher to this point. All the organization of the teaching/learning process should serve this purpose. For instance, role-plays are concerned with feelings, better understanding of one's own nature, and thanks to it they help in developing achievement motives (Alschuler, 1973). But role-plays, as can be seen from above, are to be one of the main forms of activities in an intensive program.

So, serving primarily for developing communicative competence in L2, they at the same time are the tools of enhancing students' motivation and creating proper psychological environment in the classroom.

The above description of the foundations on which classroom activities are based and the teaching/learning process in general is organized raises the question of teacher's role in this process. When a great part of students' work is done not so much in direct contact with the teacher as through cooperative learning, using technical aids etc., when one of the principal functions of the teacher becomes the function of creating easy, unconstrained, and friendly psychological climate in the classroom, s/he cannot preserve the traditional teacher's role of supreme authority in her/his class. Dubin & Olshtain (1986) point out that if the curriculum is developed to achieve communicative goals and is humanistic by nature, learners learning the language become players while their teacher is the director of this play. Thus, the teacher sheds the function of an authoritarian ruler in the classroom and becomes the director of students' activities and their partner in them in the same way a director of a play or a film is the partner of actors (it does not mean relinquishing the directorship). So, according to Dubin & Olshtain (1986), director of activities function comes to the forefront in the modern language classroom. The second very important function of the teacher there is the function of a very tactful psychological and social adviser who constantly works on relevant psychological and social conditioning of every learner.

Both functions can be combined in the definition of the teacher for modern school given by Rogers (1983) who maintained that now not teaching but facilitating of learning is necessary. Therefore, teachers should stop to be teachers and become facilitators. It is just this that is required of an English teacher in an intensive program in the conditions under discussion because only in such a function can the teacher stimulate students' communication in a foreign language which they do not immediately need outside the classroom.

Rogers (1983) points out - a teacher as a facilitator is possible if s/he enjoys the trust of her/his students rather than distrust not infrequently prevalent in a classroom. It means understanding well students' interests, desires, and inclinations, knowing their individual peculiarities. For instance, Gardner's (1983; 1993) theory of multiple intelligences means that individual differences in taking in and processing information must be taken account of. The teacher is supposed to make some adjustments in his/her teaching to facilitate learning for every student. But to make such adjustments the teacher must know learners' individual learning peculiarities and not only their interests, wishes etc. Only in this way can what Fanselow (1987) calls teacher-student rapport (and through it teacher's charisma) be created. Only in the presence of this rapport teaching can really be made learner-centered and psychological conditions be created for students to be eager to actively participate in all the forms of learning activities in the classroom. Therefore, such rapport is the indispensable prerequisite for intensification of these activities.

## Summary

In the conditions when intensive teaching of English is organized in a non-English setting, such as Ukraine, it should be done on the basis of the communicative-analytic production-based approach. It presupposes combining dominantly communicative activities with some focusing on language. Three main forms of learning activities are characteristic of this approach - communicative-algorithmic, communicative semi-heuristic, and communicative-heuristic, only the

first type being devoted to language focusing. The analytic activities may dominate during the first very short preparatory stage of the intensive course. But at the principal (intermediate) stage of it they should be totally subordinated to the communicative activities and occupy not more than a third of all the learning time. The phase pattern of "primary synthesis -analysis - communicative synthesis" is the most rational for every learning unit at this stage. Finally, at the advanced stage the analytic phase (and the language focusing with it) is better dropped out making the teaching/learning process a continuous process of communication in the target language. At all stages of the program practicing in production should occupy the greatest amount of time, with no "incubatory" period where only comprehension is trained, though naturally comprehensible input in L2 should be made as rich and variable as possible. Students' L1 may be used to make input comprehensible.

To make the program efficient, it is to be elaborated taking full account of the majority of potential students' needs. The analysis shows that primarily oral programs are needed. These programs of oral communication in English should be the combined ones where the first half is devoted to developing students' communicative competence on the basis of General English (everyday/survival communication) and the second or advanced half is a course of ESP. Of all the ESP courses, Business English is the most popular. In general, a three stage program seems to be the most rational:

1) a very short mainly analytical preparatory course developing students' pronunciation skills, some elementary grammar skills, and also psychologically conditioning learners for the kind of work required in the principal courses;

2) a course of everyday oral communication in English (for making foreign trips) where the overall domination of the communicative approach is combined with analytic language focusing facilitating learning and acquisition;

3) a course of oral business communication where there is no language focusing, the approach is fully communicative and content-based (immersion).

Selecting and designing content and materials for teaching and learning is to follow the succession:

1) selecting communicative situations where learners will most probably need to communicate orally in English;

2) selecting the most probable topics of communication in these situations;

3) selecting and/or designing typical discourses - the most characteristic samples of typical communication in the given situations and on the given topics;

4) selecting on the basis of typical discourses the language material (grammar and vocabulary) sufficient for oral communication in the given situations and on the given topics;

5) designing all the teaching/learning materials and students learning activities on the basis of all the preceding selections.

There are several ways of ensuring the intensivity of the program. The first of them is the concentration of learning time. Every week classes are to be held for not less than 12 hours, 3 or 4 times a week, but the course is to be rather short in duration with the preparatory course not longer than 2 weeks and each of the principal courses not longer than 4 months.

Even more important than time concentration are the means of making intensive the learning activity in the classroom. For communicative-algorithmic activities it is done through extensive use of technical teaching aids, such as computers and language laboratory equipment, ensuring simultaneous communicative drilling for all the students in a group. As to communicative semi-heuristic and heuristic activities, their intensivity (intensive task-based practicing in

communication) is achieved through cooperative learning, working in pairs and small groups. Of the greatest importance for intensivity of students' learning activities are the teacher's efforts to create the most propitious, unconstrained, and friendly psychological environment in the classroom and achieve relevant psychological conditioning of every learner. So, in the circumstances of teaching in such intensive programs the teacher's role is that of a facilitator, and not of the supreme ruling authority in the classroom.

# CHAPTER 3. INTENSIVE PROGRAM IN ACTION: TEACHING MATERIALS, STRUCTURE, METHODOLOGY OF TEACHING

## 3.1. The Short Preparatory Course (1st stage)

Because this short course has as its most explicit aim developing students' pronunciation stereotypes, it bears the title *"The Introductory Phonetic Course"*. It has only 8 classes allocated to it (2 weeks, 4 classes of 3 academic hours per week). The materials for the course consist of a student's book, a guide for the teacher, and an audiocassette with tape-recorded drill-like pronunciation exercises.

Being a component part of the program as a whole (its first stage), this short course has no independent significance of its own since it does very little towards communicative competence development. In principle a student who begins her/his learning with some initial knowledge of English (developed pronunciation skills and such like), can very well do without it. Yet, in spite of that, skipping the course is not recommended. First of all, practical experience has continuously demonstrated that, English pronunciation being very difficult for Russian or Ukrainian-speakers, almost all the persons, even with some initial command of the language, usually have quite a lot of things to do to make their pronunciation approach the norm.

If they skip the preparatory course, they often have much unnecessary trouble in getting rid of communicatively significant pronunciation errors in the principal courses when there is little time for repair work. Besides, all the students without exception need the psychological adjustment and conditioning provided by the course in question.

When it is said that the Introductory Phonetic Course is primarily pronunciation skill development orientated, it does not mean that within its framework it is planned to develop such skills to perfection and to attain native-like English pronunciation of students. The achievement of this effect takes many years of practicing, and the goal is seldom fully attained - practically never if language is learned in the adult state and not in the early childhood (Walsh & Diller, 1981). In general, it is known that L2 adult learners as a rule stop short of native-like success in a number of areas (Towell & Hawkins, 1994: 14-15), so the goal of attaining native-like perfection is better not set at all, especially in such a delicate field as pronunciation. All the more so, this goal is absolutely impossible in a 2 week long course. It is hardly possible to set even the goal of developing stable pronunciation skills during such a short period of time. What is possible however (and just this aim is pursued) is to form the foundation, the basis of such skills, so that learners get to know how English words, phrases etc. sound, how they should be pronounced. Students can get some knack in such pronunciation by extensive practicing, learn to discriminate English sounds, words, phrases when they hear them in speech, and in this way learn to recognize them.

If after the Introductory Phonetic Course the students immediately and without any interval pass on to the first of the two principal courses with its continuous practicing in communication, there is a good chance that the above mentioned foundation will turn into a genuine skill. This consideration makes clear why the Introductory Phonetic Course is desirable before the principal one. It is because if such a pronunciation skill foundation is not laid before, it will have to be laid in the principal course itself to the detriment of teaching communication.

Therefore, it may be said that in the domain of the pronunciation training the goals set before the entire intensive course are based on approximation. It means

that the task of achieving native-like perfection in pronunciation is not planned for any of the courses. The Introductory Phonetic Course does not even plan finishing in any way developing pronunciation skills. All the courses taken together are called upon to do this job approximating the relevant skills of native speakers to the degree when the pronunciation of a student does not make any difficulty in understanding what s/he says though a foreign accent may be well felt.

The specific task of the Introductory Phonetic Course in this respect is to practice (drill) pronunciation skills to the level where in the principal courses reinforcing them continues independently and subconsciously in oral communication practice without requiring any special activities or efforts, but only some occasional corrections on the part of the teacher.

As to grammar skill development and vocabulary learning in this course, they are subordinated to pronunciation training, as it has already been mentioned in the preceding chapter. Grammar and vocabulary mainly serve to illustrate pronunciation phenomena and/or make pronunciation practicing activities meaningful.

What is quite an independent and separate goal in the Phonetic Course is the psychological conditioning of students. This conditioning spoken about in detail in the preceding chapter goes on from the very first minutes of the first class and includes a whole set of specific measures:

1. Explaining and persuading done by the teacher at appropriate moments in the teaching/learning process. For instance, if a student makes a language error, is embarrassed by it, and it disrupts her/his practicing, it is a good moment for explaining the true role of mistakes and errors in language learning, their positive effect in interlanguage development. In this way students may be convinced not to be afraid of making errors, such fear being a serious obstacle to successful FL communication. Similar persuading is needed when short communicative practicing is held during classes in the Introductory Phonetic Course (see below) since at the beginning students are very often embarrassed to start speaking English, even if it is the simplest and well-known communicative exchange of stereotyped utterances. Persuading students may be much more effective if the teacher emphasizes and extols any, even the slightest, success of every individual learner trying to feed and maintain the feeling of "permanent achievement" in all the group. If it is done, it does not usually take long to make students start actually enjoying active participation in communicative practicing and stop avoiding it.

2. Getting the students to know each other. It is done through organizing exchange of personal information during classes, initiating talks about hobbies, interests, and such like (even in students' L1 during the intervals); important is making students show themselves "at their best" to the group, coupling them for mutual assistance and pair practicing in class and often changing pairs, so that every learner contacts as many other learners in the group as possible during the two-week course. These and similar measures (including even group tea-parties after classes) serve for creating a common "family feeling" in the group, arousing mutual sympathies and an attitude of intra-group cooperation, contribute to emergence of relaxed, easy psychological environment in the classroom.

3. Taking special measures for creating this environment, such as the total exclusion of the teacher's role as a disciplinarian - teacher's instilling in the mind of her/his students the notion of herself/himself as their partner, adviser ("facilitator") in the common challenging but enjoyable task of mastering communication in English; making this task really enjoyable even at this early stage by including many language games (see below); accompanying arduous work during classes with

jokes, funny stories, moments of relaxation for "small talk" etc. Very important is maintaining the students' feeling of "permanent achievement and success". It is done not only by way of teacher's praising every success of every individual student, as it was said above. The teacher is supposed to begin every class by exposing what are the students planned to achieve during it and to demonstrate that the scheduled results have really been achieved before saying good-bye to learners. If there are failures of any kind, the teacher should explain the causes, and demonstrate his/her confidence in the ultimate success of all the students despite inevitable occasional set-backs. If learners start feeling the same confidence, it is the best guarantee of their permanently high positive motivation.

4. Paying some attention to developing students' learning strategies and communication strategies and showing learners how to use them following the recommendations and classification of strategies in relevant literature (Faerch & Kasper, 1983; O'Malley & Chamot, 1990; Oxford, 1990). However, this work should be done sparingly, only, at the moments when the teaching/learning process itself makes it appropriate to turn to strategy analysis without encroaching seriously on the time for language learning or acquiring the communication skills proper. It especially concerns the communication strategies since, according to Bialystok (1990), they are universal and do not need to be specifically taught.

All in all, the psychological conditioning and adjustment measures do not take much time but their importance for the final success of teacher's and students' efforts is incomparable to the small place they occupy in the overall teaching activity. That is why they are not confined to the Introductory Phonetic Course but continue in the principal courses (they will not be mentioned further because they do not change from course to course).

A typical class in the Introductory Phonetic Course has the following elements:

1. *Explanations of how to pronounce* English sounds, combination of sounds, words and phrases with these sounds, patterns of intonation etc. - with special attention paid to meaning-discrimination power of different pronunciation patterns. In the process of explanation recourse is made to articulation descriptions, using pronunciation schemes (position of the tongue etc.) and intonation graphs. The phase of explanation is made as short as possible to give the greatest amount of time to training and drilling pronunciation, sound and pattern discrimination.

2. ***Pronunciation training and drilling***. It usually takes the greater part of the first half of every class time, and the learning activities are mainly conventional. The examples of them are:

a) students' listening to strings of words, tape-recorded or read by the teacher, and making some sign (raising one hand, for instance) when a definite sound is heard in a word; the same can be done with intonation patterns but strings of utterances are listened to and students are supposed to raise their hands when hearing an utterance with a definite intonation pattern;

b) repeating words, phrases, short texts (with definite sounds and intonation patterns in them) after the teacher or a cassette recorder (imitation); it is done either with visual support (seeing printed words, phrases, and texts that are heard) or without it - only with support of an aural image;

c) contrastive repetition (with aural support only) of word pairs differing by one sound in them that is hard for discrimination on hearing (such as *"b"* and *"p"*, *"d"* and *"t"* etc.); other drills to teach discriminating words with this sort of sounds in them;

d) reading aloud printed words, phrases, short texts (with definite sound and intonation patterns) without previously hearing them;
e) listening to tape-recorded words, phrases, or short texts and writing them down during pauses on the tape (dictation);
f) grouping words according to sounds heard in them and others[7].

3. *Explanations of new grammar and vocabulary* (as a rule, not more than 10-15 new words and word combinations during one class). Grammatical explanations and rules are made as concise and communication practice orientated as possible. They are often accompanied or wholly based on different graphs and schemes providing visual supports and illustrations. When introducing new words, different means are employed to ensure students' understanding of their meanings. They include showing the meaning by means of demonstrating objects, pictures, movements etc. But translation into students' native language is also used.

4. *Activities aimed at mastering grammar and vocabulary* as their primary goal (with pronunciation training as their secondary goal - see note 7). They are communicative-algorithmic activities - answering teacher's questions concerning real facts and asking such questions (in pairs, small groups); making meaningful questions, requests, commands out of scrambled words and using them for asking other students for some information or for requesting them to do something and such like. Of great importance as one of the varieties of communicative- algorithmic activities is teaching/learning somewhat resembling the Total Physical Response Method (Asher, 1988). For instance, a teacher may utter some command in English pointing at one of the students and showing by gestures what s/he wants her or him to do. This student is supposed to do it and then repeat this command to another student who, after obeying the command, receives a new one from the teacher etc. One more alternative of such a sort of activities has as its implicit aim training prepositions of place and movement. A teacher may perform some action, for example, take a book from the table and put into the drawer. Then s/he points at one of the students who is supposed to ask her/him to reverse the action ("Take the book out of the drawer and put it back on the table, please"). Another alternative is asking the teacher not to do the action s/he is doing at the moment ("Don't go out of the room, please!") etc.

Due to the nature of the course some of these activities do not have any explicit communicative orientation but just drill new grammar and vocabulary. They include filling in blanks in sentences or short texts with appropriate words, articles, forms of the verb "to be" etc. with reading sentences or a text aloud. One more type of non-communicative exercises (written and/or oral) is different grammatical transformations of given sentences. Spelling exercises are also included into this non-communicative category. If the teaching/learning activities listed above under numbers I and 2 occupy about half of every class, activities listed

[7] The above activities are exclusively pronunciation training oriented. The other types of activities described below are also aimed at pronunciation but it is only their supplementary goal. All of them are aimed at learning grammar or vocabulary (then they are listed as grammar or vocabulary learning activities) or they are some kinds of language games and/or communicative practice (then they are listed under the headings of language games and communicative practice). It should also be mentioned that the majority of exclusively pronunciation based activities listed above from "a" to "f" are deliberately made either imitation or reading based. Moreover, in testing pronunciation after the Introductory Phonetic Course it is just the ability to pronounce correctly written words, sentences, and texts that is tested (see the next chapter). It is so because in the following principal course this ability is important and needs to be developed beforehand.

under 3 and 4 do not take more than 15-20% of its time. All the other time (about one third) is devoted to language games and communicative practicing.

5. *Language games*. Students of all ages are ordinarily very enthusiastic about them and await impatiently their beginning as the most entertaining part of every class giving them maximum relaxation. Language games played in this course are phonetically, lexically, or grammatically orientated. For instance:

a) "Who remembers more words". Version 1: The teacher pronounces some sound out of those that were drilled during the class. The students are asked to pronounce as many words with this sound as they can (writing a letter on the blackboard instead of just pronouncing the sound is possible, with students first writing down the words they think of and then reading them aloud). Version 2: In the same game students are divided into teams of 3-4 learners in every team. The winner of the game is the individual (in version 1) or the team (in version 2) who could remember more words with the sound in question.

b) "Who will make up more sentences". A set of 12-15 scrambled words is given with only 4-5 verbs among them. The students are required to make up as many sentences in the imperative mood (commands, requests) out of these words as they can. The winner is the learner who manages to make up more commands and requests than anybody else in the group.

c) "Guess the word". Only the first and the last letters of an English word are written with dashes between them, one dash for every missing letter. The game is played in pairs. One student in a pair gives the other one a word to guess and asks him/her to fill in the blanks and read the whole word aloud. The "guesser" has a right to make from 5 to 10 guesses about the letters in the word (depending on how many letters are missing). Each incorrect guess means drawing a part of the "gallows" by the other student in the pair. It is on such "gallows" that the unsuccessful student gets "hung" if s/he does not manage to spell the word correctly. It is worthy of notice that this game known to every child in Ukraine or Russia is the cause of a lot of laughter and fun for adult learners.

d) "Picture games" with students in teams of 3-4 learners making some guesses concerning pictures where several interpretations are possible and coming out with a general conclusion. These games are designed following the lines laid down by Wright (1989) for application of pictures in language learning. The pictures used are usually selected so as to illustrate some points of British or American cultures, ways of life etc. In this way teaching culture begins at the earliest stage of language teaching as the latter immediately requires the former (Swiderski, 1993).

Many other language games of this sort are used, and it is hardly necessary to continue describing them because identical or similar games are analyzed in great detail in relevant literature (Maley & Duff, 1988; Rinvolucri, 1984; Wright, Betteridge & Buckby, 1991).

5. *Communicative practicing*. It does not occupy much time in this course; and yet it is held during every class giving students a foretaste of the activities that will occupy most of their time in the principal courses. Communicative practicing in the Introductory Phonetic Course is mainly devoted, as has already been mentioned, to developing some elementary skills in using communicative cliches and formulas. For instance, students may be asked to make different requests to one another. The one requested is to do what s/he is asked to do, and then s/he is to be thanked for the service done. A standard response to thanks (something like "You are welcome!" or any other appropriate formula) is expected to wind up the short conversation. In this way formulas of thanking and

responding to thanks are trained in communication modeling genuine one because requests addressed to students are quite genuine: to lend a book, to open the window in hot weather etc.

A more lengthy conversation is possible when training acquaintance making and introduction formulas. The students greet each other, ask about each other's names, ages, occupations, places of origin and habitation, say that they are glad to meet each other and so on. It is often done as short role-plays when learners use fictitious names and occupations and not their real ones. In such plays English names, places of origin and current habitation are used. It is a part of the so called "process of putting on masks" necessary for better introducing students into the British and American cultures and for their relevant psychological conditioning. This process mainly goes on in the next course, so it will be described in detail below.

But it is necessary to mention now that communicative practicing is the principal part of the Introductory Phonetic Course where familiarization with the cultures of English-speaking peoples starts - by letting the students know the differences from their culture in such everyday communication formulas as spoken of above.

### 3.2. The First Principal Course (2nd Stage)

This 14-week everyday communication course bears the name *"9 Steps in London"*. The title is due to the course's division into nine steps and to the plot unifying all the model dialogues and polylogues. According to the plot a Ukrainian businessman Vladimir Scherbak and an economist Olga Kravchenko come to London on a business trip. During their stay they get acquainted with different people, organize their stay (accommodations, meals etc.), travel about the city using public transport, do shopping and sightseeing, take measures to obtain tickets for leaving the country and so on. In this way all the situations and topics of communication listed for this course in the preceding chapter find reflection in all the model dialogues and polylogues.

An extract from one of the model polylogues used in the course is given below as an example. In this extract Olga Kravchenko (O.K.) and Peter Brooks (P.B.), an American journalist of her acquaintance who lives in London, are having dinner together at a London restaurant. At this point of their conversation they are ordering their meals:

*Waiter: May I take your orders, please?*
*O.K.: A steak with potatoes and some other vegetables for me, a tomato and cucumber salad, and tea with some cakes.*
*Waiter: Would you prefer fried potatoes or mashed potatoes, ma'am? And as to tea, with milk and sugar?*
*O.K.: Yes, with milk and sugar, please. And fries for my steak. And oh yes, I am dying for an ice-cream? One ice-cream for me, if you please.*
*Waiter: What kind of ice-cream would you like?*
*O.K.: Strawberry, please.*
*Waiter: Thank you, ma'am, and what would you like, sir?*
*P.B.: Roast beef with green vegetables. Fish salad, a roll and coffee for me, please. And I want my roast beef well roasted.*
*Waiter: I see, sir, not with blood. Any wine?*
*P.B.: You may bring some good dry wine. Choose it yourself.*

*Waiter: All right, sir and ma'am. I'll bring your orders in a few minutes.*

The materials for the course include first of all the Student's Book. The tapescripts of all the model dialogues/polylogues are printed there with parallel translations into Russian. After every tapescripts grammatical and lexical commentaries are given with necessary explanations. There is also Part 2 inside the book that contains all the instructions and printed prompts for communicative-algorithmic activities performed during the course in the language laboratory. Another book is for the teacher; it contains all the guidelines for every class, suggested activities and such like. Seven audiocassettes have all the model dialogues/polylogues recorded on them; they also have the recorded materials for communicative-algorithmic activities in the language laboratory. The materials include software for computer-assisted communicative-algorithmic activities as well. This software consists of 9 computer programs for developing grammar skills.

It has already been said in the preceding chapter that in this course all classes are divided into learning units, every learning unit designed according to the pattern "primary synthesis - analysis - communicative synthesis". One learning unit consists of three 4-hour classes, i.e. it takes one whole week. The class work in the framework of a learning unit has as its core and starting point one or several model (sample) dialogues and/or polylogues, and it is around them that all the activities are organized. One or several model dialogues and/or polylogues also form the core of every step because every step embraces a certain range of meaningful communicative situations and topics connected with everyday needs of a visitor to an English-speaking country (e.g., one step may be devoted to learning how to communicate in situations where the purpose of communication is asking and finding the way). There are 9 steps in the course but 14 learning units (as many as there are weeks allocated to this course), so that each of the nine steps has either one or two learning units (one or two weeks) devoted to it.

Classes in the framework of every learning unit are organized according to the following pattern.

The first class begins with the model dialogue/polylogue presentation by the teacher who reads it aloud "playing the roles" of all the interlocutors, i.e. trying to make his/her reading as expressive as possible (voice and intonation expressiveness, gestures, facial expressiveness). This first presentation could be very well done with the aid of a videofilm but relevant videofilms have not been designed not only because of the difficulty of producing them in the present day Ukraine due to economic reasons. Presentation by the teacher has some advantages.

These advantages were pointed out by the pioneer of intensive language teaching in Eastern Europe Georgi Losanov (1970) who recommended in his thesis just this way of presenting model dialogues or polylogues. According to Losanov, when the teacher herself/himself does it with maximum expressiveness, this expressiveness in conjunction with the teacher's authority (that a video or audiotape cannot have) is best conducive to unconscious retention of what was heard. That is why the first presentation of the model in all the intensive programs developed in the former Soviet Union, that followed the suggestopedic methodology of Losanov, was always done by the teacher. This approach was also copied in the course under discussion.

During the model presentation the full comprehension by students of what the teacher is reading is ensured not only by his/her maximum expressiveness (which has as its main purpose facilitation of retention) but first of all by the parallel written translation of the tapescript (in the Student's Book) of what the learners are

listening to. The students are recommended to refer to this tapescript and translation into their native language while listening.

The first presentation is always followed by the second one, but this time students listen to the tape-recorded version of the model dialogue/polylogue which sounds naturally - with different male and female voices, background noises, hesitations and pauses in the speech of interlocutors (which are not marked in the tapescripts - see the extract above) etc. As the full comprehension has already been attained during the first presentation, the students listen for the second time with their books closed, i.e., without seeing the tapescript of the discourse and its translation into the native language. The third listening is also possible when students repeat each utterance after the speakers (listening through ear-phones in the language laboratory) for better retention and facilitating further usage of the language material from the dialogue/polylogue. This third listening, if it takes place, is done with books open, i.e., with students' parallel reading of the tapescript of the model and its translation.

In this first class episode-after-episode "playing" of the model dialogue or polylogue by students themselves follows the presentation phase. When the learners do it, they use the printed model for speech support but "place themselves in the shoes" of interlocutors in it with relevant alterations in what they say. For instance, interlocutors in a polylogue meet and get introduced. The students do the same, but speak about themselves (names, occupations etc.). Or if the model dialogue is about asking and finding the way, the students may speak about the city not mentioned there but well known to them. This work is done either in pairs or in small groups with the teacher circulating among them rendering assistance, giving corrections, prompts, stimuli for continuing to talk etc. Continuous "speech support" in the form of a printed text and prompts from the teacher make conversing easy for students and ensure unconscious language acquisition in such a quasi-communication (communicative semi-heuristic activities).

In this first production by the learners based on the comprehensible input just introduced there is practically no distancing from the model dialogue/polylogue except some minor changes in the information (see above). But the situation and topic of communication remain identical. On the contrary, in the last and the greatest part of this first class in the learning unit the communicative semi-heuristic activities become substantially more complicated. Here the somewhat regulated and prompted character of communication does not change because the students continue using the model's tapescript as speech supports. Besides, different prompt-cards handed out by the teacher are also a kind of regulator of what the students say and how they say it. Such prompt-cards may have a description of the situation and interlocutors' roles, some key words, and such like typed on them. But with all these limitations the role-plays "staged" in this phase by students working in pairs or small groups are already distanced in their situations and topics of communication from the model dialogue/polylogue. Certainly, the similarity remains, and the same language material (grammar, vocabulary) is needed for communicating in new situations as in the model ones. But thanks to the change of situations and topics, learners get an opportunity of practicing listening and speaking in novel conditions - while solving communicative problems and tasks in these conditions with the language material they have already operated before.

For example, if in the model dialogue the interlocutors talk about the cities they live in, their history, places of interest etc., the students, proceeding from this episode, may be asked to stage a small-group role-play (prompt-card supported). In it a family planning summer vacations is engaged in discussing the cities they

would like to visit and their places of interest. Another instance of a role-play based on the same episode is one student inviting some other learners (friends of his or hers) to visit him/her in his/her native town, describing how many interesting things there are to see and to do, and answering questions about the best ways of spending time in this town.

The role-plays of this kind may be called guided (by prompt-cards, model texts etc.), or guided dialogues which are an introduction to role-plays proper differing from the latter ones by a greater degree of control over how learners act and speak (Communication in the modern language classroom, 1988: 158).

Such practicing takes not less than half the time of this class. Different language and communication games are also employed in it. For instance, if in the model polylogue the characters get to know one another, a game "Guess who he/she is" may be organized. Students work in pairs. One learner is to ask not more than 10 questions for finding out the identity of the third person (known to both learners) that his/her interlocutor keeps in mind. The inquirer becomes the winner if s/he succeeds in identifying this person with 10 questions and the loser if s/he does not. The questions can only be general/alternative ones; others are against the rules.

A specimen of questions and answers in such a game may look like the following one:

*1st student:* *Guess who this person is.*
*2nd student:* *Is this person a man or a woman?*
*1st student:* *He is a man.*
*2nd student:* *Is he young or old?*
*1st student:* *He is young.*
*2nd student:* *Is he younger or older than thirty?*
*1st student:* *He is younger.*
*2nd student:* *Is he younger or older than twenty?*
*1st student:* *He is older.*
*2nd student:* *Is he 25 years old?*
*1st student:* *Yes, he is.*
*2nd student:* *Is he an engineer?* etc.

A similar kind of game is "Guess where s/he is going and who accompanies him/her there". Quite a number of games of this kind are used.

An important feature of both the communicative semi-heuristic activities during the first class in the learning unit and the communicative-heuristic activities during the last class in it is the fact that the students often perform these activities wearing their "masks" already mentioned before. It means that they talk having assumed fictitious names, biographies, characters, ways of life etc. (most often such "masks" reflect the culture of English-speaking nations). There can be one permanent "mask" for every learner for all the period of the course's duration and a number of "replaceable" and "interchangeable" masks the utilization of which broadens significantly the range of topics, situations, and opportunities of intra-group communication. It is the first advantage of the method of putting on "masks" strongly recommended by Losanov (1970) and Kitaygorodskaya (1986). The second advantage has already been spoken about before: it is facilitation of introduction into the culture of the people whose language is being learned. But the third advantage seems to be the most important. Both Losanov (1970) and Kitaygorodskaya (1982; 1986) emphasize that when a learner is wearing a "mask", i.e. acting not as herself/himself but under a false identity, psychologically s/he loses reasons to be embarrassed of his/her far from perfect target language

performance; s/he becomes sufficiently relaxed to participate in communication, whatever childish or undignified behavior may be required for the role-plays and similar forms of activities in the classroom. The mask liberating learners from restraint and embarrassment ("it is not me but the mask who is doing all this nonsense") makes them actually enjoy their activities with consequent favorable effects for the outcome.

Some communicative-algorithmic activities are also possible during the first class in the learning unit. Usually they do not take more than 15-20 minutes of the 4 class hours, have the form of microdialogues, and serve for better learning some words and word combinations from the model dialogue/polylogue. For instance, a specimen of such a microdialogue may be as follows:

*Student 1: Sorry for interrupting, but I see you are reading a Ukrainian newspaper. Are you from Ukraine?*
*Student 2: Sure I am.*
*Student 1: Oh, how wonderful! So are my grandparents! And where are you from in Ukraine?*
*Student 2: I am from Donetsk. And what about your grandparents?*
*Student 1: They are from Kiev. Glad to meet you!*
*Student 2: Glad to meet you too!*

Students can do quite a number of such dialogues in pairs in a very short time only changing some information (for example, names of cities and countries) and thereby practicing quite a number of standard word combinations in a meaningful communicative exchange (Sure I am; How wonderful!; Where are you from?; Sorry for interrupting; Glad to meet you).

If the first class in the learning unit is fully devoted to the primary synthesis in the form described above, the second class during the week is the class of analysis.

Of the 4 class hours about 20-25 minutes at the very beginning are spent on analyzing the new grammar and some interesting or difficult points in the new vocabulary list , i.e. those new language forms introduced during the preceding class that the students have already used in their own speech. The teacher focuses the students' attention on these points utilizing the tapescript of the model dialogue/polylogue for it. S/he tries to help students formulate relevant grammar rules inductively (Herron & Tomasello, 1992) on the basis of examples from the model and from their own communicative experience of the former class. If the students fail to do it or if the teacher sees that the procedure will take too long, s/he should not hesitate to make recourse to direct explanations, grammatical and lexical commentaries in the Student's Book etc. After this phase is over, the students start the communicative drilling discussed before. During such drilling the students are to work independently using different technical teaching aids. The function of the teacher is limited to giving individual help and explanations if they are needed.

The first part of communicative drilling is computer-aided, and two academic hours (90 minutes) are given to the work in a computer laboratory. Below an example of a communicative-algorithmic computer-aided activity is shown. Implicitly it is aimed at drilling negative answer forms, but explicitly it is a kind of student-computer "talk" (or "dialogue"). The instruction that students see on the screen at the beginning of the activity is as follows:

"Answer in the negative all the questions of the computer typing your responses on the screen".

After the student has read the instruction and pressed the ENTER key, the first question appears:

*Computer:* *Are you going quite alone on your next trip?*
*Student (types):* *No, I am not going alone.*
*Computer:* *Does your family usually accompany you on your trips?*
*Student (types):* *No, it does not usually accompany me.*
*Computer:* *Are you going for pleasure?*
*Student (types):* *No, I am not going for pleasure. I am going on business*
etc. (6 questions).

When a student sees a question on the screen, s/he can also see some prompt there (e.g., "to go on business" to the third question) that helps to make the response more precise. If the response made by the student is correct, triumphant music is heard and the learner sees the word "BRAVO!!!" illuminated at the bottom of the screen. If an error is made, a, shrill sound is heard, the words "You are wrong!" appear, and the learner is asked to make another attempt. If an error is made for the second time, relevant grammar rules are illuminated on the screen explaining what was wrong grammatically in the typed sentence. After reading the rule, the student is asked to type his/her response again. If an error is made once more, correct response will be illuminated, and then a new question will appear.

All the computer-aided activities are designed in this way, and during the two academic hours learners do up to ten such activities covering all the new grammar material introduced in the model dialogue/polylogue. They are also designed so as to drill the vocabulary (at least, the most important words and phraseology) of the learning unit. So much time (two hours) is given to ten activities because, first, it allows students to think over what they are doing, thus creating better conditions for consciousness-raising in the sense of Rutherford (1987). Second, it is necessary to take into account the fact that for many students who are not used to computers, typing is a rather difficult and slow process.

All the remaining time of this class (about 65-70 minutes) is the continuation of communicative drilling in the language laboratory with the aid of cassette recorders. Practicing is similar, only done fully orally, i.e. as a "conversation" between a recorded speaker and a student who listens to the speaker through ear-phones. For example, the activity may be designed implicitly for training the Passive Voice of English verbs. The instruction is as follows: "Answer the speaker's questions about meals using prompts in your answers".

The prompts are printed in Part 2 of Student's Book (see in the preceding pages). Students read each prompt before answering every question, and it is just the prompts that make them choose Passive but not Active Voice for the verb-predicate in their responses. As a result the "conversation" between the speaker and the student may look like this:

*Speaker: Who is cooking our dinner? The prompt: by my friend.*
*Student: Our dinner is being cooked by my friend.*
*Speaker: And who usually prepares these delicious ham sandwiches of yours? The prompt: by me.*
*Student: They are usually prepared by me.*
*Speaker: The cake has been done just to my liking. Who has done it. The prompt: by my sister.*

*Student: This cake has been done by my sister etc.* (5 questions and answers that are devoted to one and the same topic - just like in computer-aided activities).

The students answer questions during pauses on the tape and then hear the correct version of what they were supposed to say read by another speaker's voice and lower than the question was uttered. The students check themselves on hearing the correct version and repeat it during a short pause after it if they find out that there was some error in what they said for the first time.

The above practice activity is typical of the work organized in the language laboratory, and about ten such communicative drills are done during this class winding up the analysis phase in one learning unit.

The third (last) class in the unit is considered to be the principal one as it is fully assigned to communicative synthesis, i.e. communicative activities most closely modeling genuine communication. Only communicative-heuristic activities are performed, and students have no artificial speech supports, such as printed texts, prompt-cards etc. They are to use the newly learned or acquired language material and mobilize all the other material at their disposal to achieve the communicative goals in a given communicative situation according to their own understanding of this situation, these goals, and according to their own communicative needs and intentions. Nothing else regulates the language form or the subject matter of their speech. The teacher can only describe the situation to talk in, but everything else should be done by learners themselves conversing (role-playing, discussing some issue etc.) in pairs or groups.

The role-play "At the Customs-Office" may be given as an example. Two of the students are assigned the roles of immigration and customs officers. The other students are "people just arrived to the country". They are standing in line to the officers and, while waiting, talk in pairs or in groups of three about the reasons of their coming, previous visits to this country, local customs regulations etc. Approaching the officers everybody in turn passes through the standard procedure which could be diversified at will: the customs officer finds something unauthorized in somebody's luggage, one new-comer turns out to be a smuggler or an international criminal, another one has some problem with his/her visa and such like.

One more example may be the role-play "Help the visitor". One of the learners is assigned the role of a tourist (visitor) in a big city in an English-speaking country. Three or four other students are passers-by and a policeman, in the city where the action is taking place. The visitor wants to find some place and turns with questions to passers-by. But nobody can help him/her giving different, often opposing, recommendations what to do until someone of authority (a policeman) is found who really knows how to get there, and s/he gives the confused and disconcerted visitor clear directions.

It is such role-plays that model genuine target language communication in the classroom. But to make them more effective, interesting, and attractive to learners, the method called "continuous role-playing" is employed. All the role-plays staged from class to class and from learning unit to learning unit are united by one plot which is made possible thanks to the "masks" learners put on at the beginning of the course (see before). For instance, at the very start the learners begin a role-play in which all of them (under their "masks") are a group of tourists flying in the same plane from Europe to the USA. During the long flight they get acquainted, and the following role-plays deal with their adventures and what

happened to them in New York. Such " continuous role-playing" enables the teacher to use Project English methodology. For instance, if the continuous role-play's plot is as described above, the project for the students may be keeping the travel journal or writing short reports to some newspaper "at home" about their impressions of the USA.

Recourse to the Project English, as it is elaborated by Hutchinson (1994), has one more advantage. The course as a whole being an oral one, it does not exclude teaching reading from it because students constantly read the texts of model dialogues/polylogues. Besides, to enable learners to actively participate in different role-plays and obtain sufficient information for it, the teacher regularly supplies them with additional texts to read. But when Project English is used in the teaching/learning process, it requires more reading, and writing as well. In this way reading and writing skills are developed though reading and writing always remain supplementary activities.

During the third class in the learning unit not only role-plays where students act under different "masks" are used. Some talks and discussions are always held where all the group and the teacher take part, or it may be done in small groups. In these discussions the students speak in their own identities (without any "masks") and the subject matter is talking over in English some characteristic features of British or American ways of life in comparison with the home country. For instance, if during classes the situations and topics of communication were checking in, staying, and checking out of an American or British hotel, the topic of discussion at the end of the unit may be the differences in hotel service there in comparison with Ukraine. Such discussions give opportunities not only of having genuine communication in the target language but also of better learners' consciousness-raising as to differences in ways of life and culture.

The learning units in the course under discussion that have the structure described above are alternated with the so called recapitulation classes (6 of them during the 14 weeks of the course). Every recapitulation class is identical in structure to the final class of any learning unit (genuine communication in the form of role-plays, talks, and discussions). The difference is that the subject matter, topics, and situations embrace several learning units for recapitulating and remembering everything learned or acquired before.

### 3.3 The Second Principal Course ($3^d$ stage)

The last 14-week long business communication course bears the title ***"Starting Business Relations"***. The materials for it include the Student's Book where the tapescripts of all the model dialogues/polylogues (with parallel translation into Russian) are printed, as well as introductory monologic texts to every business communication situation and topic of the course (see the preceding chapter). There are also lexical commentaries and vocabulary lists in this book but no grammatical commentaries because no new grammar is introduced. The materials for the teacher comprise the Teacher's Book with guidelines for every class. Besides, there are two audiocassettes with recordings of model dialogues and polylogues.

A learning unit in the course usually includes four classes, so it takes more than one week because, just like in the preceding course, there are 3 classes per week. One learning unit is devoted to one section in the Student's Book, this section containing not less than 3-4 model dialogues/polylogues and as many introductory monologic texts to them. All in all, there are nine sections in the course, i.e. nine learning units.

The first class in the learning unit starts with the teacher's expressive reading aloud of the introductory monologic text to the first model dialogue/polylogue. The text may look like the one below from Section 3 devoted to selling the firm's products:

*When we discussed the results of firm's performance, you have probably understood that the sales results are reviewed especially thoroughly. The administration of the firm should be well aware of the last few years' sales results - otherwise, there will be no foundation for setting new sales targets.*

*So, the sales figures are thoroughly analyzed at the Sales Department administration meetings. The participants discuss which figures have raised or even reached the peak, which of them leveled off, and which have decreased or fallen badly.*

*The causes of all rises and drops are considered. These causes may be different: overproduction, market situation etc. According to the figures, firm's strategy may be changed; for example, manufacture of some product may be cut or altogether ceased.*

*Let's listen to the discussion of sales figures at the Sales Department of the firm we already know - Kerbyte Office Equipment Ltd.*

Listening introduces students to the topic discussed in the following model dialogue/polylogue and the new language material (vocabulary) in it. After listening to the text a teacher-fronted discussion of it is held that helps students to fully comprehend the subject matter, meaning of new words, and to start using them. The discussion is aimed at finding out what learners know about this subject matter, as compared to similar situations of business contacts in the home country, and to finding the differences with the home country. The discussion is guided by teacher's questions and is rather short - not longer than 15 minutes. After it the model dialogue or polylogue is listened to - only in the tape-recorded form (i.e., without teacher's first reading it) and without repeating the utterances after the speaker. The students just listen to the model twice, first following the model's tapescript with translation in their books and the second time with books closed.

Model dialogues/polylogues are all similar to the tapescript below. Listening to this particular polylogue directly follows the work with the monologic text given above.

*Discussing Sales Results (Meeting at the Sales Manager's Office)*

*Sales Manager (S.M.): Today we must survey our sales in recent years. Only when we are well aware of our present situation, we can set some targets and develop some plans for the future. Office furniture occupies the major position in our sales as different types of this furniture constitute the bulk of the firm's products. Miss Brand, you as the sales assistant have always supervised the furniture sales. What can you tell us about the figures?*

*Sales Assistant (S.A.): Mr. Korkby, the figures are rather disappointing. We reached the peak in the furniture sales 4 years ago. Then in the following 3 years they leveled off at about 300,000 units per year. Though, I must say, there was a slight decrease at the end of this leveling off period. But it was not significant - by about 20,000 units. But this year the sales fell to 150,000 units. It's really a rapid drop!*

*S.M.: And what are the causes in your opinion?*

*S.A.: Overproduction. The market is overfilled. I'm sure, we must cut the production of office furniture, and cut it substantially. If you look at my sales diagram, you'll see it.*
*S.M.: You are probably right. Though it's a pity. Furniture is our traditional product. But I'll report your figures to the Board. Let them take the decision. But what about our second important product - electric type-writers? Mr. Winds, I asked you to prepare all the necessary figures for us. Have you done that?*
*Personal Assistant (P.A.): I have not only prepared the figures, Mr. Korkby, but I have made the graph too. As you see in the graph, five years ago we launched this product and in the following 3 years the sales were going up steadily. Then they fell badly one year but only for a short time. The cause was a temporary situation on the market. When it changed, the sales picked up again and reached the figure of about 200,000 units. They have settled around this figure since then and remain constant.*
*S.M.: Well, it's quite satisfactory, I am sure. We needn't change our strategy as to electric type-writers. And what about our most recent product - printers?*
*S.A.: I've supervised these sales too. The product was launched three years ago, and it went very well on the market. The sales were increasing rapidly with every year. This year sales figure is also very good -it has reached 420,000. There was not a single drop during the period.*
*S.M.: Well, we have surveyed the sales results of our main products. I must say that we have reasons to be uneasy on account of our furniture sales drop. Serious decisions and measures must be taken. In all other areas the results look good or, at least, quite normal. Thank you for participation, ladies and gentlemen* (in the business course tapescripts, just like in the tapescripts for the preceding course, all the background noises, speech hesitations, silence fillers and such like that are on the tape are not indicated).

Not all the tapescripts are printed in full like the one above. If a model dialogue is short and not difficult in form and content, only key words and expressions from it may be printed to guide the students' comprehension. It may look like below:

*Arranging a Meeting (a Telephone Conversation with a Secretary)*

*Peter Schevchuk (P.Sch.): ... I'd like to arrange ...*
*Secretary (Sec.): Would you be so kind as to state ... purpose ...*
*P.Sch.: I am in computers ... intends to purchase ... software ... to know about the conditions* etc.

A single plot unites all the model dialogues and polylogues. It revolves around business contacts of Ukrainian businessmen and businesswomen with their partners from English-speaking countries.

After the listening phase the production work based on the model dialogue/polylogue starts, and it occupies about half the time of the first class in the learning unit. Usually it begins with the teacher-fronted tapescript-supported discussion of the model when the students answer the teacher's questions on what was heard and ask their own questions if something was not quite clear. Occasionally teacher-fronted communicative-algorithmic activities are added for training some of the most important words and word combinations from the model. They look like the teacher-student microdialogues of the kind given below:

*Teacher: I was told you had called me. Why were you calling?*
*Student: I wanted to make an appointment.*
*Teacher: For what time do you want an appointment?*
*Student: The sooner the better* (expressions "to make an appointment", "the sooner the better" are being trained).

After the teacher demonstrated some examples like the one above how to drill a certain word or expression communicatively, students continue doing it in pairs. This work usually does not take longer than a quarter of an hour , and it is not frequent.

The next step is often devoted to drawing some diagrams or graphs on the basis of the information taken from the model. For instance, after listening to the polylogue "Discussing Sales Results" students are asked to draw a bar graph of the sales of different products by the firm Kerbyte Office Equipment, Ltd. Learners discuss their drawings in small groups, and after that one of the students in each group may be asked to speak to the whole class about their conclusions made from the graphs or diagrams drawn. In this way speaking in the form of a monologue is trained.

At this stage gradual distancing from the model starts when learners answer teacher's questions concerning their opinions and their own practical experience of the issues raised in the model dialogue/polylogue, what business strategy they would recommend in similar situations etc. This phase of work is wound up with simulations where the material of the model is used but the situation and the information supplied become different in quite a number of important aspects. For instance, if the model dialogue is the talk in which a Public Relations Manager of a company lets a VIP visitor know about her company, tells about its management hierarchy and such like, the relevant simulation may be organized as a "press-conference" during which the "Executive Board members" of a new (fictitious) company answer the questions about its structure. This activity, as all the other activities during this period, are model's tapescript-supported. Prompt-cards handed out by the teacher may also be used.

In this way all the activities at this stage are mainly communicative semi-heuristic ones. They continue up to the end of the first class in the learning unit and usually occupy the second class too because, after finishing with the first model dialogue/polylogue in the section, the second, the third, and the fourth ones are worked on in the same manner. So, the first two classes realize the primary synthesis.

They are followed by the communicative synthesis classes - the last two in the learning unit. It is only the communicative-heuristic activities that are pursued, the most important and lengthy of them being simulations. Some examples of such simulations are given below.

1. "Meeting of the Executive Board". Four students play the roles of Executive Board members of a computer-manufacturing company: the Senior Vice-President, the Vice-President for Production, the Vice-President for Marketing, the Vice-President for Finance and Administration. All the other students in the group play the roles of different directors, heads of departments and sections in this company: the Export-Sales Director, the Production Director for Europe, the Financial Controller, the Personnel Manager and others. These directors are invited to the Executive Board Meeting to report the current situation in the area they are responsible for. Many issues are discussed such as the situation on the market, the company's finances, the production of new types of computers etc., with all those

present taking part in the discussion. The simulation may take up to two academic hours (90 minutes), i.e. half the class.

2. "Job interview". A person applying for a job in a fictitious company is being interviewed by a Personnel Manager or a director of the department to which s/he is applying for a job.

3. "Business negotiations (planning a joint venture, signing a contract etc.)". Ukrainian businessmen (2 persons) are having talks with 2 representatives of an American or British company. It may be discussing conditions of some contract and signing it, discussing a joint venture or some project (its timing, financing and such like) etc.

4. "Touring a factory". A representative of a Ukrainian organization is touring a factory of an American or British firm (from which this organization plans to purchase some equipment that the firm manufactures). The visitor is accompanied by a factory manager and a public relations manager of the firm acting as guides. There is a similar simulation where the situation is reversed, i.e., a foreign guest is touring a Ukrainian factory with its manager as a guide.

Many other instances of simulations can be given, but the ones above are sufficient to show that all of them are organized as pair work, small group work, or a kind of discussion where all the learners in a group take part. There are also other kinds of discussions where students act in their own identities and not as participants in simulations. These discussions are devoted to talking over some issues in business relations, management, marketing in the West in comparison with Ukraine. However, unlike discussions in the first two classes of the learning unit, there are no speech supports, such as prompt-cards, tapescripts of model dialogues/polylogues etc. The students talking in small groups are guided only by their personal opinions, experience, all the information (including that from the supplementary texts for reading - see below) received during classes.

The "continuous role-playing" and Project English methodologies already spoken of in relation to the preceding course are especially widely used for the business course as it is very auspicious for employing them. For instance, the group enrolled in the Business English course in the first year of its functioning (in 1993/1994 academic year) was working on the project "Joint American-Ukrainian Pet Transportation Company". In this project students were organizing a fictitious company engaged in transporting pets from place to place at requests from their owners. They developed the structure of the company, its management hierarchy, took upon themselves different positions in the company with relevant responsibilities etc. All the simulations and discussions were organized in the framework of this company's functioning ("continuous simulation"), and to participate actively, the students had to read some supplementary texts recommended by the teacher, as well as to find their own additional reading materials. They also were to do some written work with the crowning outcome of the project as a whole also in the form of writing - compiling of a voluminous company's prospectus in English by all the students working as a team.

This sort of activities, having primarily motivational significance as they greatly arouse learners' interest, make them relaxed and enthusiastic, is also important for parallel teaching of reading and writing though, just like in the everyday communication course, reading and writing in the business course are supplementary skills helping to develop aural/oral skills.

It should be mentioned that, unlike the everyday communication course where attention is focused on developing skills of speaking in the form of a dialogue or a polylogue (rapid exchange of relatively short utterances), in the business course

efforts are made to develop students' speaking in the form of a monologue (lengthy discourses). The samples of monologic speech for students are not only the monologic texts in the Student's Book spoken of in detail before. In the model dialogues/polylogues whole parts are also quite lengthy monologues by one of the interlocutors. For instance, in a model polylogue "Discussing the Firm's Results (at a Board Meeting)" the Vice-President for Finance and Administration is speaking about the financial situation of the firm at the end of the year. He says:

*-Our results are pleasing, ladies and gentlemen. I can report a 10% turnover increase and a 5% costs drop. The profits are up. So, we have performed well on the whole. But I must say that the results on the export market are rather disappointing. No increase compared with the last year. No wonder, this market is very competitive.*

The fragment above is a specimen of a micromonologue, and such micromonologues are included in all the simulations that students take part in. For instance, the simulation "Meeting of the Executive Board" described before by its very situation requires micromonologues of this kind when invited directors report to the Board their results, target figures etc. All kinds of discussions also require monologic speech when students state their views and opinions and try to prove them. Very important for developing monologic speaking is drawing different graphs and diagrams by students with commenting on drawings (see before). Supplementary texts that students read in the process of their project work are also very good for talking at length about their content with other students who have not read them, i.e. for monologic speaking skills development. Therefore, it may be said that in the business course the attention paid to developing dialogic and monologic speaking skills is shared equally.

In this course, just like in the preceding one, regular learning units described above alternate with recapitulation classes. The activities during these classes are the same as during final classes in learning units, i.e. communicative-heuristic activities, mainly in the form of simulations, talks, discussions. But they are designed on the material of several preceding learning units or even the whole preceding part of the course. Besides serving the recapitulation purposes, such classes are necessary for making use of two other advantages. First, they interrupt for a while the continuous and very intensive process of students' learning and acquiring new language material (new vocabulary, forms of speech etc.) It gives an opportunity of some relaxation in this respect, the total absence of which might impair the results. Second, the recapitulation classes have a strong motivational significance because they, as nothing else, can demonstrate to students how much they already know and can do in English. It helps maintaining students' feeling of success, very important for continuous progress.

## Summary

The three stages of the program are designed in the way to ensure continuous students' advancement in communicative competence development but so as not to sacrifice either fluency or accuracy at any of the stages. That is why the first short preparatory course is primarily accuracy-orientated. But even in it the orientation towards communicative competence development remains. Thanks to it by the end of the course the students who finished it learn not only how to pronounce words and phrases in English or acquire some elementary grammar skills but they also

become able to speak in some standard situations where it is necessary to greet somebody, to thank him/her, to introduce himself/herself and such like.

It paves the way to the radical change in the first of the principal courses when fluency comes to the forefront. The communicative activities occupy two thirds of every learning unit time in this course, and thanks to them by its end students are supposed to communicate quite fluently in everyday situations speaking in the dialogic or polylogic kinds of intercourse with competence sufficient to be fully understood and to understand everything said to them.

But accuracy is not sacrificed since analytic activities, that are in the background but yet very important in the structure of the course as a whole, assist learners in mastering grammar and vocabulary in the way to make their speech free of language errors annoying native speakers and making it hard for them to understand what was meant.

The analytic activities concentrated during the second stage make it possible to do without them at the final stage, i.e. to design it as a continuous communication process where the level at which students are able to communicate orally using both dialogic and monologic forms of speech is steadily enhanced (the advanced stage of oral communication). Thus, in a comparatively short program learners are supposed to make a considerable advance in English - at any rate, quite a sufficient advance to meet their most common and probable needs when coming to an English-speaking country. Moreover, due to permanent recourse to reading and writing as supplementary learning activities in oral courses, some relevant skills in these areas may be developed as well. All this makes a good foundation for further advancement in English if learners want or need to, so the course under discussion may be considered not only as the one which is designed to give substantial practical results all by itself but also as a basic step towards further improvement of one's English.

# CHAPTER 4. THE INTENSIVE PROGRAM TEACHING/LEARNING OUTCOMES

## 4.1. Testing Procedure

The intensive program, when designed-and made ready for use, immediately required an appropriate testing technique for finding out the teaching results and learning outcomes. Such results were necessary not only for providing students with some sort of certificate at the end of the course. They were primarily needed to let the students, as well as the teachers and the designer of the course, see how successful, or unsuccessful, were their efforts, what level of language command had been attained, and what a student could really do with her/his English having attained this level. Besides, the results of teaching/learning were to serve the diagnostic purposes after each of program's stages, i.e. they were to be obtained not only after the final course but after the first and second courses as well so that the teacher could see whether his or her students were ready to move on to the next stage. And last but not least, testing was to demonstrate the efficiency, successfulness or inefficiency of the program as a whole in the first years of its functioning. The aim was to either make necessary corrections and accept the program as quite efficient and worthy of further development and use, or to discard it as inefficient. According to these aims, the testing system was to be distinguished by the following characteristic features:

1. It could not be a standard proficiency test of the TOEFL type or Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency type (Alderson, Krahnke, & Stansfield, 1987) orientated at testing primarily receptive skills (reading, listening), sometimes writing, always grammar and vocabulary, but practically never speaking which was the leading skill developed in the program under discussion. At the same time the experience of tests such as TOEFL in effective testing of listening skills was to be taken full account of.

2. The testing system should be primarily speaking and listening-orientated, with speaking tests being of the oral interview type, or the role-play type, or the verbal presentation type and such like (Alderson, Krahnke, & Stansfield.1987; Cohen, 1994; Madsen, 1983; Wilds, 1975) giving opportunities of assessing both speaking and listening. But separate listening tests were to be designed to evaluate listening skill development more precisely. Besides, in the final course the speaking test was to evaluate not only speaking in the form of a dialogue but in the form of a monologue as well since both kinds of skills were developed in the course. All the tests (speaking in the form of a dialogue and a monologue, listening) should reproduce actual conditions of language use (Paltridge, 1992). Otherwise, it would be impossible to judge whether the goals of teaching speaking and listening have been reached because of incongruities existing between language communication and testing procedure (Savignon, 1992). It means the need of direct testing, focusing directly on learners' proficiency as demonstrated by the way communicative tasks are carried out - so that proficiency is evaluated in terms of genuine language behavior (Ingram, 1985: 246). Such a kind of testing will further be called the communicative one.

3. A whole set of criteria was to be specified for assessing proficiency demonstrated by testing. Such criteria could be formulated following the way the ACTFL proficiency guidelines had been formulated (Byrnes & Canale, 1987), and they were necessary primarily for evaluating speaking skills. It is much easier to evaluate listening skills and the level of their development by determining how

much of what had been heard was comprehended, what specific information was understood, and by setting up some rating system depending on quantitative indications. But when testing speaking, if there is no well defined system of multiple criteria with separate scales for each of them, judging students' performance will inevitably remain purely subjective because qualitative criteria are mostly to be taken account of. There are many instances of the criteria-governed approach used for different evaluation purposes. One of such instances for assessing speaking in testing can be found in the work by Cohen (1994) where the rating scales for speaking ability evaluation are divided into socio-cultural ability scale, socio-linguistic ability scale, grammatical ability scale, and beyond the scales strategies. These abilities or strategies are the very criteria according to which different aspects of the general speaking ability are evaluated. In this way evaluation by criteria has as its purpose making as objective as possible marking for a speaking test which is not objective in its essence, giving a creditable degree of reliability to a subjective human marking system (Underhill, 1987: 90). There is one more way of achieving that, besides using a set of criteria when learners are rated against the level on a scale having a series of proficiency descriptions of their language behavior (Ingram, 1985: 247). It is taking two assessors for every test who negotiate their marks at the end of it (Underhill, 1987: 90). Probably, combining both ways is the best policy.

4. The testing system should be criterion-referenced not only in the sense described above but also as distinct from the norm-referenced system (Bachman, 1989). In the conditions under consideration it is totally unimportant to find out the difference in levels of mastering the course material attained by different examinees as norm-referenced testing does (Davies, 1990: 17). What is important is to set attainable goals and to see how those under test managed to attain them - and such an approach is characteristic of criterion-referenced testing where rank order is not wanted (Davies, 1990).

5. The tests after every course should fully correspond to this particular course content. Thus, testing after the preparatory course, which is mostly analytic in nature, presupposes using tests of the analytic type (tests of pronunciation and grammar). They can even be quite traditional, of the sort Lado (1961) developed and recommended. But since some communicative formulas are also acquired in this course, there must be a format for testing students' skills in using such formulas in conditions similar to those in which they are used in communication. In the test following the everyday communication course, besides fully communicative testing of listening an speaking, specific testing of grammar skills is also important since development of such skills through communicative-algorithmic activities in the phase of analysis occupies a considerable place. Finally, after the business communication course, where no analytic activities are practiced but the whole course is in fact a continuous communication, only communicative testing is possible.

6. Testing should be made as precise and unbiased as possible, so the less human examiners' intervention is practiced the better for the results. That is why computer testing should be made use of enabling to enjoy the advantages of computerized assessment (Higgins, 1988; Stansfield, 1986). It is hardly possible to do that for testing speaking or pronunciation, though even in these cases there is a good place for a computer as it is the machine that can set tasks and score points. But testing listening and grammar can be fully computerized with no human examiner/assessor intervention.

It was according to the notions set down under numbers 1-6 above that the whole testing system for all the three courses of the intensive program has been designed.

a) The Introductory Phonetic Course Tests

The testing system for this course includes 5 separate tests. The first three ones are designed specifically for testing students' pronunciation. To be more exact, their purpose is to test whether students can correctly pronounce when reading aloud English words, sentences, or texts. Such checking is necessary, as has already been mentioned in the preceding chapter, because after the preparatory course, in the first of the principal courses learners often have to use tapescripts of model dialogues/polylogues as prompts for their own speaking. It requires being able to correctly pronounce a word, sentence, or even part of a text which is perceived visually (since aural images can be forgotten).

The first of these three tests is reading aloud twenty English words. The procedure is as follows. A student sees numbers on the screen of a computer. They include-only 5 figures from I to 5. An examinee is asked to choose one of those figures and, having entered his/her choice into the computer's memory, to press the ENTER key. A list of twenty words under this number appears on the screen (so, the choice is made totally blindfold). This list may look like the one below (option No.4.):

*John, George, church, think, influential, Byrd, just, torn, parents, taught, monastery, thing, lecture, well-bred, lark, drink, where, nigh, who, brought.*

The students' reading is listened to by a human assessor (only one is needed for testing in this course) who gives the examinee one point for every word read absolutely correctly from the point of view of pronunciation. So, 20 points maximum can be scored with points less than 15 being considered a failure score (less than 75%). 15 points are considered as a satisfactory result, points from 16 to 18 as a good one, and 19-20 points as an excellent result.

Test No.2 is designed identically, only a student is asked to read not isolated words but 5 sentences. Their list may look like the one compiled for option No.2:

*Has your friend already finished this task? Where is he now? How long will he be doing it? He is staying at home now. Do all your best!*

Five sentences are to be read with correct pronunciation and intonation, and mispronouncing a single word or a wrong intonation results in the whole sentence being assessed as read incorrectly. So, there are not more than 5 points to be scored with one point deducted for every sentence where errors in reading aloud are detected. If a student scores 3 points, it is considered as a satisfactory result (above the failure level); if 4 points, the result is good, while 5 points are excellent.

Test No.3 is-also identical in procedure but the most difficult of all three of them. A student is asked to read an excerpt of about 60-70 words from an original work of fiction by a classic American or British author. For instance, it could be an excerpt like below (option No.4):

*The people of the valley missed him from their gatherings. At the store they questioned him, but he had his excuse ready. "I'm taking one of those mail courses", he explained. "I'm studying at night". The men smiled. Loneliness was*

*too much for a men, they knew. Bachelors on farms always got a little queer sooner or later.*
(From the 1984 edition of "The Pastures of Heaven and Other Stories by John Steinbeck".- Moscow : Raduga Publishers, p. 206).

A student can score up to 25 points with 1 point deducted for every two mispronounced words or one wrong intonation, or any hesitation, stumbling and such like. The test is considered as passed if not less than 17 points are scored. 17-20 points are a satisfactory result, 21-23 points a good one, and 24-25 points an excellent one.

After each of the three tests the assessor enters the points scored by the examinee, and the machine adds them up showing the total result.

The fourth test is the test of grammar. It is taken without any participation of a human examiner (assessor). A student is to choose 5 out of ten grammar testing tasks suggested to him/her in the computer list (s/he sees only 10 figures and is supposed to choose 5 of them, i.e. it is done blindfold). Every test task has 10 items in it, for instance, 10 sentences that are to be transformed in a particular manner. An example of a task is given below (No.8):

*Instruction: On the left side of computer's screen you see 10 sentences. Make general questions to each of them using as prompts the adjectives you see in the right hand column. You have 8 minutes to do the task.*

| | |
|---|---|
| *It is a room.* | *light* |
| *These girls are students.* | *good* |
| *Those boys are friends.* | *your* |
| *This is our city.* | *large* etc. |

Students are supposed to type in a special screen space questions like: "Is it a light room?", "Are these girls good students?" etc. If the question is correct, the initial sentence on the screen disappears and an answer to the question appears in a frame of green color. If something is incorrect in the typed question, the correct version of it appears in a red frame. The computer gives a student one point for every typed question with no error of whatever kind. So, up to 10 points can be scored with one point subtracted for every incorrect question. The computer also "fines" examinees for surpassing the time limit set in the instruction (this limit is set taking into account slowness in computer typing of the absolute majority of students when using the Latin alphabet). "Fining" means subtracting one point for every minute of excess time. In this way for five grammar tasks in the test a student can score up to 50 points. The failure scores are below 37 points (less than 75%) while scores from 37 to 40 points are considered as satisfactory, scores from 41 to 45 points are considered as good, and scores from 45 to 50 points as excellent.

The final test is devoted to some of the standard communicative formulas already known to students and their using them in communication in conditions simulating to a certain degree a genuine conversation. This test is designed as a communicative-algorithmic activity, unlike the preceding four purely formal tests.

The task for students is "to talk" to a computer giving (typing) the most appropriate verbal reactions to the stimuli for speech appearing on the screen. The "talk" is to proceed in the following manner:

*Computer: Hello!*
*Student* (is supposed to type): *Hello!* (or *Hi!,* or *Good morning!,* or any other acceptable greeting - all appropriate formulas are in the computer's memory).

*Computer: I am a computer. And what are you?*
*Student: I am a student* (*engineer, businessman* etc. - all the names of occupations are acceptable).
*Computer: How interesting! Thank you!*
*Student: You are welcome!* (or any other formula of socially acceptable reaction to thanking).
*Computer: What is your name, please?*
*Student: My name is N.* (any name is acceptable).
*Computer: Glad to meet you!*
*Student: Glad to meet you too!* (or *Pleased to meet you too!* or any other acceptable reaction).
*Computer: Good-bye!*
*Student: Bye-bye!* (or *Bye!* or *Good-bye!* etc.).

As there are only six student's responses, and each of them which is made correctly brings one point (the assessment is totally computerized with no human intervention), the maximum score can be 6 points. If an error is made in any of student's responses, s/he is asked by the computer to try once more and respond correctly. If a correct answer is given in the second attempt, 0.5 point is scored. If not, the correct version of an expected response appears on the screen and some next stimulus is given. It is necessary to score not less than 4 points to pass the test, with 5 points as a good result and six points as an excellent one.

When this final test is passed, the computer sums up all the results and makes a conclusion whether the test as a whole (i.e., consisting of 5 sub-tests) has been passed. It is so if the total number of points scored is not less than seventy six. 76-80 points are considered as a satisfactory result and 81-90 points as a good one. Scores of 91-106 (maximum) points are considered as excellent.

b) The First Principal Course Tests

For the first of the principal courses (that of everyday oral communication) three tests are designed. The first of them is for testing speaking in the form of a dialogue. Two students have to choose 1 out of 16 options of conversation tasks in the computer program. Having entered the chosen number into the computer's memory, the two students see the text of a particular task appear on the screen. This text is an outline of a role-play with the description of a situation and a topic of communication for each of the interlocutors and with explaining to her/him his or her own role in the intercourse. The description can look like the following three ones:

*Option No.2*

*At the airport information desk*

| *1st interlocutor* | *2nd interlocutor* |
|---|---|
| *You come to the information desk to get information concerning your flight and the airport's conveniences that you may need. Be polite to the clerk.* | *You are a clerk at the airport information desk. Answer the questions of a passenger and suggest something for him/her to do while waiting for his/her flight. Be polite, cooperative, and helpful.* |

*Option No.9*

*Checking in at a hotel*

| *1st interlocutor* | *2nd interlocutor* |
|---|---|
| *You are talking to a receptionist while checking in at a hotel. Try to learn everything about the hotel and staying in it that may be of interest to you. Be polite, do not forget to greet the receptionist and thank him/her at the end of the talk.* | *You are a hotel receptionist. Talk to a checking in customer. Ask him/her all the necessary questions, tell him/her everything s/he wants to know, and try to convince him/her to use as many services of your hotel as possible to make his/her stay enjoyable. Be polite, cooperative and helpful.* |

*Option No.11*

*Ordering a meal at a restaurant*

| *1st interlocutor* | *2nd interlocutor* |
|---|---|
| *You want to order a meal at a restaurant. Talk to the waiter and ask her/him to help you in your choice of food and drinks. Be polite to the waiter.* | *You are a waiter at a restaurant. Talk to the visitor and do your best to serve her/him well. Help her/him to choose food and drinks. Be polite, cooperative, and helpful.* |

After reading the description, the examinees start conversing at once (no time for thinking over is allowed). For evaluation purposes in accordance with the criteria given below the best way would be recording students' dialogues with the following detailed analysis. But it turned out that, when the speech of those under test was recorded, they became concentrated on the process of recording or simply embarrassed, and communication often sharply deteriorated. This phenomenon was discussed by Morgan (1997: 437) who included tape-recording among those established research technologies that "... have the potential to be overly intrusive and counterproductive ...". That alone made it necessary to avoid recording, to say nothing of the fact that such a procedure makes communicative tests less authentic, deprives assessors of opportunities of seeing the communication live and directing it if needed (Underhill, 1987: 35). That is why the method of 2 assessors was used for objectivity reasons. They listened to students' speaking assessing the speech of every examinee by marking the points scored by him/her. The assessors were specially trained and made their assessments strictly according to 8 fixed criteria, each having a fixed scale of points. These criteria and their scales were as follows:

1. Relevance of what is said to what should be said in a given communicative situation (see examples above) with a communicative topic typical of it (10 point scale with an assessor supposed to deduct one point for everything said that s/he feels to be an incongruity).

2. Relative grammatical, lexical, and phonological accuracy of student's speech (10 point scale with one point supposed to be deducted for every language error impeding unhindered correct comprehension of what the speaker meant to say; the test is to be discontinued as a failure if more than 10 such errors are made).

3. Number of utterances in the conversation from each of the interlocutors (before testing students are told that they are supposed to make their conversation as long as they can, and every interlocutor is expected to contribute not less than 10 utterances to it; so, a 10 point scale was devised with assessors instructed to give

this maximum to every student from whom, judging by their impression, they heard 10 or more than 10 utterances; assessors are supposed to deduct as many points from ten as they think proper if the dialogue is shorter than it should be).

4. Variety of grammatical forms (structures) and vocabulary used by a speaker (assessors were instructed to give 10 points to students who demonstrated by their speaking that their vocabulary was rich and varied and they could make use of all the grammar forms needed for better expressing meaning; on the contrary, limited student's vocabulary and a poor stock of well-mastered grammatical structures was to make assessors deduct as many points from ten as they thought proper).

5. Speaking fluency compatible with the normal average rate of native speakers' speech (10 points if it is compatible, with deducting points from 10 if speech becomes too slow, hesitant, undue pauses start occurring frequently etc.).

6. Logical coherence of speech and its linguistic cohesion achieved by using special language markers of such cohesion (10 points, with one point deducted for every incoherence or lack of cohesion).

7. The initiative character of what the speaker said as an indicator of his/her ability to stimulate interlocutors to continuing the conversation and his/her ability to use all resources at his/her disposal to convey meaning - both linguistic and non-linguistic resources including communicative strategies. Such an ability seems to be so vital for successful communication in the form of a dialogue that this criterion somewhat outweighs many of the preceding ones. That is why a 20-point scale was designed for it, so that an assessor could be more specific in determining the degree of initiativity and creativity characterizing the speech of any given examinee.

8. For the same reason a 20-point scale was designed for the last criterion. It was the ability of an examinee to freely comprehend (aurally) what was said by interlocutors.

The criterion system above evaluates different aspects of learners' communicative competence and using it enables students to score up to 100 points for one conversation (dialogue). But to get more precise data, every examinee is asked to take part in five such conversations one after another, but every time with a different interlocutor (so, every student has to choose 5 dialogic tasks out of 16 in the computer list). Thus, 500 points can be scored. The testing results are considered as excellent and the communicative competence, speaking skill development as high if a subject scores 450 (90% of all the points) and more. They are considered as quite good and sufficiently high if from 400 to 449 points (from 80% to 90%) are scored. Points from 375 to 399 (75% and up to 80%) are considered as an indicator of learners' achieving the level of communicative competence sufficient for satisfying all their basic communicative needs in everyday communication in the form of a dialogue (a satisfactory result ). Lower scores are considered as a failure.

The two assessors listening to students' speaking are instructed to do their assessing quite independently of each other. After finishing they are supposed to negotiate their scores (if they cannot come to a common point of view, their scores are added up and the sum divided into two). Then the negotiated scores are entered into the computer and after that considered as final.

The two other tests for this course were designed in the way to be carried out totally without human assessors' intervention (assessing fully computerized). The first test in this battery is a listening test. In it a student has to choose blindfold one number of a text for listening out of five. After entering the chosen number into

the computer, this student listens to the text under the selected number. It may be a text like the following one (option No. 1):

*Many people from other cities and even other countries come to study at our University. So, when a future student arrives at our city, he or she always has a problem of finding the way to the University. It is rather difficult if you do not take a cab but prefer to use public transport. That is why I'll explain it to you - so that when you come, you'll be able to go straight there.*

*If you arrive by train, you should bake bus 5 at the railway station. You get in at the railway station and you get off at the third stop. You will find yourself in the center of the city opposite the department store. You are to cross the street to the department store. There you turn to the right, and then into the first street to the left. Just at the corner there is a tram stop. You are to board tram 3 and to get off at the second stop. Here you must walk. You'll cross the road and walk by the other side of the street to the corner. Then you'll turn to the left. You walk straight ahead along the street and just in front of you you'll see the buildings of the University.*

*If you come to our city by plane, you should take bus 26 at the airport, and it will take you straight to the University.*

The text for listening in the tapescript above (without any pauses, hesitations, silence-fillers which are on the tape) sounds originally in a female voice and listening to it lasts a little longer than a minute and a half. After listening a learner has to do 7 computer-aided comprehension tasks checking comprehension of different parts and details of information from the text. For instance, the comprehension tasks to the text above are as follows:

1. *Choose the correct alternative. In this text it is explained how to find your way to the:*

1) *department store*
2) *railway station*
3) *university*
4) *airport*

2. *Type the kind and number of public transport you should take from the railway station* (the student is supposed to type *"bus 5"*).
3. *Choose the correct alternative. Where are you supposed to get off when you go by bus?*

*1) at the second stop near the University*
2) *at the third stop opposite the department store*
3) *at the fifth stop opposite the department store*
4) *at the third stop opposite the theater*

4. *Place your marker or the spot in the plan of the city center ( that you see below on the screen) where you are to walk from the bus stop if you follow exactly the directions given to you* (if the student chooses the right spot, the sign *"Tram stop"* starts flashing on and off on the screen) etc.

The computer gives an examinee 10 points for every correct answer, and only one minute to give it. If more than 30 sec. pass before the examinee starts making her/his response but it is correct, only 5 points can be scored, with no points both for an incorrect response and for thinking it over longer than 1 min. Besides, the first task, always the easiest one and just checking general

comprehension, becomes the reason for discontinuing the test as a total failure if a student makes an error in it. In this way 70 points can be scored for this test, with 55 points as a satisfactory result, 60 points as a good one, 65-70 points as an excellent one (50 points and less are considered a failure).

The final test in the battery is a grammatical one (like the preceding two tests, it checks the command of the vocabulary from the course as well, but this checking is a concomitant task only) . That is why it is not a communicative test as those in speaking and listening. It is designed in a similar (almost identical) way to the grammatical test in the Introductory Phonetic Course. An examine has to do 5 grammatical tasks choosing them out of 20 alternatives. In every task there are 5 sentences to be somehow transformed according to instruction or questions to be answered etc. The test is fully computerized and the procedure is absolutely identical to grammatical testing in the Introductory Phonetic Course (including the computer taking record of the time spent for doing the test and "fining" students for exceeding the time limit). The only difference is that tasks are designed as communicative-algorithmic activities characteristic of the analytic phase in this course. An example may be as given below (option No.6).

*Instruction: Ask questions to get more details about visiting a department store. Ask (type) your questions in accordance with the prompt-words that you will see below the sentences giving some information about visits to the department store in question.*

*Computer:* *I often went to this department store.*
*Prompt-word: Why.*
*Student* (types): *Why did you go there?*
*Computer:* *Because I needed buying a lot of things.*
*Computer:* *I am going to go there again.*
*Prompt-word: when.*
*Student:* *When are you going to go there again?*
*Computer:* *I am going there in a minute.*
*Prompt-word: Why.*
*Student:* *Why are you going there?* etc.

Since in this grammatical task there are only five questions for students to ask, the top score (as in any other of 20 tasks of this kind) is 5 points. So, having to do 5 tasks in a row, a student can score up to 25 points. The conditions for passing this test were made easier than for the other two as it was considered only supplementary to them. So, it is enough to score 17 points (70%) to pass, with 17-19 points considered as a satisfactory result, 20-22 points as a good one, and 23-25 points as an excellent one.

In this way the test for this course as a whole, i.e. the battery of three tests (speaking, listening, and grammar), is considered as passed if a student scores 447 points out of 595 possible ones. Scores from 447 points to 473 points are satisfactory results, points from 474 to 531 are good ones, and everything higher is an excellent result. Taking into account the complex and varied procedure of testing, the scores higher than 447 points (more than 75% of those to be scored) could be a sufficient testimony of a rather high level of students' communicative competence development fully enabling them to feel themselves free in everyday oral communication in English.

c) The Second Principal Course Tests

For the second of the principal courses (that of oral business communication) four teats are designed. The first of them has two functions. First, it is a kind of preparatory "warming up" test to get students ready and psychologically concentrated for principal, more complicated tests. That is why it is designed as a guided dialogue. Second, this test is used specifically for checking students' skills enabling them to make business phone calls since developing such skills occupies an important place in the business course.

The test is designed as follows. The student chooses one number out of all the numbers of guided dialogue alternatives in the computer list. When the number is entered, the instruction to the chosen guided dialogue appears on the screen, like the one below (option No. 1):

*You are calling Mr. Jenkins, the Vice-President of Johnson and Jenkins shipbuilding company. His secretary answers:*

*1. Say hello to her and introduce yourself (you are a representative of a Nikolaev shipbuilding company).*

*2. Tell the secretary that you would like to arrange an appointment with her boss.*

*3. Say that the purpose of your visit is to start negotiations. Your company plans to buy diesel engines from Johnson and Jenkins shipbuilding company.*

*4. Tell the secretary that the appointment time she suggests does not suit you as you have another important appointment at that time* etc.

When the instruction is read, the test starts. Everything "the secretary" says is recorded with pauses for student's guided responses. As a result the guided dialogue No. 1 usually proceeds like below:

*Secretary (recorded speaker): Johnson and Jenkins Shipbuilding Company. Mr. Jenkins' secretary speaking. May I help you?*

*Student: Hello! I am a representative of Nikolaev Shipbuilding Company. My name is N.*

*Secretary: What can I do for you?*

*Student: I would like to make an appointment with Mr. Jenkins.*

*Secretary: Would you, please, state the purpose of your visit?*

*Student: The purpose of my visit is to start negotiations. We plan to buy diesel engines that your company manufactures for our ships.*

*Secretary: It's very interesting. Hold the line, please. I'll consult Mr. Jenkins. Are you still on? Yes, Mr. Jenkins will be glad to see you and discuss everything. Will tomorrow at 3 o'clock do for you?* etc.

Two assessors are to listen to student's talking to a recorded speaker giving the student 10 points for every socio-culturally, socio-linguistically, and linguistically acceptable reaction to speaker's utterances and deducting as many points from ten for different errors as each assessor thinks proper. The assessors negotiate their total final marks, thus giving the student a single score at the end. As there are not more than six student's responses to speaker's utterances, the top score is 60 points with 45-48 points as a satisfactory result, 49-54 points as a good one, and 55-60 points as an excellent one.

The second test in the battery (dialogic speech in the sphere of business communication) is absolutely identical in all the details (procedure, scoring etc.) to the dialogic speech test for the preceding course. The same number of points can be scored. The only differences are situations and topics of communication suggested to students (business talks), as shown in an instruction to a pair of students (option No. 1) given as an example below:

| *1st interlocutor* | *2nd interlocutor* |
|---|---|
| *You are a representative of a big iron-and-steel works from Ukraine. Now you are at the office of Mr. Crews, the Export Sales Director of the firm "Metallico" manufacturing equipment for iron-and-steel works. Your purpose is negotiating purchase of some equipment at the lowest possible price.* | *You are Mr. Crews, the Export Sales Director of the firm "Metallico" manufacturing equipment for iron-and-steel works. Negotiate the sale of such equipment to a Ukrainian iron-and-steel works. Your purpose is to convince the representative of this works that you suggest very reasonable conditions.* |

As in the similar test for the preceding course, students have to take part in 5 business talks of this kind scoring up to 500 points.

The third test in the battery is a monologic speech test. It is designed in a way similar to a dialogic speech test. But only one student, not a pair of them, chooses his/her individual task and delivers his/her discourse in front of two assessors. Only one task for a talk/presentation is chosen out of 10 possible alternatives. In this task the situation of monologic speaking (presentation) is described, its topic is indicated, and a certain social role is prescribed to a student. The task (instruction) may be alike to the one below (option No.6):

*You are a Senior Vice-President of a big electronic company. Make a report to share-holders at the annual meeting. In your report you must tell the share-holders about the company's projects for the next year.*

Students are usually allowed 3-5 minutes to think and to make notes before starting their discourse. Assessors use the same criteria, the same scales, and the same procedure as for speaking in the form of a dialogue. But only the first six criteria are used as the last two ones (the initiative character of speaking and comprehending what an interlocutor says) are not applicable to speaking in the form of a monologue. In this way (as there is only one discourse to deliver) a student can score up to 60 points. 45-48 points are considered as a satisfactory result (with the failure level below 45 points, i.e. below 75% of all the possible points); 49-54 points are a good result, and 55-60 points an excellent one.

The final test is that of listening. The procedure is essentially the same as in the preceding course but with one radical difference. An examinee gets only one task to the text s/he listened to instead of seven. But it is a problem-solving task requiring drawing some conclusion from or making a decision on the basis of information received. Thus, an ordinary situation of listening for business purposes is reproduced. For instance, the text for listening may be as in the following tapescript (option No.1):

*Listen to the text about competition. When the text is over, press the "ENTER" key of your computer and do the task.*

*Competitiveness of a firm depends on many factors. Let us consider an example. Three firms manufacturing office furniture are on the market: A, B, and C. The firm A is the oldest one. It has a good reputation. But recently the products of the firm are not very attractive and reliable. The prices are high. And the firm cannot make heavy investments into development and technology. So, the firm rapidly loses market share and profitability.*

*The firm B is quite young. The duration of its presence on the market is short, but the firm makes heavy investments into development, technology, and advertisement. So, its products are reliable and attractive. The prices are medium. The market share of the firm and its profitability are slowly but constantly increasing.*

*The firm C is also young. It has a great market share because its prices are low. But the annual return is not great. And it is lowering. So does the profitability, the reliability, and attractiveness of the firm's products. The reason is that, because of low annual returns, the firm cannot invest much into development and technology. But still the firm holds steadily on the market due to low prices.*

*And now you must say which of the firms is the most competitive, which one ranks second, and which one third.*

Ranking is done by students with the aid of a computer. If a correct response (B, C, A) is given, 100 points are scored, if not-0. In that case a student listens to one more text but, after a correct response, s/he scores only 50 points. Therefore, to pass the test as a whole (the battery of 4 tests) , a student should score at least 540 points. The scores from 540 to 576 are considered as satisfactory, scores from 577 points to 648 points as good, and from 649 points to 720 points (the top score) as excellent.

### 4.2. Selection of Students to Be Tested for Verifying the Efficiency of the Program

Of all the students who were enrolled for learning English in the intensive program under consideration only some were selected at enrollment stage to be tested at the end of it for verifying its efficiency. They were those persons who either had not learned English before or had learned it so long ago or in such conditions that they had acquired practically no communicative competence, no grammatical competence, no vocabulary worth mentioning. Without observing this condition, no judgment about the efficiency or inefficiency of the program based on students' learning outcomes could be considered as reliable. The selected students were gathered in special groups - not more than 12 students in one group because, according to Kitaygorodskaya (1986), 10-12 people is the optimum number of learners in a group for intensive teaching/learning.

Three years of consecutive testing were judged to be a sufficient period (with different groups of learners and different teachers) for coming to definite conclusions about the program's efficiency. These years were the first three ones of its functioning: 1993/1994, 1994/1995, 1995/1996 academic years.

In the first of these years 34 students were tested after the Introductory Phonetic Course, and the same 34 students after the first principal course. But after the business course only 19 of these students were tested. The cause is that as a rule not less than 1/3 of all the students enrolled discontinue their studies after the first of the two principal courses (everyday communication), which is quite

autonomous, since for their own personal goals they do not need business communication in English.

In 1994/1995 academic year 51 student was tested after the Introductory Phonetic Course and the course "Nine Steps in London". 30 of them also finished the Business English course and were tested. The 21 persons who dropped out after the everyday communication course, just like in the previous year, included only those learners who did not need Business English for their personal use (career plans, professional requirements etc.). So, their dropping out was quite natural.

In 1995/1996 academic year the intensive program functioned only during 4 months - March-June 1996. The reason was the absence from Ukraine of the author of this book (research work in the USA as a Fulbright grantee) who was the program organizer and director. It was inevitable that not many students could be enrolled in the period covering less than the second half of the academic year - all the more so that learners were enrolled only for the first two courses - the Introductory Phonetic one and "Nine Steps in London". The Business English course for these students could begin only after a two month interval - in September 1996 as this intensive program was always stopped for July-August. Of all the students enrolled one group was gathered that satisfied the above mentioned requirements for testing purposes. In this way 11 learners were tested after the preparatory and everyday communication courses.

Therefore, there were 95 students tested after course 1 and course 2, and 49 students tested after course 3 during three academic years. This number of examinees seemed sufficient for judging, on the basis of their learning outcomes (as shown by testing results and their statistical analysis), the efficiency of the program as a whole. All the selected students formed 9 groups (three in 1993/1994 academic year, five in 1994/1995 academic year, and one in 1995/1996 academic year).

These groups were taught by 6 different teachers (though all of them were trained identically in using the teaching methodology described in the preceding chapters). It gave an opportunity, in case of getting uniform or compatible results in different groups and years, of avoiding the risk of ascribing these results to personal efficiency or inefficiency of one and the same teacher.

Very important were the differences between learners. As to sexual differences 40% of them were males, while all the others were females. The most vivid was the variety in ages and occupations. The learners were people from different walks of life - industrial workers, high school and university students, businessmen, physicians, engineers, secretaries, bank employees, housewives, managers and many others. There were great differences in students' age too. As the program was designed for adolescents and adults, the lowest enrollment age was 13 and the highest 60. Among those tested the youngest P.Y.I.[8] had just turned thirteen when he was enrolled in 1995/1996 academic year, while the oldest person L.I.A. met his sixtieth birthday in the middle of the program in 1993/1994 academic year. All the other examinees were evenly distributed between the ages of 13 and 40 with about 10-20 persons in each of the following age groups: 13-16, 17-20, 20-25, 25-30, 30-35, 35-40 years of age. Besides L.I.A. already mentioned above, there was only one representative of an older age group in 1993/1994 academic year - C.Y.M. who was 46 years old. There was also one student of this age in 1994/1995 academic year (T.N.V.); all the others were younger. Such a variety was absolutely necessary for evaluating the efficiency of the program since it was essential to find out how good (or bad) it was for all those who were

[8] Subsequently all the examinees will be designated by the initial letters of their last names, first names, and patronymics.

supposed to learn English in it - adolescent and adult students of various ages and occupations.

### 4.3. Testing Results and Their Discussion

Testing results of every examinee in every kind of test and in each of the courses are given in Tables 1, 2, 3 below. Each of the 3 tables (the results of testing after the Introductory Phonetic Course, the course "Nine Steps in London", the course "Starting Business Relations") is divided into parts (a, b, c), every part being devoted to testing results of those particular students who learned English in this particular course during a definite academic year. Mean scores for every academic year are given at the bottom of every part in every table.

Table 1

Students' Testing Results After the Preparatory Course
a)1993/1994 academic year

| Student | Points scored in test No. | | | | | Total (out of 106 points) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 1. A.E.V. | 17 | 3 | 23 | 41 | 6 | 90 |
| 2. A.O.V. | 13 | 4 | 23 | 46 | 6 | 92 |
| 3. C.A.L. | 18 | 5 | 24 | 39 | 6 | 92 |
| 4. G.A.V. | 20 | 5 | 25 | 48 | 6 | 104 |
| 5. G.T.N. | 17 | 5 | 24 | 39 | 6 | 91 |
| 6. G.V.N. | 18 | 4 | 23 | 39 | 6 | 90 |
| 7. G.Y.M. | 17 | 3 | 21 | 46 | 6 | 93 |
| 8. I.N.V. | 18 | 5 | 24 | 46 | 5 | 98 |
| 9. K.A.P. | 17 | 4 | 20 | 40 | 5 | 86 |
| 10. K.A.V. | 17 | 4 | 22 | 44 | 6 | 93 |
| 11. K.K.V. | 18 | 3 | 22 | 47 | 6 | 96 |
| 12. K.S.A. | 17 | 5 | 20 | 47 | 5 | 94 |
| 13. L.I.A. | 18 | 5 | 23 | 43 | 6 | 95 |
| 14. L.O.A. | 18 | 5 | 22 | 48 | 6 | 99 |
| 15. L.T.K. | 17 | 4 | 22 | 50 | 6 | 99 |
| 16. M.A.D. | 18 | 3 | 20 | 42 | 6 | 89 |
| 17. M.M.A. | 19 | 5 | 20 | 50 | 6 | 100 |
| 18. M.O.V. | 17 | 4 | 19 | 46 | 6 | 92 |
| 19. N.L.N. | 20 | 5 | 25 | 42 | 6 | 98 |
| 20. O.A.N. | 17 | 4 | 20 | 43 | 5 | 89 |
| 21. P.A.S. | 18 | 5 | 22 | 38 | 4 | 87 |
| 22. P.E.B. | 19 | 5 | 25 | 48 | 6 | 103 |
| 23. S.A.S. | 19 | 5 | 24 | 49 | 6 | 103 |
| 24. S.A.V. | 17 | 5 | 24 | 45 | 5 | 96 |
| 25. S.A.Y. | 18 | 5 | 23 | 41 | 6 | 93 |
| 26. S.O.B. | 20 | 5 | 24 | 42 | 6 | 97 |
| 27. T.I.O. | 17 | 4 | 22 | 46 | 6 | 95 |
| 28. T.I.P. | 19 | 5 | 25 | 46 | 6 | 101 |
| 29. T.M.R. | 20 | 5 | 25 | 47 | 6 | 103 |
| 30. T.M.V. | 18 | 4 | 25 | 43 | 4 | 94 |
| 31. V.E.A. | 18 | 5 | 24 | 49 | 5 | 101 |
| 32. V.O.V. | 20 | 4 | 22 | 44 | 5 | 95 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 33. Z.L.N. | 20 | 5 | 23 | 47 | 5 | 100 |
| 34. Z.O.V. | 17 | 4 | 22 | 46 | 6 | 95 |
| Mean | 18.0 | 4.44 | 22.70 | 44.61 | 5.65 | 95.38 |

b) 1994/1995 academic year

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. A.S.V. | 18 | 5 | 20 | 50 | 4 | 97 |
| 2. A.V.A. | 19 | 4 | 23 | 41 | 5 | 92 |
| 3. B.E.A. | 18 | 5 | 25 | 46 | 5 | 99 |
| 4. B.E.G. | 17 | 3 | 20 | 44 | 6 | 90 |
| 5. B.M.S. | 15 | 4 | 18 | 44 | 6 | 87 |
| 6. B.N.I. | 18 | 5 | 21 | 49 | 6 | 99 |
| 7. B.V.A. | 19 | 5 | 24 | 47 | 6 | 101 |
| 8. B.V.I. | 19 | 5 | 21 | 43 | 6 | 94 |
| 9. B.V.V. | 19 | 4 | 25 | 46 | 6 | 100 |
| 10 D.A.A. | 20 | 4 | 22 | 50 | 6 | 102 |
| 11. D.A.I. | 17 | 4 | 19 | 47 | 6 | 93 |
| 12. D.A.V. | 20 | 5 | 23 | 48 | 6 | 102 |
| 13. D.Y.S. | 20 | 5 | 25 | 48 | 6 | 104 |
| 14. E.V.V. | 20 | 5 | 24 | 49 | 6 | 104 |
| 15. I.T.A. | 16 | 5 | 20 | 46 | 6 | 93 |
| 16. K.K.V. | 19 | 4 | 23 | 47 | 6 | 99 |
| 17. K.N.I. | 17 | 4 | 23 | 49 | 6 | 99 |
| 18. K.V.I. | 20 | 5 | 24 | 46 | 5 | 100 |
| 19. K.V.V. | 19 | 5 | 20 | 48 | 5 | 97 |
| 20. L.A.G. | 19 | 5 | 24 | 47 | 6 | 101 |
| 21. L.I.L. | 18 | 5 | 22 | 46 | 6 | 97 |
| 22. L.R.A. | 19 | 3 | 22 | 48 | 6 | 98 |
| 23. L.S.P. | 17 | 4 | 20 | 44 | 6 | 91 |
| 24. M.A.R. | 16 | 5 | 22 | 42 | 5 | 90 |
| 25. M.E.N. | 18 | 4 | 20 | 40 | 6 | 88 |
| 26. M.E.V. | 19 | 5 | 24 | 50 | 6 | 104 |
| 27. M.O.V. | 17 | 4 | 20 | 46 | 6 | 93 |
| 28. M.T.V. | 20 | 5 | 25 | 49 | 6 | 105 |
| 29. M.V.K. | 18 | 5 | 24 | 44 | 6 | 97 |
| 30. M.V.V. | 20 | 4 | 25 | 44 | 5 | 98 |
| 31. P.A.E. | 19 | 3 | 24 | 49 | 6 | 101 |
| 32. P.A.L. | 19 | 5 | 21 | 44 | 5 | 94 |
| 33. P.B.E. | 17 | 5 | 22 | 41 | 6 | 91 |
| 34. P.I.Y. | 14 | 3 | 19 | 31 | 6 | 73 |
| 35. P.S.Y. | 17 | 5 | 20 | 43 | 4 | 89 |
| 36. P.V.V. | 18 | 3 | 18 | 43 | 4 | 86 |
| 37. R.S.A. | 17 | 5 | 20 | 49 | 6 | 97 |
| 38. S.E.Y. | 18 | 5 | 20 | 48 | 6 | 97 |
| 39. S.L.Y. | 18 | 3 | 20 | 48 | 6 | 95 |
| 40. S.N.R. | 19 | 5 | 23 | 50 | 6 | 103 |
| 41. S.N.V. | 17 | 5 | 22 | 48 | 6 | 98 |
| 42. S.O.M. | 19 | 5 | 23 | 50 | 6 | 103 |
| 43. S.V.V. | 15 | 3 | 18 | 47 | 5 | 88 |
| 44. T.A.M. | 18 | 5 | 24 | 49 | 6 | 102 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 45. T.I.V. | 20 | 5 | 25 | 45 | 6 | 101 |
| 46. T.N.V. | 15 | 3 | 18 | 45 | 6 | 87 |
| 47. T.S.G. | 19 | 5 | 24 | 43 | 6 | 97 |
| 48. T.T.S. | 17 | 5 | 20 | 43 | 4 | 89 |
| 49. V.A.V. | 20 | 5 | 25 | 49 | 6 | 105 |
| 50. Y.S.G. | 20 | 5 | 24 | 50 | 6 | 105 |
| 51. Z.N.O. | 19 | 5 | 24 | 45 | 6 | 99 |
| Mean | 18.15 | 4.47 | 22.0 | 46.03 | 5.68 | 96.35 |

c) 1995/1996 academic year

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. A.E.V. | 20 | 5 | 24 | 46 | 5 | 100 |
| 2. G.K.A. | 20 | 5 | 24 | 45 | 6 | 100 |
| 3. K.P.K. | 19 | 5 | 25 | 48 | 4 | 101 |
| 4. L.A.Y. | 20 | 5 | 22 | 50 | 6 | 103 |
| 5. M.A.V. | 20 | 5 | 25 | 47 | 6 | 103 |
| 6. M.E.V. | 18 | 5 | 23 | 47 | 6 | 99 |
| 7. P.N.V. | 20 | 5 | 25 | 44 | 6 | 100 |
| 8. P.I.Y. | 15 | 5 | 20 | 48 | 6 | 94 |
| 9. T.E.I. | 17 | 4 | 17 | 38 | 5 | 81 |
| 10. T.O.L. | 18 | 5 | 25 | 46 | 6 | 100 |
| 11. T.O.V. | 18 | 4 | 19 | 44 | 6 | 91 |
| Mean | 18.64 | 4.81 | 22.64 | 45.72 | 5.63 | 97.45 |

Table 2

Students' Testing Results After the First of the Principal Courses - Everyday Oral Communication

a[1]) 1993/1994 academic year - speaking (in the form of a dialogue) test results

| Students | Points (for five dialogues) scored according to criterion No. | | | | | | | | Total for 8 criteria (5 dialogues) out of 500 points |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1. A.E.V. | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 500 |
| 2. A.O.V. | 50 | 50 | 46 | 46 | 45 | 50 | 85 | 66 | 438 |
| 3. C.A.L. | 50 | 43 | 50 | 47 | 50 | 50 | 98 | 98 | 486 |
| 4. G.A.V. | 50 | 44 | 50 | 49 | 45 | 50 | 99 | 98 | 485 |
| 5. G.T.N. | 50 | 45 | 50 | 49 | 46 | 49 | 97 | 100 | 486 |
| 6. G.V.N. | 50 | 36 | 50 | 32 | 34 | 50 | 78 | 86 | 416 |
| 7.G.Y.M. | 50 | 21 | 23 | 36 | 29 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 309 |
| 8. I.N.V. | 50 | 48 | 50 | 48 | 47 | 50 | 92 | 100 | 485 |
| 9. K.A.P. | 50 | 35 | 50 | 39 | 42 | 50 | 89 | 93 | 448 |
| 10.K.A.V | 49 | 44 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 491 |
| 11.K.K.V | 50 | 38 | 50 | 38 | 41 | 50 | 95 | 97 | 459 |
| 12.K.S.A. | 50 | 43 | 50 | 44 | 48 | 50 | 81 | 98 | 464 |
| 13. L.I.A. | 50 | 38 | 50 | 44 | 45 | 50 | 90 | 99 | 466 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14.L.O.A. | 50 | 45 | 50 | 43 | 45 | 49 | 94 | 100 | 476 |
| 15.L.T.K. | 50 | 49 | 50 | 40 | 44 | 50 | 78 | 84 | 445 |
| 16.M.AD | 50 | 48 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 95 | 100 | 491 |
| 17.M.MA | 50 | 42 | 50 | 46 | 50 | 50 | 96 | 98 | 482 |
| 18.M.O.V | 50 | 32 | 50 | 37 | 43 | 50 | 90 | 90 | 442 |
| 19.N.L.N. | 50 | 38 | 50 | 39 | 44 | 50 | 81 | 86 | 438 |
| 20.O.A.N | 50 | 44 | 50 | 42 | 46 | 50 | 94 | 94 | 470 |
| 21.P.A.S. | 50 | 43 | 50 | 41 | 44 | 50 | 96 | 97 | 471 |
| 22.P.E.B. | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 95 | 100 | 495 |
| 23.S.A.S. | 48 | 48 | 49 | 43 | 47 | 47 | 62 | 48 | 392 |
| 24.S.A.V. | 50 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 49 | 97 | 100 | 494 |
| 25.S.A.Y. | 50 | 50 | 41 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 491 |
| 26.S.O.B. | 50 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 498 |
| 27. T.I.O. | 50 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 499 |
| 28. T.I.P. | 50 | 41 | 50 | 40 | 43 | 49 | 89 | 92 | 454 |
| 29.T.M.R | 50 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 498 |
| 30.T.M.V | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 95 | 100 | 495 |
| 31.V.E.A. | 50 | 48 | 50 | 49 | 49 | 49 | 96 | 100 | 491 |
| 32.V.O.V | 50 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 49 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 498 |
| 33.Z.L.N. | 50 | 49 | 50 | 48 | 49 | 50 | 95 | 100 | 491 |
| 34.Z.O.V. | 50 | 44 | 50 | 50 | 49 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 493 |
| Mean | 49.9 | 44.2 | 48.7 | 45.2 | 46.3 | 49.8 | 91.4 | 93.4 | 468.7 |

**a[2]) 1993/1994 academic year - listening test and grammar test results, total for all the tests**

| Student | Listening test | Grammar test | Total for 3 tests (out of 595 points) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Points scored (out of 70) | Points scored (out of 25) | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. A.E.V. | 50 | 25 | 575 |
| 2. A.O.V. | 65 | 17 | 520 |
| 3. C.A.L. | 60 | 16 | 562 |
| 4. G.A.V. | 70 | 23 | 578 |
| 5. G.T.N. | 50 | 21 | 557 |
| 6. G.V.N. | 60 | 18 | 494 |
| 7. G.Y.M. | 60 | 25 | 394 |
| 8. I.N.V. | 45 | 21 | 551 |
| 9. K.A.P. | 60 | 22 | 530 |
| 10.K.A.V. | 70 | 25 | 586 |
| 11.K.K.V. | 60 | 20 | 539 |
| 12. K.S.A. | 70 | 22 | 556 |
| 13. L.I.A. | 65 | 18 | 549 |
| 14. L.O.A. | 60 | 23 | 559 |
| 15. L.T.K. | 70 | 17 | 532 |
| 16.M.A.D. | 70 | 25 | 586 |
| 17.M.M.A. | 70 | 19 | 571 |
| 18.M.O.V. | 50 | 23 | 515 |
| 19. N.L.N. | 60 | 18 | 516 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 20.O.A.N. | 45 | 19 | 534 |
| 21. P.A.S. | 70 | 19 | 560 |
| 22. P.E.B. | 65 | 19 | 579 |
| 23. S.A.S. | 60 | 21 | 473 |
| 24. S.A.V. | 70 | 21 | 585 |
| 25. S.A.Y. | 70 | 21 | 582 |
| 26. S.O.B. | 60 | 20 | 578 |
| 27. T.I.O. | 65 | 25 | 589 |
| 28. T.I.P. | 70 | 24 | 548 |
| 29.T.M.R. | 70 | 21 | 589 |
| 30.T.M.V. | 70 | 17 | 582 |
| 31. V.E.A. | 65 | 17 | 573 |
| 32.V.O.V. | 60 | 16 | 574 |
| 33. Z.L.N. | 60 | 17 | 568 |
| 34. Z.O.V. | 60 | 25 | 578 |
| Mean | 62.5 | 20.6 | 551.8 |

b[1]) 1994/1995 academic year - speaking (in the form of a dialogue) test results

| Students | Points (for five dialogues) scored according to criterion No. | | | | | | | | Total for 8 criteria (5 dialogues) out of 500 points |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1. A.S.V. | 50 | 45 | 37 | 31 | 38 | 46 | 55 | 68 | 370 |
| 2. A.V.A. | 50 | 46 | 43 | 45 | 44 | 46 | 80 | 100 | 454 |
| 3. B.E.A. | 50 | 45 | 46 | 48 | 48 | 50 | 94 | 100 | 481 |
| 4. B.E.G. | 50 | 46 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 92 | 100 | 488 |
| 5. B.M.S. | 50 | 32 | 46 | 37 | 40 | 46 | 81 | 84 | 416 |
| 6. B.N.I. | 50 | 47 | 50 | 48 | 46 | 50 | 90 | 100 | 481 |
| 7. B.V.A. | 50 | 47 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 497 |
| 8. B.V.I. | 50 | 43 | 47 | 44 | 50 | 50 | 86 | 98 | 468 |
| 9. B.V.V. | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 500 |
| 10.D.A.A | 50 | 45 | 50 | 43 | 42 | 48 | 84 | 100 | 462 |
| 11. D.A.I. | 48 | 33 | 45 | 41 | 40 | 46 | 85 | 82 | 420 |
| 12.D.A.V | 50 | 44 | 50 | 46 | 47 | 50 | 96 | 98 | 481 |
| 13.D.Y.S. | 50 | 44 | 50 | 50 | 46 | 47 | 100 | 100 | 487 |
| 14.E.V.V. | 50 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 95 | 100 | 493 |
| 15. I.T.A. | 50 | 44 | 50 | 47 | 47 | 50 | 98 | 98 | 484 |
| 16.K.K.V | 50 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 499 |
| 17. K.N.I. | 50 | 45 | 50 | 48 | 43 | 50 | 93 | 96 | 475 |
| 18. K.V.I. | 50 | 45 | 44 | 45 | 44 | 46 | 83 | 98 | 455 |
| 19.K.V.V | 50 | 49 | 50 | 43 | 49 | 50 | 80 | 92 | 463 |
| 20.L.A.G | 50 | 48 | 39 | 42 | 50 | 50 | 93 | 100 | 472 |
| 21. L.I.L. | 50 | 47 | 50 | 43 | 49 | 50 | 88 | 100 | 477 |
| 22.L.R.A. | 50 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 499 |
| 23. L.S.P. | 50 | 44 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 494 |
| 24.M.A.R | 49 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 48 | 48 | 97 | 99 | 489 |
| 25.M.E.N | 49 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 47 | 48 | 95 | 99 | 487 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 26.M.E.V | 50 | 48 | 50 | 49 | 49 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 496 |
| 27.M.O.V | 50 | 37 | 50 | 48 | 48 | 49 | 94 | 98 | 474 |
| 28.M.T.V | 50 | 48 | 50 | 49 | 48 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 495 |
| 29.M.V.K | 50 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 496 |
| 30.M.V.V | 50 | 45 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 495 |
| 31.P.A.E. | 50 | 43 | 50 | 50 | 46 | 47 | 98 | 100 | 484 |
| 32.P.A.L. | 48 | 38 | 45 | 41 | 42 | 46 | 83 | 88 | 431 |
| 33.P.B.E. | 50 | 48 | 46 | 49 | 45 | 49 | 95 | 100 | 482 |
| 34. P.I.Y. | 50 | 46 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 496 |
| 35. P.S.Y. | 50 | 31 | 46 | 41 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 418 |
| 36.P.V.V. | 50 | 47 | 48 | 45 | 48 | 47 | 81 | 92 | 458 |
| 37.R.S.A. | 50 | 47 | 44 | 39 | 32 | 50 | 59 | 100 | 421 |
| 38.S.E.Y. | 50 | 46 | 50 | 46 | 46 | 48 | 86 | 100 | 472 |
| 39.S.L.Y. | 50 | 47 | 50 | 50 | 47 | 50 | 91 | 100 | 485 |
| 40.S.N.R. | 50 | 45 | 50 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 95 | 100 | 488 |
| 41.S.N.V. | 50 | 43 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 90 | 100 | 483 |
| 42.S.O.M | 50 | 39 | 46 | 42 | 38 | 50 | 70 | 84 | 419 |
| 43.S.V.V. | 50 | 32 | 50 | 43 | 38 | 50 | 88 | 100 | 451 |
| 44.T.A.M | 50 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 90 | 100 | 488 |
| 45. T.I.V. | 50 | 43 | 44 | 44 | 50 | 50 | 93 | 100 | 474 |
| 46.T.N.V. | 50 | 34 | 50 | 46 | 39 | 50 | 88 | 100 | 457 |
| 47.T.S.G. | 50 | 47 | 39 | 41 | 50 | 49 | 98 | 100 | 474 |
| 48. T.T.S. | 50 | 47 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 95 | 100 | 492 |
| 49.V.A.V | 50 | 50 | 44 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 492 |
| 50.Y.S.G. | 50 | 42 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 492 |
| 51.Z.N.O. | 50 | 41 | 50 | 48 | 48 | 50 | 98 | 100 | 485 |
| Mean | 49.9 | 44.4 | 48.0 | 46.5 | 46.6 | 49.1 | 90.3 | 97.5 | 472.4 |

**b[2]) 1994/1995 academic year - listening test and grammar test results, total for all the tests**

| Student | Listening test | Grammar test | Total for 3 tests (out of 595 points) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Points scored (out of 70) | Points scored (out of 25) | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. A.S.V. | 70 | 17 | 457 |
| 2. A.V.A. | 70 | 15 | 539 |
| 3. B.E.A. | 65 | 21 | 567 |
| 4. B.E.G. | 70 | 24 | 582 |
| 5. B.M.S. | 60 | 17 | 493 |
| 6. B.N.I. | 70 | 20 | 571 |
| 7. B.V.A. | 70 | 22 | 589 |
| 8. B.V.I. | 60 | 19 | 547 |
| 9. B.V.V. | 65 | 24 | 589 |
| 10 D.A.A. | 65 | 19 | 546 |
| 11. D.A.I. | 70 | 17 | 507 |
| 12.D.A.V. | 65 | 22 | 568 |
| 13. D.Y.S. | 65 | 18 | 570 |
| 14.E.V.V. | 60 | 20 | 573 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 15. I.T.A. | 65 | 16 | 565 |
| 16.K.K.V. | 65 | 18 | 582 |
| 17. K.N.I. | 70 | 23 | 568 |
| 18. K.V.I. | 70 | 22 | 547 |
| 19.K.V.V. | 70 | 19 | 552 |
| 20. L.A.G. | 70 | 20 | 562 |
| 21. L.I.L. | 70 | 19 | 566 |
| 22. L.R.A. | 70 | 22 | 591 |
| 23. L.S.P. | 70 | 16 | 580 |
| 24.M.A.R. | 70 | 19 | 578 |
| 25.M.E.N. | 70 | 16 | 573 |
| 26.M.E.V. | 70 | 24 | 590 |
| 27.M.O.V | 70 | 23 | 567 |
| 28.M.T.V. | 60 | 21 | 576 |
| 29.M.V.K | 70 | 24 | 590 |
| 30.M.V.V | 70 | 21 | 586 |
| 31. P.A.E. | 70 | 20 | 574 |
| 32. P.A.L. | 65 | 21 | 517 |
| 33. P.B.E. | 70 | 20 | 572 |
| 34. P.I.Y. | 70 | 22 | 588 |
| 35. P.S.Y. | 50 | 18 | 486 |
| 36. P.V.V. | 60 | 17 | 535 |
| 37. R.S.A. | 70 | 21 | 512 |
| 38. S.E.Y. | 55 | 22 | 549 |
| 39. S.L.Y. | 65 | 25 | 575 |
| 40. S.N.R. | 70 | 24 | 582 |
| 41. S.N.V. | 65 | 23 | 571 |
| 42.S.O.M. | 55 | 19 | 493 |
| 43. S.V.V. | 70 | 21 | 542 |
| 44.T.A.M. | 65 | 19 | 572 |
| 45. T.I.V. | 70 | 16 | 560 |
| 46.T.N.V. | 70 | 17 | 544 |
| 47. T.S.G. | 70 | 17 | 561 |
| 48. T.T.S. | 70 | 24 | 586 |
| 49.V.A.V. | 65 | 20 | 577 |
| 50. Y.S.G. | 70 | 20 | 582 |
| 51. Z.N.O. | 50 | 21 | 556 |
| Mean | 66.5 | 20.1 | 558.9 |

**c[1]) 1995/1996 academic year - speaking (in the form of a dialogue) test results**

| Students | Points (for five dialogues) scored according to criterion No. | | | | | | | | Total for 8 criteria (5 dialogues) out of 500 points |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1. A.E.V. | 50 | 39 | 50 | 39 | 47 | 47 | 100 | 100 | 472 |
| 2. G.K.A. | 50 | 39 | 50 | 39 | 47 | 47 | 100 | 100 | 472 |
| 3. K.P.K. | 50 | 46 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 496 |

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4. L.A.Y. | 50 | 45 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 495 |
| 5.M.A.V. | 50 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 499 |
| 6. M.E.V. | 50 | 44 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 494 |
| 7. P.N.V. | 50 | 38 | 50 | 41 | 45 | 47 | 94 | 97 | 462 |
| 8. P.I.Y. | 50 | 47 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 95 | 100 | 492 |
| 9. T.E.I. | 50 | 38 | 47 | 39 | 45 | 50 | 58 | 100 | 427 |
| 10.T.O.L. | 50 | 44 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 494 |
| 11.T.O.V. | 50 | 40 | 50 | 41 | 45 | 47 | 94 | 99 | 466 |
| Mean | 50.0 | 42.6 | 49.7 | 45.4 | 48.1 | 48.9 | 94.6 | 99.6 | 479.0 |

**$c^2$) 1995/1996 academic year - listening test and grammar test results, total for all the tests**

| Student | Listening test | Grammar test | Total for 3 tests (out of 595 points) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Points scored (out of 70) | Points scored (out of 25) | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1. A.E.V. | 60 | 22 | 554 |
| 2. G.K.A. | 65 | 23 | 560 |
| 3. K.P.K. | 70 | 25 | 591 |
| 4. L.A.Y. | 60 | 21 | 576 |
| 5. M.A.V. | 70 | 25 | 594 |
| 6. M.E.V. | 60 | 24 | 578 |
| 7. P.N.V. | 70 | 20 | 552 |
| 8. P.I.Y. | 70 | 17 | 579 |
| 9. T.E.I. | 60 | 21 | 508 |
| 10. T.O.L. | 70 | 25 | 589 |
| 11. T.O.V. | 60 | 21 | 547 |
| Mean | 65.0 | 22.2 | 566.2 |

Table 3

**Students' Testing Results After the Second Principal Course - Business Communication**

**$a^1$) 1993/1994 academic year - speaking (in the form of dialogue - test 1 and 2) test results**

| Students | Test 1 | Test 2 | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Points scored (out of 60) | Points (for 5 dialogues) scored according to criterion No. | | | | | | | | Total for 8 criteria (5 dialogues) out of 500 points |
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| 1(1)[9].A.E.V. | 59 | 50 | 46 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 496 |

[9] Numbers in brackets refer to the same student's number in tables 1 and 2 in the same academic year.

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2(3).C.A.L. | 53 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 95 | 100 | 495 |
| 3(4).G.A.V. | 60 | 46 | 50 | 50 | 47 | 48 | 49 | 88 | 100 | 478 |
| 4(5).G.T.N. | 56 | 50 | 45 | 50 | 47 | 40 | 50 | 92 | 98 | 472 |
| 5(8).I.N.V. | 55 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 49 | 49 | 50 | 96 | 100 | 494 |
| 6(9).K.A.P. | 47 | 50 | 38 | 50 | 38 | 37 | 48 | 78 | 78 | 417 |
| 7(10).K.A.V. | 50 | 50 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 499 |
| 8(11).K.K.V. | 50 | 50 | 33 | 50 | 40 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 473 |
| 9(14).L.O.A. | 60 | 50 | 46 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 496 |
| 10(16).M.A.D | 60 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 500 |
| 11(17)M.M.A | 50 | 50 | 44 | 50 | 47 | 44 | 50 | 88 | 100 | 473 |
| 12(21).P.A.S. | 60 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 500 |
| 13(23).S.A.S. | 51 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 45 | 43 | 49 | 86 | 100 | 471 |
| 14(25).S.A.Y. | 60 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 48 | 38 | 90 | 100 | 476 |
| 15(27).T.I.O. | 59 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 498 |
| 16(28).T.I.P. | 56 | 50 | 39 | 50 | 40 | 39 | 50 | 90 | 90 | 448 |
| 17(30).T.M.V | 47 | 50 | 43 | 49 | 47 | 43 | 40 | 90 | 95 | 457 |
| 18(30).V.O.V | 60 | 50 | 42 | 50 | 50 | 49 | 50 | 98 | 100 | 489 |
| 19(33).Z.L.N. | 57 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 98 | 100 | 498 |
| Mean | 55.3 | 49.8 | 45.8 | 49.9 | 47.4 | 46.8 | 48.6 | 94.2 | 97.9 | 480.5 |

a[2]) 1993/1994 academic year - speaking (in the form of a monologue - test 3) and listening (test 4) tests results, total for all the tests

| Students | Test 3 | | | | | | | Test 4 | Total for 4 tests (out of 720 points) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Points scored according to criterion No. | | | | | | Total for 6 criteria (out of 60 points) | Points scored (out of 100) | |
| | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1(1).A.E.V. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 715 |
| 2(3).C.A.L. | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 59 | 100 | 707 |
| 3(4).G.A.V. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 50 | 648 |
| 4(5).G.T.N. | 10 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 56 | 100 | 684 |
| 5(8).I.N.V. | 10 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 58 | 100 | 707 |
| 6(9).K.A.P. | 9 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 48 | 100 | 612 |
| 7(10).K.A.V. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 709 |
| 8(11).K.K.V. | 10 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 55 | 100 | 678 |
| 9(14).L.O.A. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 716 |
| 10(16).M.A.D | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 720 |
| 11(17)M.M.A | 10 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 58 | 100 | 681 |
| 12(21).P.A.S. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 720 |
| 13(23).S.A.S. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 682 |
| 14(25).S.A.Y. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 55 | 100 | 691 |
| 15(27).T.I.O. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 717 |
| 16(28).T.I.P. | 10 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 51 | 100 | 655 |
| 17(30).T.M.V | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 664 |
| 18(30).V.O.V | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 59 | 100 | 708 |
| 19(33).Z.L.N. | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 59 | 100 | 714 |
| Mean | 9.9 | 9.2 | 10.0 | 9.5 | 9.3 | 9.8 | 57.8 | 97.4 | 690.9 |

b[1]) 1994/1995 academic year - speaking (in the form of dialogue - test 1 and 2) test results

| Students | Test 1 | Test 2 | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Points scored (out of 60) | Points (for 5 dialogues) scored according to criterion No. | | | | | | | | Total for 8 criteria (5 dialogues) out of 500 points |
| | | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 |
| 1(1).A.S.V. | 47 | 50 | 43 | 49 | 47 | 43 | 40 | 90 | 95 | 457 |
| 2(3).B.E.A. | 60 | 50 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 96 | 100 | 495 |
| 3(5).B.M.S. | 53 | 50 | 38 | 50 | 34 | 31 | 35 | 60 | 83 | 381 |
| 4(6).B.N.I. | 54 | 45 | 47 | 50 | 50 | 47 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 489 |
| 5(7).B.V.A. | 60 | 45 | 47 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 492 |
| 6(8).B.V.I. | 60 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 45 | 50 | 92 | 100 | 487 |
| 7(9).B.V.V. | 60 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 500 |
| 8(10).D.A.A. | 55 | 50 | 45 | 50 | 50 | 30 | 50 | 80 | 90 | 445 |
| 9(14).E.V.V. | 60 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 500 |
| 10(15).I.T.A. | 56 | 50 | 45 | 50 | 45 | 42 | 50 | 93 | 100 | 475 |
| 11(17).K.N.I. | 60 | 49 | 47 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 496 |
| 12(19).K.V.V | 55 | 40 | 25 | 50 | 45 | 50 | 45 | 90 | 90 | 435 |
| 13(21).L.I.L. | 50 | 45 | 35 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 90 | 470 |
| 14(23).L.S.P. | 55 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 50 | 46 | 50 | 100 | 90 | 484 |
| 15(26).M.E.V | 58 | 50 | 47 | 50 | 48 | 47 | 50 | 95 | 100 | 487 |
| 16(27).M.O.V | 51 | 50 | 40 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 90 | 100 | 480 |
| 17(28).M.T.V | 60 | 50 | 43 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 493 |
| 18(30).M.V.V | 60 | 50 | 43 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 493 |
| 19(31).P.A.E. | 50 | 50 | 25 | 50 | 45 | 30 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 450 |
| 20(32).P.A.L. | 50 | 50 | 40 | 50 | 50 | 45 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 485 |
| 21(33).P.B.E. | 55 | 50 | 30 | 50 | 50 | 45 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 475 |
| 22(39).S.L.Y. | 60 | 50 | 46 | 50 | 47 | 46 | 50 | 98 | 100 | 487 |
| 23(40).S.N.R. | 55 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 500 |
| 24(42).S.O.M | 55 | 50 | 35 | 40 | 35 | 50 | 50 | 65 | 65 | 390 |
| 25(43).S.V.V. | 50 | 48 | 34 | 46 | 46 | 30 | 50 | 70 | 90 | 414 |
| 26(44).T.A.M | 52 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 500 |
| 27(45).T.I.V. | 55 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 48 | 50 | 99 | 100 | 497 |
| 28(46).T.N.V. | 60 | 50 | 45 | 50 | 50 | 30 | 50 | 80 | 90 | 445 |
| 29(50).Y.S.G. | 60 | 50 | 44 | 50 | 50 | 46 | 50 | 95 | 95 | 480 |
| 30(51).Z.N.O. | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 500 |
| Mean | 55.5 | 49.1 | 43.0 | 49.5 | 48.1 | 45.0 | 49.0 | 93.1 | 95.9 | 472.7 |

b[2]) 1994/1995 academic year - speaking (in the form of a monologue - test 3) and listening (test 4) tests results, total for all the tests

| Students | Test 3 | | | | | | | Test 4 | Total for 4 tests (out of 720 points) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Points scored according to criterion No. | | | | | | Total for 6 criteria (out of 60 points) | Points scored (out of 100) | |
| | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1(1).A.S.V. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 664 |
| 2(3).B.E.A. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 50 | 665 |
| 3(5).B.M.S. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 59 | 100 | 593 |
| 4(6).B.N.I. | 10 | 6 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 10 | 53 | 100 | 696 |
| 5(7).B.V.A. | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 59 | 100 | 711 |
| 6(8).B.V.I. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 707 |
| 7(9).B.V.V. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 720 |
| 8(10).D.A.A. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 55 | 100 | 655 |
| 9(14).E.V.V. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 720 |
| 10(15).I.T.A. | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 59 | 100 | 690 |
| 11(17).K.N.I. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 716 |
| 12(19).K.V.V | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 650 |
| 13(21).L.I.L. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 680 |
| 14(23).L.S.P. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 699 |
| 15(26).M.E.V | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 59 | 100 | 704 |
| 16(27).M.O.V | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 55 | 100 | 686 |
| 17(28).M.T.V | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 713 |
| 18(30).M.V.V | 10 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 58 | 100 | 711 |
| 19(31).P.A.E. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 660 |
| 20(32).P.A.L. | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 55 | 100 | 690 |
| 21(33).P.B.E. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 50 | 640 |
| 22(39).S.L.Y. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 59 | 100 | 706 |
| 23(40).S.N.R. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 715 |
| 24(42).S.O.M | 10 | 5 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 50 | 100 | 595 |
| 25(43).S.V.V. | 8 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 54 | 100 | 618 |
| 26(44).T.A.M | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 59 | 100 | 711 |
| 27(45).T.I.V. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 712 |
| 28(46).T.N.V. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 10 | 55 | 100 | 660 |
| 29(50).Y.S.G. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 58 | 100 | 698 |
| 30(51).Z.N.O. | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 60 | 100 | 710 |
| Mean | 9.9 | 9.1 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 9.2 | 9.9 | 58.2 | 96.7 | 683.2 |

The data in tables 1, 2, 3 underwent statistical analysis. Its purpose was to determine their validity and the significance of differences (variability) between sampling and generalized variances. It was necessary to find out whether the sampling variances, i.e. the minimum and the maximum values in every vertical column in all the tables, were the same values that one and the same generalized variance included as its members. The positive answer would mean that individual differences in testing results of different students (irrespective of their sex, age, and occupation differences) were statistically insignificant, and in any other similar

group of adolescent and adult learners in identical learning conditions similar results could reasonably be expected. Similar comparison of testing results in different years had to be made because if they proved identical or closely similar, it would be an even stronger evidence supporting the conclusion that the method of teaching, teaching and learning materials etc. ensured stable learning outcomes, stable students' attainment of quite a definite level of communicative competence.

The t-test was used for statistical analysis as the handiest procedure for drawing conclusions concerning differences or similarities of 2 groups of data (Gagliardi, 1994:13). As Gagliardi (1994: 13) points out: "A great advantage of t-distribution is that it behaves like a normal distribution but it functions with small samples of a maximum 30 subjects". In this way the analysis followed the standard t-test procedures of experimental data processing: dividing collected data into groups for comparing them two at a time in order to decide if they come from the same population (i.e. if they are basically identical or closely similar), employing in computations quantiles of Fischer's and Student's distributions, inter-comparing maximum and minimum mean variances in separate groups of students in the framework of their total number, and comparing those variances with relevant distributions.

The analysis demonstrated that in all cases (p=0.95 ... 0.99) all the sampling variances values were fully within the bounds of one and the same generalized variance. It was computed that in testing after the Introductory Phonetic Course in 1993/1994 academic year an average student scored 89.86% ± 1.3% of all the points out of 20 in test 1; 88.7% ± 0.65% of points out of 5 in test 2; 90.81 ± 1.7% of points out of 25 in test 3; 89.23% ± 3.4% of points out of 50 in test 4, and 94.1% ± 0.5% of points out of 6 in test 5. The total testing score for such an average student was 95.4% ± 4.75% of points out of 106.

Relevant figures for the Introductory Phonetic Course testing in 1994/1995 academic year were 89.0% ± 1.5%; 87.7% ± 0.76%; 86.3% ± 2.22%; 88.8 ± 6.6%; 92.9% ± 0.6%; 94.3% ±6.3%. Finally, for 1995/1996 academic year such figures were 93.2% ± 1.6%; 96.0% ± 0.4%; 90.5% ± 2.8%; 91.5% ± 3.1%; 93.9% ± 0.7%; 97.5% ± 6.5%. It can be seen, even without any additional mathematical analysis (it was done and fully confirmed the following conclusions), that the statistical analysis data above convincingly prove not only the fact that the overwhelming majority of students had very high testing results (approaching the top scores) after the Introductory Phonetic Course. They also prove that such results for different years are not only very close but in a number of cases almost identical. Finally, they prove that individual differences of students in testing results (reflected in figures after ±) are not very great, never exceeding ± 6.6%.

The testing results after the first principal course (everyday oral communication) for an average student in 1993/1994 academic year were 93.7% ± 38.9% of points scored out of 500 points in test1 (speaking); 89.3% ± 7.5% of points scored out of 70 in test 2 (listening); 81.9% ± 3.1% of points scored out of 25 in test 3 (grammar). The total testing result was 92.7% ± 40,7% of points out of 595. In 1994/1995 academic year the results for test 1 were 94.5% ± 27.6% of points out of 500; for test 2 they were 94.95% ± 7.1% of points out of 70; for test 3 they were 80.4% ± 2.6% of points out of 25, with the total of 93.8% ± 27.3% of points out of 595. In 1995/1996 academic year the corresponding figures were 95.8% ± 3.2 ; 92.9% ± 3.2%; 88.7% ± 3.2%; 95.2% ± 3.2%.

Again the figures obtained in statistical analysis demonstrate not only high results of testing in all the years but also the uniformity and stability of such results from year to year. But there is one difference as compared to the statistical analysis

data of the Introductory Phonetic Course testing results. There the individual deviations, as shown by all the figures after ±, were insignificant meaning uniformly high test scores for practically all the individual students with exceptions (test failures) extremely rare, if at all possible. It was the same with the results of tests 2 and 3 in all the years of testing after the first principal course and with the results of test 1 in 1995/1996 academic year. In these cases individual deviations never exceeded ± 7.5% (see above). But speaking test results in 1993/1994 and 1994/1995 academic years showed the top possible individual deviations of ± 38.9% and ± 27.6% (see above). Such speaking test individual deviations range also made this range very great for the total test figures in both of the academic years: ± 40.7% and ± 27.3% (see above).

Further analysis showed that the wide range of individual deviations demonstrated by speaking tests statistical computation data, which signified the minus boundary of these deviation being lower than the test failure score, had as its cause the testing results of very few students. For instance, in 1993/1994 academic year the only examinee who failed the speaking test was G.Y.M. (see No.7 in table 2, $a^1$) but his result greatly influenced the individual deviations range for all the group. The same, though to a much lesser degree, can be said about the speaking test results of students G.V.N. and S.A.S. in 1993/1994 academic year (see No.6 and No.23 in table 2, $a^1$). In 1994/1995 academic year only student A.S.V. (No. 1 in table $2b^1$) failed the speaking test, and only 5 students (B.M.S., D.A.I., P.S.Y., R.S.A., S.0.M. - see No.5 No. 11, No.35, No.37, No.42 in table 2, $b^1$), though they passed the test, and not with a narrow margin at all, had their results substantially lower than those of the other students in the group of this year. It is just such students, who make either an exception (those failing the test) or an absolute minority (those passing the test but with much lower scores than the others), that become the cause of some wide ranges of possible individual deviations in testing results. At the same time this wide range when compared to the very high testing results of the absolute majority of students in every academic year (these results being reflected in all the statistical analysis figures preceding the ± sign) emphasizes the high efficiency of the course in question for such an absolute majority.

After the second principal course (that of business communication) the testing results of an average student in 1993/1994 academic year according to the statistical analysis were 92.2% ± 4.8% of points scored out of 60 in test I (guided dialogue); 97.9% ± 5.4% of points scored out of 500 in test 2 (speaking in the form of a dialogue); 96.3 ± 3.4% of points scored out of 60 in test 3 (speaking in the form of a monologue); 97.4% ± 11.4% of points scored out of 100 in test 4 (listening). The total figures for all the four tests were 95.9% ± 16.8 of points scored out of 720 points. The corresponding figures for 1994/1995 academic year testing were 92.6% ± 4.1% of all the points scored in test 1; 94.6% ± 18.6% of all the points scored in test 2; 96.8% ± 3.0% of all the points scored in test 3; 96.7% ± 12.7% of all the points scored in test 4, with the total of 94.7% ± 39.2% of all the points scored in four tests. Figures it table 3 and those obtained in their statistical analysis make draw absolutely the same conclusions that were drawn on the basis of the first principal course testing results.

In general, all the data given above in tables 1, 2, 3 and their statistical analysis make it possible to draw quite definite conclusions concerning the efficiency of the intensive program as a whole and of its separate courses. And the only possible conclusion that can be made from all the table figures and their mathematical analysis is that the testing results prove the high efficiency of the

program and its courses without a shadow of a doubt. As can be seen from the description of the testing procedure in 4.1, it was rather strict so that testing results could be a valid indication of student's success or failure in any given course. The results (learning outcomes) obtained are an indication of an overall success of the overwhelming majority of learners in all the 3 courses and during all the three years. Besides the quantitative analysis above of the figures from tables 1, 2, 3, it can also be proved by the qualitative analysis of these figures.

For instance, in 1993/1994 academic year in the Introductory Phonetic Course testing the total results of 28 students out of 34 were excellent (91 points and higher out of 106), and only the results of 6 students were good (81 - 90 points). There was not a single even satisfactory result, to say nothing of failures (less than 76 points). In separate tests included in this testing procedure there was only one failure (student A.O.V. in test 1 scored only 13 points out of 20 with points below 15 considered as a failure level - see table 1a, No.2). But this failure may be considered as accidental (maybe, due to anxiety at the beginning of testing) because in other 4 tests the same student demonstrated very high results scoring 92 points for all 5 of them (i.e., an excellent total outcome).

In 1994/1995 academic year there was one failure in testing after the Introductory Phonetic Course out of 51 cases. P.I.Y. (table 1b, No.34) scored 14 points out of 20 in test I and 31 points out of 50 in test 4 (above the failure level score being at 37). The total score was also below the failure level - 73 points. There were also 3 failures in test 1 (students I.T.A., S.V.V., T.N.V. - see table 1b, No.15, No.43, No.46). But these results, just like in the case of student A.O.V. in 1993/1994 academic year, may be considered as accidental because in all the other 4 tests these three students demonstrated satisfactory, good, or excellent performance coming up at the end with good or excellent total scores. As to all the other 47 students in that year, the outcome of their testing in total scores was excellent for 40 of them and good for seven, with all separate tests generally passed with either good or excellent scores. In 1995/1996 academic year the results were even better: no failures for the test as a whole (only excellent results and good ones) and no failures in separate tests.

Therefore, the high efficiency and guarantee in attaining the planned teaching/learning effect in the preparatory course could be considered as proved by the results not only of quantitative analysis but by the qualitative analysis as well.

Much more important for proving the efficiency of the course as a whole were the testing results after the two principal courses. In testing after the course of everyday communication in 1993/1994 academic year 27 students out of 34 passed it with excellent total scores (more than 531 points out of 595). There were only 5 good total results (474 - 531 points) and one satisfactory result (the already mentioned student S.A.S. with the total score of 473 points - see table $2a^2$, No.23). The student in question passed the listening and grammar tests with good scores but speaking test results were only satisfactory (392 points - see No.23 in table $2a^2$), and it predetermined the total score. There was also one failure case in total testing results - the already mentioned student G.Y.M. (table 2 $a^1$ and $a^2$, No.7) who failed the speaking test having scored only 309 points in it, with the failure score being below 375 points. The cause of this failure is not the age of the student (46 - the second oldest student among all those enrolled this year) since the learner who was much older than he (L.I.A. - sixty years of age) had excellent results in speaking and listening tests (table 2 $a^1$ and $a^2$, No.13). The cause of G.Y.M.'s failure in the speaking test was purely personal as this student, being a manager and a very busy person, missed about 40% of his classes. But despite that, he had good scores in the

listening test and excellent ones in the test of grammar. Even in the speaking test, though he failed it, the score demonstrated that he was quite able to explain what he wanted communicating in English with the aim of solving his everyday problems. As to the other students, their communicative competence development level was quite high.

The situation was approximately the same in 1994/1995 academic year. There was only one failure in the speaking test - the already mentioned student A.S.V. (table $2b^1$ and $b^2$, No. 1). The cause of this learner's (who was 17 years old and a high school student) failure was also missing many classes during the course - about 30%. But in this case the learner was on the verge of passing the test having scored 370 points with 375 points being the required minimum. Because of this fact she could achieve the total testing score that was higher than the failure level (457 points) since her listening test result was excellent (70 points) and her grammar test result was satisfactory (17 points). All the other students had either good or excellent results in the speaking test, i.e. higher than 400 points.

In the listening test there was only one satisfactory result, i.e. 55 points, for 51 examinees (S.E.Y. - see table 2 $b^2$, No.38) and two failures - 50 points (P.S.Y., Z.N.O. - table 2 $b^2$, No.35 and 51). Both of these students had high scores in speaking, so their failures in the listening test could either be accidental or an indicator of some specific faults in individual development of listening skills. It is interesting to note that in 1993/1994 academic year there were four students who failed the listening test (A.E.V., G.T.N., M.O.V., O.A.N. - table 2 $a^1$, No.1, No.5, No.18, No.20) even though these students passed the speaking test with excellent results (A.E.V., G.T.N., O.A.P.), or, at least, with good ones (M.O.V.). It is one more evidence of the fact that good development of speaking skills is not always followed by parallel development of listening skills.

One more fact is of some interest. Both in 1993/1994 and in 1994/1995 academic years there were a few students who failed the grammar test: 2 in 1993/1994 academic year (C.A.L., V.O.V. - table $2a^2$, No.3, No.31) 2nd 5 in 1994/1995 academic year (A.V.A., I.T.A., L.S.P., M.E.N., T.I.V. - table $2b^2$, No.2, No.15, No.23, No.25, No.45) though all these 7 persons had excellent results in speaking and 6 of them had excellent results in the listening test (with one good result - student V.O.V.). It means that in the speaking test the learners in question made very few grammar and other language errors which could be called serious, i.e. making some difficulty for an interlocutor in understanding the meaning of the utterance. And in fact students C.A.L. and T.I.V. made only 7 such errors each in 5 dialogues, V.O.V. an M.E.N. made one of them each, student A.V.A. - four, students I.T.N. and L.S.P. - six such errors each (see criterion No.2 in table $2a^1$ and $b^1$).

The fact that none of these students made more than 7 serious grammar errors in 5 lengthy conversations while every one of them made nine or even ten errors in the grammar test[10] signifies two things. The first is that the number of really serious errors was not significant in the speech of our students because only such errors were the reason for deducting points in the speaking test according to criterion No.2. None of the students failed this test because of inadequacy of speaking skill development in accordance with the accuracy of speech criterion. It is most probably due to the employment of the communicative-analytic approach because when intensive and other second or foreign language programs are

[10] It should be reminded that in the grammar test a student could score 25 points with one point deducted for every error. 17 points was the lowest score above the failure level, and all those who failed this test scored not more than 15 or 16 points (table $2a^1$ and $b^1$).

designed exclusively on the basis of the communicative approach, students' speech is often a curious blend of target and native languages with a multitude of grammatical errors that hinder communication. Immersion is a good example of it, as follows from what Collinson (1989) and Safty (1989) wrote in their articles. This shortcoming is totally absent from the intensive program under discussion. But the second thing to be noted from the fact that there may be more errors made in the grammar test than in actual speaking is that in reality in the process of speaking our students commit more grammatical errors than are within the scope of action of criterion No.2. This criterion was supposed to embrace only those errors that could really hinder comprehension while an assessor might ignore all the errors that were insignificant. On the contrary, the grammar test took account of all grammatical errors - whether they impeded communication or not. But in this case the fact that only a few students failed to pass the test in grammar is an additional testimony of grammatical training which is quite adequate for developing sufficient grammatical skills, while the high results of speaking and listening tests testify that grammar training does not impede the development of communicative competence. This can only be the merit of the balanced nature of the communicative-analytic approach.

The results of testing after the everyday communication course in 1995/1996 academic year were also similar to those described above. They could even be considered as the highest in all the three years of testing because in the speaking test 10 students out of 11 scored excellent results, and only one student scored a good result (no satisfactory results). In the listening test 6 students had excellent results and 5 students good results (no satisfactory results again). Finally, in the grammar test, just like in the preceding years, the results were poorer than in the tests checking communicative skills development: excellent results of 5 students, good results of 5 other students, and only a satisfactory result of the last (eleventh) student. But that year there were no failures in the grammar test.

Therefore, the three years long testing results and their qualitative (as well as quantitative) analysis testify to the very high efficiency of the everyday communication course. Both of these kinds of analysis give sufficient evidence supporting the expectation of similar learning results to be obtained whenever the course under consideration is employed in similar teaching/learning conditions. It means that for the absolute majority (practically for all) of adult and adolescent students of different ages and occupations this course guarantees oral communicative competence development sufficient for speaking English in everyday situations in accordance with their communicative needs when they come to an English-speaking country. They will also easily understand what is said to them in such situations. The language that students employ in this communication is accurate enough to be understood without any difficulty by native-speakers testifying to the adequate language (formal) training in the course. Thus, the first of the principal courses of the intensive program, just like its preparatory course, may be said to fully meet the ends for which it was developed.

The second principal course (business communication) testing results were even higher than in the preceding course. During the two years of testing, as can be seen from table $3a^1$, $a^2$, $b^1$, $b^2$, there was not a single case of failure either in total scores or in any of the four separate tests. The total scores of 49 students during 2 years were only good or excellent with not a single satisfactory result (16 excellent results and 3 good ones in 1993/1994 academic year and 25 excellent results and 5 good ones in 1994/1995 academic year). Scores lower than good or excellent ones were quite a rarity even for separate tests. For instance, in test 1 there were only 2 satisfactory scores in 1993/1994 academic year (47 points - students K.A.P. and

T.M.V. - see table 3a[1], No.6, 17) and one such score of 47 points in 1994/1995 academic year (student A.S.V. - table 3b[1], No. 1). In test 2 there were no satisfactory scores in 1993/1994 academic year (only good and excellent ones) and only two satisfactory scores in 1994/1995 academic year (students B.M.S. and S.O.M. who scored 381 and 390 points for five dialogues - see table 3b[1], No.3 and No.24). In test 3 there was only one satisfactory score (48 points scored by student K.A.P. - see table 3a[2], No.6) in 1993/1994 academic year, and there were no such scores in 1994/1995 academic year.

Finally, in the listening test (test 4) there was only one case in 1993/1994 academic year when a student could not do a problem-solving task after listening and had to listen to a new text and do a new task to get the minimum of 50 points (student G.A.V. - table 3a[2], No.3). In 1994/1995 academic year there were not more than 2 similar cases among 30 students (B.E.A., P.B.N. - table 3b[2], No.2, No.21). In all the three cases it was not lack of understanding aural information but missing some important detail while listening, and it was just that, and not the underdevelopment of listening skills that prevented the students from coping with the first listening task. It was proved by subsequent interviews with the three examinees in question and by the fact that there was no difficulty for them when doing the second listening test task which was in no way easier than the first one. So, in testing after the business communication course there were no real indications that some students had their listening skills underdeveloped, as it was in testing after the everyday communication course when six examinees had failed the listening test (see before). Moreover, there were indications that those students who had had problems with the listening test after the everyday communication course sharply improved their listening skills in the business course attaining the required level. Confirmation of this statement can be seen in the fact that of the six students who had failed in the listening test after the first principal course, three continued to learn English in the business course. All these three students (A.E.V., G.T.K. in 1993/1994 academic year and Z.N.O. in 1994/1595 academic year) passed the listening test in this course at the first trial and without any difficulty (see table 3a[2], No. 1, 4 and b[2], No.30).

In general, the total absence of failures, very few scores that were not higher than satisfactory, radical improvement of some skills that several students had underdeveloped in the period of learning English in the preceding course signify not only the high efficiency of the business course proper. They mean that this course has a very good finalizing effect for the program as a whole, "polishing up", "putting finishing touches" to what remained undone or underdone at the preceding stage - in this way completing the development of students' oral communicative competence. The high efficiency of the business course proved by the testing results discussed above is the final proof of the high efficiency of the developed intensive program in its entirety. This efficiency means that both the intensive program and its integral parts (courses) fully meet the requirements and ends for which they were created reliably ensuring the teaching/learning outcomes. What is very important - the testing results clearly demonstrate the absence of any differences in such successful learning outcomes that could be ascribed to students' differences in sex, age, and occupation. It is a clear indication of the suitability of the program for all the categories of adolescent and adult students.

### 4.4. Students' Evaluation of the Intensive Program

The high efficiency of the intensive program proved by the testing results and their analysis could be called the objective efficiency. But to he sure of its overall efficiency it was also desirable to find out whether this program was subjectively efficient in students' opinion. To do this, the evaluation of the program by students was required. It was done in two ways.

The first one was by using numerical evaluation combined with interviewing students on the results and reasons of the numerical evaluation made by every individual learner. All those students who finished the everyday communication course and were examinees in the testing procedure described before were asked to evaluate the course using a 100 point scale, depending on how fully it met their personal needs and requirements in learning English. As it was only an oral everyday communication course, those students who also needed Business English course, as well as reading and writing skills, were indicating as many points out of 100 as, in their opinion, would faithfully reflect the real part of their overall communicative needs that could be covered by their communicative competence in English (developed during learning it in the course in question). After the evaluation was done students were interviewed on their reasons for indicating a particular number of points.

As a result in 1993/1994 academic year 25 students out of 34 evaluated this course with 50-90 points (11 students - 50 points, 1 - 55, 4 - 60, 1 - 65, 4 - 70, 4 - 80, 1 - 85, and 1 student - 90 points). Nine students evaluated the course with 20-45 points (2 students - 20 points, 1 - 30, 4 - 35, 1 - 40, and I student - 45 points). The data for 1994/1995 academic year were as follows. 37 students out of 51 evaluated the course with 50 points and more (11 students - 50 points, 3 - 55, 6 - 60, 5 - 70, 1 - 75, 2 - 80, 4 - 90, 4 - 95, 1 student - 100 points). 14 students evaluated it with 20 - 45 points (2 students - 20 points, 1 - 25, 1 - 30, 4 - 35, 2 - 40, 4 students - 45 points). In 1995/1996 academic year the evaluation figures were quite similar: 9 out of 11 students evaluated the course with 50 and more points (2 students - 50 points, 1 - 75, 1 - 80, 1 - 81, 1 - 83, 2 - 85, 1 student - 100 points). One student in all the group evaluated the course with 30 points and one more student - with 45 points.

Interviewing the students after they finished their evaluation demonstrated that the figures above reflected a very high students' opinion of the course's efficiency. Not a single student expressed the slightest dissatisfaction with this course, all of them agreeing that it fully achieved what it was planned to achieve guaranteeing acquiring oral communication skills enabling to communicate in English (and quite fluently at that) in a broad range of everyday situations. But the majority of students were sure that they needed more than just this course, and so made the evaluations in accordance with how every individual student understood his or her needs.

It turned out in interviewing that all those students who evaluated the everyday communication course with 50-80 points thought that as an addition to it they first of all needed reading and writing skills. As to the course of ESP (Business English), many of them planned to attend it but considered it not more, and often less, important than the course of everyday communication. A considerable part of these students were not interested in Business English (or any other ESP) at all, and did not plan to attend the second course. So, all such students made their evaluation in accordance with how much they thought they needed additional reading, writing, or ESP courses but taking it for granted that the course just finished had given them at least half of what they needed.

On the contrary, all those students who evaluated the course with not more than 20-45 points, said during interviewing that they enrolled primarily to learn Business English and thought the everyday communication course to be nothing more than a preliminary stage. Finally, interviewing demonstrated that all those students who did not want either an additional ESP course or developing reading and writing skills were the learners giving the highest evaluation marks to the oral communication course: 81, 83, 85, 90-100 points (2 students in 1993/1994 academic year, 9 students in 1994/1995 academic year, 5 of them in 1995/1996 academic year). It means that this course practically fully suited their overall needs in English while the evaluation marks by all the other students, if considered from the point of view of the results of their interviewing, prove these learners' high opinion of its efficiency as an integral part (but only a part) of a broader course of English.

The evaluation of the Business English course was done in the same manner by the students who finished it. In 1993/1994 academic year all the 19 students evaluated it with 50-90 points out of 100 (1 student - 50 points, 5 - 60, 2 - 65, - 70, 4 - 75, 2 - 60, 1 - 85, 2 - 90 points). The data were quite similar in 1994/1995 academic year when 8 students of 30 gave 50 points to the business course, 3 - 60, 3 - 70, 5 - 75, 4 - 80, 4 - 90, and 3 - 100 points. All the students thought, as was made clear from subsequent interviewing, that they needed reading and writing skills so they evaluated the oral Business English course with 50-60 points if it fully satisfied their needs and requirements in oral business communication but gave them less than enough in reading and writing. More than 60 points were given if the learners thought that concomitantly the course had taught them reading and writing skills in business communication. The mark was the higher the more fully developed, in students' opinions, these skills were in accordance with their personal requirements[11]. Thus, those three students in 1994/1995 academic year who evaluated the business course with 100 points said in interviews that the reading and writing skills they acquired in it together with speaking and listening skills fully satisfied their needs. Developing reading and writing skills was not really the task of the intensive course, and reading and writing were used only as an aid to acquiring speaking and listening skills (see chapters 2 and 3). So, if a student acquired these skills and evaluated the business course with 50 points, i.e. as half meeting his/her needs for mastering business communication in English, it meant that the needs in oral business communication were met in full and the course had achieved its end.

The conclusion that the students had really evaluated parts of the intensive program as highly as it follows from what was said above was confirmed by one more numerical evaluation they were asked to do. Those students who passed through all the 3 stages of the intensive program ( i.e. after the business course and simultaneously with evaluating this particular course) were asked to evaluate the program as a whole using a 100-points scale. But this time they were supposed to assess not how well this program met their overall needs in mastering English (speaking, listening, reading, and writing), but how well it met their expectations of an oral communication course, whether they got everything from it they had expected at enrollment stage. In this kind of evaluation in 1993/1994 academic year

[11] It may be said that the data about students' needs in reading and in writing contradict the data in chapter 2 (2.3) demonstrating that the majority of potential learners do not care much about these skills. But it should be remembered that needs before learning change in the process and after it - having acquired speaking and listening skills, students start needing reading and writing.

2 students out of 19 gave 70 points out of 100 to the program, 4 students gave 80 points, 2 - 85, 3 - 90, 7 - 100 points and one student evaluated the program with 120 points (more than the scale permitted). In 1994/1995 academic year 5 students out of 30 gave 70 points to the intensive program, 2 students gave 75 points, 1 - 80, 5 - 90, 16 students - 100 points. One student gave 200 points. It means that practically all the students admitted they had obtained everything they could reasonably expect of a good and efficient oral communication program, and two students thought that the program exceeded their expectations.

Therefore, numerically (taking into account the explanations received from all the learners in subsequent interviews) students assessed the whole program's efficiency quite high. But to make the results of such evaluations more valid, both after the everyday communication course and after the business course students were also asked to write their opinion about each of the courses and the program as a whole (every student was free in choosing the form in which to express her/his opinion in writing and could make this writing as detailed and lengthy as s/he thought proper). It was the second way of getting students' evaluation of the program. Learners wrote about their impressions only in their mother tongue (so, all the examples of students' opinions below are given in translation) since they were not taught writing in English as a specific set of skills and it was necessary to provide opportunities of fully and freely describing impressions and giving opinions.

Of the 95 students who wrote about their impressions during three years not a single one expressed even a slightly negative opinions. All the impressions were highly positive. For instance, such opinions about the everyday communication course as those given below were quite characteristic:

*I enjoyed my classes of English very much. There you learn and have fun at one and the same time. I enjoyed working with the aid of a computer and would like to have more of this activity. Listening to tape-recorded English speech helped a lot. Talking in English in small groups ensured developing speaking skills. I am satisfied with the results. Thank you for the method of teaching and great thanks to the teachers.*

(G.T.N., 29 years old, an engineer, 1993/1994 academic year)

*With the aid of this wonderful program I have really got command English. The teaching approach is the best. The classes are very good and interesting. Thanks a lot for the opportunity of learning very effectively.*

(D.A.A., 22 years old, an industrial worker, 1994/1995 academic year)

All the other written evaluations are usually in the same tenor meaning that students' opinions are highly positive. But, just like in the evaluation by G.T.N. above, eagerness is often expressed to have more classes where computers (i.e. computer-assisted training of grammatical forms) are used. Many other students stated without ambiguity that work devoted specifically to learning grammar should have a greater share. A good example is the following evaluation:

*This course gave me an opportunity of mastering everyday communication in English. It enabled me to learn English and acquire speaking skills. But it would be better if more attention was focused on grammar in our classes.*

(Y.S.G., 25 years old, a housewife, 1994/1995 academic year)

Opinions of this kind were quite numerous. It certainly does not mean that the share of grammar focusing should really be increased in the course as it can only be done to the detriment of communicative teaching/learning. But it does give one more confirmation of the correctness of Green's (1993) statement that students often think language focusing activities to be not less (if not more) effective than communicative activities. It also gives support to the already mentioned in Chapter 2 Nunan's recommendation (1988: 95) of using traditional learning activities, especially at the initial stages. And finally, such students' opinions are an indirect support to the communicative-analytic approach when communication is combined with language focusing.

Students often indicated as one of the important advantages of the oral everyday communication course its acculturation potential that played a great part in making them acquainted with the American and British cultures, ways of life, norms of behavior etc. An example can be found in the following opinion:

*I think that the course has a great merit of making students learn the elements of culture, customs, teaches them how to behave abroad. Without it, it is possible to learn the language only with great limitations.*

(M.E.V., 35 years old, a housewife, 1995/1996 academic year)

As to the business communication course, students' evaluation of it was even higher than of the preceding course. There were no critical remarks, like the one given in the evaluation of Y.S.G. above. The evaluations given below as examples were quite typical.

*I want to say "Thank you very much!" to all those who worked on developing this program of learning English. Besides getting command it, I learned a lot in the field of business.*

(I.N.T., 24 years old, a secretary, 1993/1994 academic year)

*The course is designed perfectly. The classes were very interesting and organized as continuous simulations in the field of business and marketing. Thank you very much for the mastery of English that I have acquired.*

(S.L.Y., 26 years old, a university student, 1994/1995 academic year)

*My greatest thanks to those who created and organized the course "Starting Business Relations". It is wonderful that during such a short period of time and having no opportunity of learning outside the classroom, I have acquired such a good command of English which I already use in my professional activities.*

(T.N.V., 46 years old, a research associate, 1994/1995 academic year)

Therefore, it may be safely asserted that the written (verbal) evaluation of the intensive program by our students was quite high. It not only matched their own positive numerical evaluation of it but was even more clear and expressive on the positive side. Thus, the subjective efficiency of this program may be considered as well proved as its objective efficiency.

## Summary

The necessity of assessing the efficiency of the intensive program as a whole and its separate courses made it expedient to develop an objective testing system for

finding out the learning outcomes. It also required a specific selection of students to be tested so as to get an authentic picture of how efficient the program was when teaching adolescent and adult learners of different ages and occupations. As a result, testing proved a very high efficiency both of the program itself in its entirety and of its parts. It was found out that this program and its courses fully and without fail met the ends for which they had been designed enabling students to attain exactly those levels of oral communicative competence in English that had been scheduled as the program's and its courses' goals. This high standard was reached in teaching all kinds of adolescent and adult students irrespective of their sex, age, or occupation. Such conclusions were confirmed by the statistical analysis of the testing results and their qualitative analysis. The objectively high efficiency of the program is reinforced by its subjective efficiency. It is seen from the fact that students evaluated it highly both in using a numerical scale and when sharing their impressions verbally. It means that the program is not only really efficient but the students think it to be efficient which is very important for obtaining the required learning outcomes. It testifies to the soundness and correctness both of the theoretical foundations of this program and its practical design.

# CHAPTER 5. INTENSIVE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN THE USA AND UKRAINE: SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES

It has already been said that the intensive program of English described in this book, despite all its original characteristics, is in many principal features typical of intensive foreign language programs spread all over the territory of the former Soviet Union. But it was desirable to find out whether this program was comparable to intensive ESL programs existing in the West, i.e. whether it could be considered as a manifestation of world-wide tendency in designing such programs.

The chance of such an in-depth comparison was given to the author of this book by the fact that in August-December 1995 he worked in the USA as a Fulbright grantee at the English Language Institute - a division of the State University of New York at Buffalo, New York. The intensive program of English taught at this Institute to international students coming to the USA may be considered as quite typical for that country. It is also a successful program. The author does not possess numerical data as to the successful learning outcomes (and it is not his business to supply them) but the very fact of this Institute's international popularity - it has students from 101 countries and never lacks applicants during the enrollment period - testifies to the teaching/learning success. That is why comparing the two programs, the American and the Ukrainian one - both successful and both typical for their countries - could give a clear response to the question whether the design and structure of the intensive program of English in Ukraine was based on the same fundamental notions and tendencies that underlie intensive EFL/ESL teaching in the West, i.e. whether it matched the Western (US) standards. Such a comparison was made possible thanks to the kind cooperation of Dr. Stephen C. Dunnett, Director of the English Language Institute ( ELI) who gave his permission to include into this book a short description of the Intensive English Program implemented there.

It should be said that at the ELI there are 2 principal language programs. One is quite specific - for instance, it is used for improving language skills of the international teaching assistants and is in general mainly designed for the University context. This program called "English as a Second Language, Credit Program" will not be discussed further because of its specificity and total incomparability with the Ukrainian program. Incomparability is due to the fact that English as a second language program is designed for the kind of students who are typical only of the USA and not of Ukraine (students such as the already mentioned international teaching assistants). But the other "The Intensive English Program" is of the greatest interest for the purpose of comparison. First of all, it is a typical intensive program and second, just as the Ukrainian intensive program, it is aimed at students of different ages and occupations pursuing different ends in learning English. So, it is to the discussion and comparison of this program that the chapter is devoted.

One of the aims of the "The Intensive English Program"[12] is teaching English to students coming to the USA with the purpose of entering one of the American universities and getting their education there. So, the course is considerably EAP orientated, and the majority of students are in their mid-twenties. But as it is supposed that those who finish the course will be able to major in quite different fields after entering an American university, the program is not strictly specialized.

[12] In describing the Intensive English Program in this chapter, besides observations made by the author, the prospectus (revised in 1992) of ELI published at the State University of New York at Buffalo is used, as well as the ELI syllabuses and curricula prepared by Program's academic coordinator, Assistant Director Barbara A. Campbell.

Besides, the program is aimed at teaching English for non-academic purposes too (everyday communication and other ends which can be pursued by different students). That is why the program is for a great part a course of General English, though with a substantial part of the material directly related to EAP. Thanks to that the students not only in their mid-twenties but also ranging in age from the late teens to the late fifties often get enrolled and their occupations and plans for using English are often very varied.

Only those persons are enrolled who have been learning English before (in their own countries or elsewhere), i.e. those who have already reached some elementary level of communicative competence sufficient for at least primitive communication in English. The initial level of this competence is determined at enrollment stage with the aid of placement testing. According to its results students are assigned to groups of different levels of initial proficiency in English. They can be assigned to low intermediate, intermediate, high intermediate, or advanced groups (there are false beginners' groups as well). The structure of teaching/learning process for different levels is similar, if not to say identical, the difference being in the degree of complexity and difficulty of materials for teaching and learning that are used depending on the initial proficiency of students in a group As a result, at the end of the course students from groups of different levels attain different levels of communicative competence development and acquire unequal language skills. That is why it is not an infrequent occurrence for students who finished their course in a lower level group to start it again but in a higher level group.

The course is approximately 15 weeks long, so there are two enrollments annually: one for the fall semester and another one for the spring semester. Besides, there is a third enrollment for a somewhat more intensive 12-week summer program beginning in late May. There are 25 hours of instruction every week, i.e. 5 days a week with 5 classes per day, every class lasting one academic hour (50 minutes). A feature which is quite distinct from the system of organizing foreign language classes in the former USSR is that at the ELI every class during the day concentrates on some separate communication or language skills. Thus, one class every day is assigned to oral communication (speaking) skills development, two consecutive classes (two fifty-minute hours) to reading and writing, one whole class is grammar orientated, and finally, one class is devoted to the language laboratory. During this class attention is primarily focused on listening skills though other communicative activities are also pursued, such as developing spoken English. In this class pronunciation practice is of great importance too. Consequently, students have five hours of oral communication (speaking) classes, ten hours of reading and writing classes, five hours in the language laboratory, and five hours of grammar classes per week. This distribution is unchangeable during the course, so the organizational pattern is absolutely stable. It is convenient to students as they quickly learn the order in which different activities follow one another every day of the week - so habits get formed that permit facilitation of active participation in every activity.

Different instructors teach different kinds of classes - so that in one group there is one teacher for oral communication (speaking) class, another one - for reading and writing classes, one more for grammar class, and finally, one more for supervising the work at the language laboratory. Therefore, every group has 4 instructors, and this approach is called "team-teaching" at the ELI (it should not be mixed up with team-teaching characteristic of content learning when a teacher of English cooperates with a teacher of history, physics, or some other subject; at the ELI "team-teaching" means cooperation of different English teachers, everyone of

whom is responsible for developing a different set of students' language or communication skills).

The fact that every kind of class is primarily devoted to development of different kinds of skills does not mean that only such skills function and are trained there. For instance, in oral communication classes, besides speaking and listening, reading and some- times even writing are used. But both reading and writing are only auxiliary during these classes. They serve for developing oral communication skills, facilitating such development. In the same way in reading classes students do a lot of discussing on the basis of the texts they have just read or are going to read. It is sure to develop speaking skills, but the principal purpose of such discussions is more profound and accurate comprehension of what is read. Thus, the integrative approach implementation is ensured when listening leads to reading and discussion etc. (McDonough & Shaw, 1993).

There is a separate text-book(s) used for every kind of class, every text-book being aimed at developing just those communicative or language skills that are the main focus of attention in this class. At the same time for one and the same type of class text-books are different in groups of different levels so that at lower levels less advanced text-books are recommended. In this way practically dozens of alternative text-books are used for all kinds of classes in groups of all the levels. All the text-books are based on the communicative approach. A good example is the text-book by Jones, L., & Bayer, C. Activities Book. Functions of American English. Communicative Activities in the Classroom (published in 1983 at Cambridge by Cambridge University Press). It is used as one of the text-books for oral communication (speaking) classes in high intermediate groups.

It is necessary to describe the typical structure of every kind of class to see clearly the principles underlying this Intensive English Program.

1. ***Oral communication (speaking) classes.*** They focus on developing fluency and comprehensibility in English when communicating in formal and informal settings both in everyday life and in academic context. At the same time, the tasks of improving vocabulary, grammar, pronunciation, i.e. language skills, are set. So, developing communicative competence and language focusing go hand in hand. Very important is the task of acquainting students with the American culture, lifestyle, and with the American socio-cultural norms of communication. All the separate tasks are subordinated to the overall central task of developing formal and informal communication skills in English.

The sources of information that serve as the basis for oral communication are texts from recommended text-books (the students most often read them during the period of preparing their home tasks though sometimes directly in class), information (texts) heard from tapes or from the teacher, video-films watched in class. Such films, different prerecorded video programs are frequently employed, and the video laboratory occupies an important place in the teaching /learning process as video equipment is considered to be one of the best means of presenting whole authentic situations of communication (Lonergan,1984). Besides, video and recording equipment is used for recording and viewing the performance of students themselves (self-evaluation).

The communicative practice of students during oral communication classes is organized as talks and discussions in pairs and small groups (cooperative learning). These talks and discussions are focused on solving problems (cultural or others), asking and answering questions, and role-playing. Such forms of communication as presentations, panel discussions and debates are very widely used. In this way full scale modeling of genuine communication in English is

achieved (it is in fact quite a genuine communication because, as distinct from the conditions in Ukraine, international students in one ELI group share only one common language - and it is English, however badly or well they know it). In the process of practicing, the functions of the teacher are confined to either taking part in talks or discussions or just to their organizing and supervising with the aim of giving some directions, corrections, and additional information where needed - but without interfering, interrupting, or disrupting communication (for instance, if student's language errors make his/her meaning incomprehensible to interlocutors, the teacher tries to help in eliciting what is really meant and prompts correct alternatives of expressing such meaning in English). Communicative practicing dominates every speaking class occupying the greater part of its time.

A very important place in every oral communication class is assigned to the so called cultural awareness activities such as interviewing an American on socio-cultural topics, interviewing a class-mate on socio-cultural topics related to the country s/he came from, descriptions of cultural objects, photos, pictures etc., small group discussions of cultural information, problem solving activities dealing with socio-cultural behaviors.

All these communicative activities are combined with language focusing ones. The latter activities are subordinated to communication, dominated by it, and take a relatively small part of the class. They concentrate on vocabulary development and focus on idioms and two-word verbs, include exercises that in my terminology could be called communicative-algorithmic ones - when, for instance, students circulate the classroom asking their classmates questions of a specific grammatical structure with a definite idiom in every question. Pronunciation-focusing activities are also in use (gross pronunciation errors correction). Finally, grammar focusing activities are not infrequent - often with explicit explanations of grammar material by the teacher and special grammar-orientated tasks done as a rule out of class (home tasks). All these activities as a whole are a clear manifestation of the communicative-analytic approach as it is described in this book.

2. ***Reading and writing classes.*** The principal focus of attention and the aims of these classes, as they are formulated in the syllabus, are fully communicative. For reading it is acquiring skimming and scanning skills; locating the main ideas and details in a text; making inferences and guessing; identifying paragraph patterns; comprehending author's ideas, style, sentiments; making outlines and summaries, paraphrases etc. At the same time language focusing aims are set, such as getting students to learn synonyms and antonyms, guessing new words' meaning from context or from known roots and affixes, from Latin and Greek roots. In a similar manner writing aims are dominantly communicative - instructing students in writing coherent paragraphs, teaching appropriate rhetorical patterns to apply to a specific writing task (narration, argumentation, description, cause/effect etc.), guiding students in generating ideas for writing compositions, instructing students how to evaluate, revise, and edit compositions. But language focusing tasks are also paid considerable attention to. It is, for instance, instructing students in writing basic and complex sentences, in linguistic means of connecting ideas (by using "because", "since", "hence", "although" etc.).

The activities in the classroom in reading instruction follow the pattern: pre-reading - reading - post-reading (sometimes pre-reading is done at the end of one class, reading as a home task, and post-reading at the beginning of the following class). Pre-reading presupposes getting students acquainted with the topic of the article, eliciting what they already know about such a topic, and discussing this

background knowledge. Pair and small group discussions, brainstorming are often used, as well as teacher-fronted asking and answering questions. In the reading phase finding main ideas in the article (skimming), finding specific information in it quickly (scanning), and other similar activities directed at eliciting information are emphasized. Finally, in the post-reading phase students discuss, ask questions and express their opinion about the article read and the information in it. Special tasks with the specific purpose of checking comprehension are in use too - teacher-fronted asking and answering questions, multiple choice, true/false statements. The communicative activities and all the types of comprehension checking activities are combined with language focused ones - such as discussing some lexical or grammatical phenomena in the texts that are read with relevant commentaries from the teacher and language focusing exercises (finding synonyms, for example).

For teaching writing pre-writing, writing, and post-writing activities are used. They include discussing topics orally before writing by way of brainstorming in small groups, practicing in writing clear topic sentences, theses, and supporting sentences, practicing in using transitions while writing, free writing, practicing in writing paragraphs and essays, practicing in revising and rewriting essays. In general, the communicative process-oriented approach (Zamel, 1982) is the dominant one. But again focusing on language forms is broadly practiced when students are explicitly instructed how to write sentences of different types, and different exercises to this end are made in class and as home tasks. Therefore, in reading and writing classes the same communicative-analytic approach is employed as in oral communication classes.

3. ***Language laboratory classes.*** They are aimed at listening comprehension development. Students listen to different tapes and do tasks checking comprehension. Among the tapes to be listened to are samples of actual college lectures, samples of ESP tapes to develop specialized vocabularies (in oral communication and reading/writing classes orientation towards EAP and ESP is also strongly felt in accordance with the general orientation of the program). It is done to make students acquire skills needed for understanding and taking notes of academic lectures and presentations for functioning not only in everyday settings but in academic settings as well.

This purely communicative approach to listening comprehension training is combined with instruction directed specifically at improving students' pronunciation, intonation, and grammar. Even drills are used for this purpose if needed, so language focusing is quite explicit though communicative listening certainly dominates language focused tasks (communicative-analytic approach).

4. ***Grammar classes.*** They are mainly analytical activities dominated, and drills are provided that are totally grammatical form-focused. But this language focusing has communication as its final aim, i.e. grammar is taught to be used in speaking and writing. It is achieved by way of including communicative activities into grammar classes but principally thanks to the fact that such classes are combined with, dominated by, and serve as tools for teaching communication in speaking, reading and writing classes. So, the grammar classes being prevalently analytical by themselves in the context of all the other types of classes are well within the boundaries of the communicative-analytic approach.

It should be mentioned that during grammar classes TOEFL grammar practice is given weekly. In general, testing and training for the TOEFL exam occupy a substantial place in the program as a whole. For instance, TOEFL reading comprehension and vocabulary practices are provided in the reading/writing classes, different kinds of tests and quizzes are regularly administered in all the

types of classes, and at the end of the course as a whole the TOEFL test is administered to all the students.

From everything said above the differences between this American intensive English teaching system and the Ukrainian one seem quite striking. But the principal differences are to be explained as many of them are in reality superficial, i.e. conditioned by varying external circumstances and not by opposing theoretical approaches.

For instance, the Ukrainian system is strictly oral communication orientated while the American system-embraces all the four basic skills (speaking, listening, reading, and writing) with equal attention to each of them. The cause is bound up with different learners' needs that condition different instruction goals to be set (entering one of the American universities or staying in the USA for quite a long period of time, permanently making some use of English in one's home country etc. as is the case with the ELI's students, or a short visit to an English-speaking country where oral communication will primarily be required, as is the case with the users of the Ukrainian intensive program). The same cause underlies the difference in specialization of both programs - General English and Business English (confined to business talks) in one case; General English and EAP/ESP without a too specific orientation towards some narrow academic area in the American case. Different goals also underlie the differences in the testing systems being employed. If the American system emphasizes teaching English for academic purposes, it naturally makes reading and listening skills very prominent. Then, employment of TOEFL and TOEFL-like testing is also quite natural. On the contrary, when speaking and listening are emphasized, as in the Ukrainian system, and reading and writing are only supplementary, oral skills should be focused on in the testing system too. The same reason explains why the Ukrainian program does not need team-teaching characteristic of ELI's program - when only oral communication is taught it would not be reasonable to assign a team of teachers to one group of students.

Many differences result from the variety of teaching/learning conditions. For instance, the ELI's program has two times more classes per week (25 hours) than the Ukrainian course (12 hours), and these classes meet every day, except week-ends, while in the Ukrainian program they meet only 3 times a week and in the evening or on week-ends as a rule. It could not be otherwise because the students who come to the USA to participate in the Intensive English Program usually do not have to do anything else there. That is why classes in the daytime and every week-day are not just possible, but they are the only reasonable solution to make the program really intensive. It also gives an opportunity for numerous and various home assignments to be done. In Ukraine people who participate in the program do it without interrupting their work or studies at school or university, as it has already been mentioned in chapter 2. So, only their evenings and week-ends are free for classes of English, and they certainly cannot be held every day. Besides, in this case home assignments should not take any considerable time as it is hardly to be expected of learners to do them after their working day - so much the more after their working day plus their class of English.

One more difference is the fact that in the Ukrainian program L1 of the students is made use of. It is certainly impossible in the ELI's program because in every group students are from various countries with different first languages. Other differences in the intensive programs from two different countries can be analyzed, but it is hardly necessary because all of them like the ones described above are the results either of the differences in goals or in the conditions of teaching/learning.

But they never reflect any difference in the basic theoretical underpinnings of the two programs.

These underpinnings are surprisingly identical - surprisingly as both programs were developed absolutely independently not only of each other. The Ukrainian program was designed following what was done in the field of intensive foreign language teaching in the former USSR. The course of the ELI is based on the achievements of the Western methodology, and before the 90s there were not many contacts of these approaches from different parts of the world. That is why the identity of theoretical underpinnings is of special interest.

The first of such identities is the communicative-analytic approach underlying both programs as can be very clearly seen from the descriptions in this book. Both approaches are also identically production-based when teaching speaking is concerned. Moreover, the learning activities used in both cases are identical: role-playing, discussions, problem-solving tasks, simulations etc. The same can be said of the ways of making both programs really intensive. It is done not only by concentrating class hours, so that weekly there are as many of them as is reasonably possible in each separate case. It is also achieved in both cases by broad employment of cooperative learning. Work in small groups and pairs is fundamental for organization of active learning in these programs. They equally achieve intensification also by broad application of technical teaching aids - thus, language laboratories and tapes are identically important for the Ukrainian and the ELI's program. Identical is the attention paid to creating easy unconstrained relaxed psychological environment in the classroom. To attain this end and provide the best psychological conditions for actively communicating in English the same means are employed as those that were described in the preceding chapters of this book when analyzing the Ukrainian system.

Actually, no further analysis is necessary to safely assert that the theoretical approaches underlying both intensive programs have no essential differences, while the differences between the two programs that do exist are in reality nothing but divergent practical interpretations and applications of one and the same approach depending on varying students' needs and external circumstances. Both systems of intensive teaching are highly efficient. The proofs of the Ukrainian program's efficiency have already been discussed in chapter 4. As to the efficiency of the ELI's program, it has already been said at the beginning of this chapter that it needs no other proof than the international popularity of the English Language Institute. Such efficiency of both systems is the testimony of the correctness of the theoretical approach - as well as of the fact that this approach has been correctly and effectively interpreted and adjusted to differing external circumstances and teaching goals.

## Summary

Comparison of one of the intensive English programs typical for the USA with the Ukrainian program described in this book demonstrated that, despite numerous differences in goals and practical application that depend solely on external conditions and differing students' needs, both programs are essentially the same in their theoretical foundations and the approach they are based on. The fact that one and the same theoretical approach is accepted in different countries quite independently of each other and in both cases ensures desirable teaching/learning outcomes - this fact is a good reason for considering such an approach to be one of the best for intensive English program development.

# CONCLUSION

The purpose of this book was not only to acquaint an international reader with intensive teaching of English in Ukraine and an IEP developed by the author. The purpose also was to compare this program typical of the former Soviet Union with a program typical of the United States and to see whether similarities can be found, i.e. whether the road taken for developing IEPs in Ukraine is principally the same that is taken in the USA. Everything said in this book demonstrates that the Ukrainian way is not only highly efficient as it ensures students' communicative competence development and learning outcomes that fully coincide with pre-set teaching goals formulated according to learners' practical needs. What is no less important is the fact that the theoretical underpinnings, the fundamental assumptions on which the Ukrainian program is based are quite similar to the theoretical foundations of IEPs typical of the USA.

These similar and common assumptions include first of all the communicative-analytic approach combining domination of communicative activities in the teaching/learning process with language focusing activities (when and where they may help) subordinated to communication. It means that cognitive theory is taken serious account of. Another common assumption is the production-based approach when teaching speaking. The interactionist view is followed and not the creative construction approach when comprehensible output is rather neglected as compared to comprehensible input. The third common assumption is the way intensivity is ensured. Besides great concentration of classes in a relatively short course, it also requires broad application of technical aids (computers, language laboratory equipment) in less creative learning activities, especially in drill-like ones. In more creative activities intensification is achieved by way of cooperative learning (with work done in pairs and small groups), role-playing, using lengthy classroom talks, discussions, brainstorming etc. Such forms of teaching/learning derive from the communicative approach and employing them as the basic forms for an intensive program may be considered as one more common feature of US and Ukrainian IEPs. Both of them also pay considerable attention to psychological conditioning of students, creating an unconstrained, relaxed psychological environment in the classroom, to making students eager and unafraid to communicate in English transforming this communication into an efficient and agreeable means of meeting their personal requirements and needs. Finally, both programs are designed taking fully into account learners' real needs, and it is them that regulate language material selection, teaching and learning materials selection and design, the methodology of teaching. Thus, the learners'-needs centered approach underlies both IEPs.

It is the last common feature that is the source of major differences in the two programs. Differences in needs engender differences in teaching/learning goals and then in the process, organization, style, and structuring of teaching and learning. The differences in their conditions further accentuate the dissimilarities of the two programs - and yet all of them do not change the fact that the theoretical roots are absolutely the same.

This commonness is extremely important for the Ukrainian intensive program. It shows that it is developed along the same main lines that are characteristic of IEPs in the West, and in the USA in particular. Therefore, as the Ukrainian course is typical of intensive foreign language teaching practiced all over the former Soviet Union for about two decades already, such teaching is in no way behind the current trends in the West. As the approach to IEPs development in the

former USSR got formed almost quite independently of the West, it means that intensive English teaching professionals there and, for instance, in the USA came to the same conclusions with hardly any mutual influencing. It is an additional proof of such conclusions correctness, as well as a proof of good reasons behind designing an IEP just along the lines described in this book.

It is also a good reason behind hoping for better and improving prospects lying ahead for intensive commercial teaching of English in Ukraine. In chapter 1 causes of such teaching better prospects , as compared to the state-regulated and free system were discussed. The most important of these causes was named - the inefficiency of the state-regulated system and the more effective character of commercial teaching as far as learning outcomes are concerned. Such efficiency of one of the commercial intensive programs was given a convincing proof of in chapter 4. The fact that Ukrainian IEPs are not only highly practically efficient but quite compatible with similar US systems, as it was demonstrated in chapter 5, seems to be very significant for further successful development. First of all, it means that students who finished an intensive English program in Ukraine, similar to the one described in this book, will have no teaching/learning methodology incompatibility problem if they want to further improve their English in one of the US intensive English programs. In this case they will see there practically the same methodology and the same organization of the teaching/learning process. Second, American and other Western teachers of English will meet no incompatibilities with their habitual teaching procedures, methods, and organization if they come to Ukraine to teach in intensive English programs there. In this way intensive teaching of English in Ukraine is becoming a component part of the world-wide intensive English programs network making its contribution to spreading of English as an international language.

## REFERENCES

Adam, J.B., & Shawcross, A.J. (1963). *The language laboratory*. London: Pitman.
Alderson, J.C., Krahnke, K.J., & Stansfield, C.W. (Eds.). (1987). *Reviews of English language proficiency tests*. Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
Alschuler, A.S. (1973). *Developing achievement motivation for adolescents: Education for human growth*. Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Educational Technology Publications.
Asher, J.J. (1988) *Learning another language through actions: The complete teacher's guidebook*. Los Gatos (CA): Sky Oaks Productions, Inc.
Auerbach, E.R. (1993). Reexamining English only in the ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 9-32.
Bachman, F., & Palmer, A.S. (1982). The construct validation of some components of communicative proficiency. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16, 449- 464.
Bachman, L.F. (1989). The development and use of criterion-referenced tests of language ability in language program evaluation. In R.K. Johnson (Ed.), *The second language curriculum* (pp. 242-258). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bahloul, M. (1994). The need for a cross-cultural approach to teaching EFL. *TESOL Journal*, 3, 4-6.
Bancroft, W.J. (1978). The Losanov method and its American adaptations. *The Modern Language Journal*, 62, 167-175.
Berns, M. (1990a). *Contexts of competence: Social and cultural considerations in communicative language teaching*. New York & London: Plenum Press.
Berns, M. (1990b). "Second" and "foreign" in second language acquisition/foreign language learning: A sociolinguistic perspective. In B. VanPatten & J.F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/Foreign language learning* (pp. 3-11). Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
Bialystok, E. (1988). Psycholinguistic dimensions of second language proficiency. In W. Rutherford & M.S. Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching: A book of readings* (pp. 31-50). New York: Newbury House Publishers.
Bialystok, E. (1990). *Communicative strategies: A psycholinguistic analysis of second language use*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
Blair, R.W. (1991). Innovative approaches. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language* (pp. 23-45). Boston (MA): Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
Bley-Vroman, R. (1988). The fundamental character of foreign language learning. In W. Rutherford & M.S. Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching: A book of readings* (pp. 19-30). New York: Newbury House Publishers.
Bley-Vroman, R. (1990), The logical problem of foreign language learning. *Linguistic Analysis*, 20, 3-49.
Brinton, D.M., Snow, M.A., & Wesche, M.B. (1989). *Content-based second language instruction*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.
Brumfit, C. (1984). *Communicative methodology in language teaching. The roles of fluency and accuracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Burns, M. (1996). Audience and schema in an intensive English program in Japan. *TESOL Matters*, 6(2), 11.
Butterfield, A. (1989). *Drama through language through drama*. Banbury: Kemble Press.

Byrnes, H., & Canale, M. (Eds.). (1987). *Defining and developing proficiency: Guide lines, implementations, and concepts.* Lincolnwood (IL): National Textbook Company.
Canale, M., & Swain, M, (1980). Theoretical basis of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics*, 1, 1-47.
Caprio, M. (1993). Content learning: *Extending the global awareness of language students.* Zielsprache Englisch, 22, 16-22.
Celce-Murcia, M. (1991). Grammar pedagogy in second and foreign language learning. *TESOL Quarterly*, 25, 459-480.
Chamot Uhl, A., & O'Malley, J.M. (1994). *The CALLA handbook: Implementing the cognitive academic language learning approach.* Reading (MA): Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
Chaudron, C. (1988). *Second language classroom: Research on teaching and learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Clarke, D. (1989). Design consideration in writing CALL software, with particular reference to extended material. In K. Cameron (Ed.), *Computer assisted language learning program structure and principles* (pp. 28-37). Oxford: Intellect Ltd.
Coffey, B. (1984). ESP - English for specific purposes. *Language Teaching*, 1, 2-16.
Cohen, A.D. (1994). *Assessing language ability in the classroom.* Boston (MA): Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
Collinson, V. (1989). Future trends and challenges in French immersion. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 45, 561-566.
*Communication in the modern language classroom* (1988). Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
Cooper, R.L. (1989). *Language planning and social change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Corder, S.P. (1988). Pedagogic grammars. In W. Rutherford & M.S. Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching: A book of readings* (pp.123-145). New York: Newbury House Publishers.
Crookall, D., Coleman, D.W., & Verslius, E.P. (1990). Computerized language learning simulation: Form and content. In D. Crookall & R.L. Oxford (Eds.). *Simulations, gaming, and language learning* (pp. 165-782). New York: Newbury House Publishers.
Crookall, D., & Oxford, R.L. (Eds.). (1990). *Simulation, gaming, and language learning.* New York: Newbury House Publishers.
Davies, A. (1990). Principles of language testing. Oxford & Cambridge (MA): Basil Blackwell.
DiPietro, R.J. (1987 ). *Strategic interaction: Learning languages through scenarios.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Dixon, C.N., & Nessel, D. (1983). *Language experience approach to reading (and writing): Language experience reading for second language learners.* Hayward (CA): The Allemany Press.
Doughty, C. (1991). Second language instruction does make a difference: Evidence from an empirical study of SL realization. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition,* 13, 431-469.
Dubin, F., & Olshtain, E. (1986). Course design: *Developing programs and materials for language learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Ellis, R. (1986). *Understanding second language acquisition.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (1990). *Instructed second language acquisition: Learning in the classroom*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
Ellis, R. (1993) .The structural syllabus and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27, 91-113.
Ellis, R. (1994). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Ely, P. (1984). *Bring the lab back to life*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Faerch, C., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1983). *Strategies in interlanguage communication*. London & New York: Longman.
Fanselow, J.F. (1987). *Breaking rules: Generating and exploring alternatives in language teaching*. New York & London: Longman.
Finocchiaro, M., & Brumfit, C. (1983). *The functional-notional approach: From theory to practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
Fotos, S., & Ellis, R. (1991). Communicating about grammar: A task-based approach. *TESOL Quarterly*. 25, 629-653.
Fotos, S.S. (1994). Integrating grammar instruction and communicative language teaching through grammar consciousness-raising tasks. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 323-351.
Freeman; D.E., & Freeman, Y.S. (1994). *Between worlds. Access to second language acquisition*. Portsmouth (NH): Heinemann.
Freeman, Y., & Freeman, D. (1991). Using sheltered English to teach second language learners. *California English*, 27, 6-7, 26.
Gagliardi, C. (1994). Number 9. The use of the t-test in English linguistics. *The European English Messenger*, 3, 13-14.
Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.
Gardner, H. (1993). *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. New York: Basic Books.
Garrigues, M. (1992). Traitement automatique et apprentissage des langues. *Le Français dans le monde*, 251, 68-73.
Gattegno, G. (1963). *Teaching foreign languages in schools: The silent way*. Reading (MA): Educational Explorers Ltd.
Green, J.M. (1993). Student attitudes toward communicative and non-communicative activities: Do enjoyment and effectiveness go together? *The Modern Language Journal*, 77, 1-10.
Hawkins, B. (1991). Back to back: Drama techniques and second language acquisition. *Die Neuren Sprachen*, 90, 119-136.
Herron, C., & Tomasello, M. (1992). Acquiring grammatical structures by guided induction. *The French Review*, 65 , 708-718.
Higgins, J. (1988). *Language, learners, and computers. Human intelligences and artificial intelligence*. London & New York: Longman.
Higgins, J., & Johns, T. (1984). *Computers in language learning*. London & Glasgow: Collins ELT.
Higgins, J.J., & Morgenstern, D. (1990). Simulations on computers: Elements and examples. In D. Crookall & R.L. Oxford. *Simulation, gaming, and language learning* (pp. 183-189). New York: Newbury House Publishers.
Hutchinson, T. (1994). *Project English. 2. Student's book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for specific purposes: A learner-centred approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, V., & Hyland, F. (1992). Go for gold: Integrating process and product in ESP. *English for Specific Purposes*, 11, 225-242.
Ingram, D.E. (1985). Assessing proficiency: An overview on some aspects of testing. In K. Hyltenstam & Pienemann (Eds.), *Modeling and assessing second language acquisition* (pp. 215-276). San Diego (CA): College-Hill Press.
Johnson, F. (1983). *Communicative syllabus design and methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Jones, C., & Fortesque, S. (1987). *Using computers in the language classroom*. London & New York: Longman.
Jones, K. (1982). *Simulations in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kelly, P., Strupek, P. (1993). The power of positive teaching. *Zielsprache Englisch*, 23, 12-15.
Kelly, P. & Vanparys, J. (1991). The language laboratory - A new evaluation. *Zielsprache Englisch*. 4, 29-34.
Kennedy, C., & Bolitho, R. (1984). *English for specific purposes*. London: MacMillan Publishers Ltd.
Kessler, C. (Ed.). (1992). *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book*. Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Prentice Hall Regents.
Kramsch, C.J. (1990). What is foreign language learning research? In B. VanPatten & J.F. Lee. *Second language acquisition/Foreign language learning*. Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
Krashen, S.D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
Krashen, S.D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. New York: Longman Group Ltd.
Krashen, S.D., & Terrell, T.D. (1983). *The natural approach. Language acquisition in the classroom*. Oxford/San Francisco: Pergamon Press/Alemany Press.
Kumaravadivelu, B. (1994). The postmethod condition? (E)merging strategies for second/foreign language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 27-48.
Lado, R. (1961). *Language testing. The construction and use of foreign language tests: A teacher's book*. London : Longmans .
Lado, R. (1964). *Language teaching: A scientific approach*. New York: McGraw Hill.
Lado, R., & Fries, C. (1958). *English pattern practices (Establishing the patterns as habits)*. Ann Arbor (MI): The University of Michigan Press.
Lapkin, S., & Cummins, J. (1984). Canadian French immersion education: Current administrative and instructional practices. In *Studies on immersion education: A collection for United States educators* (pp. 58-86). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.
Larsen-Freeman, D. (1986). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Le Ninan, C. (1992). Quels documents vidéo ... Pour les cours de français de spécialité. *Le français dans le monde*, 251, 59-61.
Lewis, M., & Hill, J. (1985). *Practical techniques for language teaching*. Hove: Language Teaching Publications.
Lightbown, P. (1990). Process-product research on second language research in the classroom. In B. Harley, P. Allen, J. Cummins, M. Swain (Eds.), *The development of second language proficiency* (pp. 82-92). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lightbown, P.M., & Spada, N. (1994). *How languages are learned*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Livingstone, C. (1983). *Role play in language learning*. London: Longman.
Lonergan, J. (1984). *Video in language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Long, M. (1983a). Does second language instruction make a difference? A review of research. *TESOL Quarterly*, 17, 359-382.
Long, M. (1983b). Native speaker/non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 126-141.
Long, M. (1985). A role for instruction in second language acquisition: Task-based language teaching. In K. Hyltenstam & M. Pienemann (Eds.), *Modeling and assessing second language acquisition* (pp. 77-99). San Diego (CA): College-Hill Press.
Long, M. (1988). Instructed interlanguage development. In L.M. Beebe (Ed.), *Issues in second language acquisition. Multiple perspectives* (pp. 115-141). New York: Newbury House-Publishers:
Long, M. (1990). The least a second language acquisition theory needs to explain. *TESOL Quarterly*, 24, 649-666.
Long, M., & Porter, P. (1985). Group work, interlanguage talk, and second language acquisition. *TESOL Quarterly*, 19, 207-228.
Maddison, P., & Maddison, A. (1987). The advantages of using microcomputers in language teaching. In D. Hainline (Ed.), *New developments in computer-assisted language learning* (pp. 20-31). London & Sydney: Croom Helm, New York: Nichols Publishing Company.
Madsen, H.S. (1983). *Techniques in testing*. New York: Oxford Universityy Press.
Malamah-Thomas, A. (1991). *Classroom interaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Maley, A., Duff, A. (1988). *Drama techniques in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McDonough, J., & Shaw, C. (1993). *Materials and methods in ELT: A teacher's guide*. Oxford: Blackwell.
McLaughlin, B. (1985). *Second language acquisition in childhood. Vol.2. School-age children*. Hillsdale (NJ): Lawrence Elbaum Associates, Publishers.
Medgyes, P. (1983). The schizophrenic teacher. *ELT Journal*, 37 (1), 2-6.
Morgan, B. (1997). Identity and intonation: Linking dynamic processes in an ESL classroom. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 431-450.
Moscovitz, G. (1978). *Caring and sharing in the foreign language class: A source book on humanistic teaching*. Cambridge: Newbury House Publishers.
Munby, J. (1978). *Communicative syllabus design: A sociolinguistic model for defining the content of purpose-specific language programmes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Nayar, P.B. (1997). ESL/EFL dichotomy today: Language politics or pragmatics? *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 9-37.
Netten, J.E., & Spain, W.H. (1989). Student-teacher interaction pattern in the French immersion classroom: Implications for levels of achievement in French language proficiency. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 45, 485-501.
Nunan, D. (1988). *The learner centred curriculum: A study in the second language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
O'Dwyer, L.M. (1996). Putting the T in TESOL. *TESOL Matters*, 6 (2), 21.

Olsen, R.E.W-B, & Kagan, S. (1992). About cooperative learning. In C. Kessler (Ed.), *Cooperative language learning: A teacher's resource book* (pp. 1-30). Englewood Cliffs (NJ): Prentice Hall Regents.
O'Malley, M.J., & Chamot, Uhl A. (1990). *Learning strategies in second language acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. New York: Newbury House Publishers.
Paltridge, B. (1992). EAP placement testing: An integrated approach. *English for Specific Purposes*, 11, 243-268.
Paulston, C.B. (1992). *Linguistic and communicative competence: Topics in ESL*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
Pennington, M.C. (Ed.).(1995). *New ways in teaching grammar*. Alexandria (VA): TESOL.
Peregoy, S.F., & Boyle, O.F. (1993). *Reading, writing, and learning in ESL. A resource book for K-8 teachers*. New York & London: Longman.
Phillips, R. (1987). Morphology, masking, and computer-assisted language instruction. In D. Hainline (Ed.), *New developments in computer-based language learning* (pp. 176-205). London & Sydney: Croom Helm, New York: Nichols Publishing Company.
Pica, T., Lincoln-Porter, F., Paninos, D., & Linnell, J. (1996). Language learners' interaction: How does it address the input, output, and feedback needs of language learners? *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 59-84.
Pienemann, M. (1984). Psychological constraints on the teachability of languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 6, 186-214.
Richards, J.C. (1990). *The language teaching matrix*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Richards. J., Platt, J.J., & Weber, H. (1985). *The Longman dictionary of applied linguistics*. London: Longman.
Rinvolucri, M. (1964). *Grammar games: Cognitive, affective and drama activities for EPL students*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Rivers, W.M. (1972). *Speaking in many tongues: Essays on foreign language teaching*. Rowley (MA): Newbury House Publishers, Inc.
Rivers, W.M. ( 1973). Language learning and language teaching-any relationship? In W. C. Ritchie (Ed.), *Second language acquisition research: Issues and implications* (pp.201-213). New York: Academic Press.
Rivers, W.M. (1986). Comprehension and production in interactive language teaching. *The Modern Language Journal*, 70, 1-7.
Rivers, W. (1990). Interaction and communication in the language class in the age of technology. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 46, 271-283.
Robinson, P.C. (1980). *ESP*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Robinson, P.C. (1991). *ESP today: A practitioner's guide*. Hamel, Hempstead: Prentice Hall.
Rogers, C.R. (1983). *Freedom to learn for the 80's*. Columbus (OH): Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company.
Rutherford, W.E. (1987). *Second language grammar. Learning and teaching*. London & New York: Longman.
Safty, A. (1989). Some reflections on a decade in the French immersion classroom. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 45, 549-560.
Saunders, P. (1987). "The dark castle" - an adventure in French. In D. Hainline (Ed.), *New developments in computer-assisted language learning* (pp. 69-77). London & Sydney: Croom Helm, New York: Nichols Publishing Company.

Savignon, S.J. (1983). *Communicative competence: Theory and classroom practice. Texts and contexts in second language learning.* Reading (MA): Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
Savignon, S.J. (1990). In second language acquisition/foreign language learning, nothing is more practical than a good theory. In B. VanPatten & J.F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/Foreign language learning* (pp. 185-197). Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
Savignon, S.J. (1992). This is only a test: What classroom tests tell learners about language and language learning. In E. Shohamy & A.R. Walton (Eds.), *Language assessment for feedback: Testing and other strategies* (pp.53-71). Dubuque (IA): Vendall/Hunt Publishing Company.
Searle, J. (1972). What is a speech act? In P.P.Giglioli (Ed.), *Language and social context: Selected readings* (pp. 136-154). Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
Seliger, H. (1988). Psycholinguistic issues in second language acquisition. In L. M. Beebe (Ed.), *Issues in second language acquisition* (pp. 17-40). New York: Newbury House Publishers.
Smith, M.S. (1988). Consciousness raising and the second language learner. In W. Rutherford & M.S. Smith (Eds.), *Grammar and second language teaching: A book of readings.* (pp. 51-60). New York: Newbury House Publishers.
Spolsky, B. (1989). *Conditions for second language learning: Introduction to a general theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Stack, E.M. (1969). *The language laboratory and modern language teaching.* London: Oxford University Press.
Stansfield, C. W. (Ed.). (1986). *Technology and language testing: A collection of papers from the Seventh Annual Language Testing Research Colloquium held at Educational Testing Service, Princeton. New Jersey. April 6-9, 1985.* Washington, D.C.: TESOL.
Strevens, P. (1977). *New orientations in the teaching of English.* London: Oxford University Press.
Swain, M. (1984). Research and evaluation studies. In *Studies on immersion education: A collection for United States educators.* (pp. 87-112). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.
Swain, M. (1985). Communicative competence: Some roles of comprehensible input and comprehensible output in its development. In S.M. Gass & C.G. Madden (Eds.), *Input in second language acquisition* (pp. 235-253). Rowley (MA): Newbury House Publishers.
Swiderski, R.M. (1993). *Teaching language, learning culture.* Westport (CT): Bergin & Garvey.
Tang, C. (1997). On the power and status of the nonnative ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly*, 31, 577-580.
Terrell, T.D. (1982). The natural approach to language teaching: An update. *The Modern Language Journal*, 66, 121-132.
Tollefson, J.W. (1995). Introduction: Language policy, power, and inequality. In J.W. Tollefson (Ed.), *Power and inequality in language education* (pp. 1-8). New York: Cambridge University Press.
Tomasello, M., & Herron, C. (1989). Feedback for language transfer error: The Garden Path techniques. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 11, 385-395.
Towell, R., & Hawkins, R. (1994). *Approaches to second language acquisition.* Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
Underhill, N. (1987). *Testing spoken language: A handbook of oral testing techniques.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Underwood, J.H.(1984). Linguistics, computers, and the language teacher: A communicative approach. Rowley (MA): Newbury House Publishers.
Van Abbe, D. (1965). Audio-lingual methods in modern language teaching. In B. Dutton (Ed.), *A guide to modern language teaching methods* (pp. 85-136). London: Cassell.
VanPatten, B. (1990). Theory and research in second language acquisition and foreign language learning: On producers and consumers. In B VanPatten & J.F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/Foreign language learning* (pp. 17-26). Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
VanPatten, B., & Cadierno, T. (1993). Input processing and second language acquisition: A role for instruction. *The Modern Language Journal*, 77, 45-57.
VanPatten, B., & Lee, J.F. (1990). Contexts, processes, and products in second language acquisition and foreign language learning. In B. VanPatten & J.F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/Foreign language learning* (pp.240-245). Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
Wallace, E., & Lambert, A. (1984). An overview of issues on immersion education. In *Studies on immersion education: A collection for United States educators* (pp.8-30). Sacramento: California State Department of Education.
Walsh, T.M., & Diller, K.C. (1981). Neurolinguistic considerations on the optimum age for second language learning. In K.C. Diller (Ed.), *Individual differences and universals in language learning aptitude* (pp.3-21). Rowley (MA): Newbury House Publishers.
Weng Xianzhi (1996). English language teaching in China. *TESOL Matters*, 6 (1), 9.
Widdowson, H.G. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Widdowson, H.G. (1994). The ownership of English. *TESOL Quarterly*, 28, 377-389.
Wildner-Bassett, M.E (1990). Coexistence discourse worlds: The development of pragmatic competence inside and outside the classroom. In B. VanPatten & J.F. Lee (Eds.), *Second language acquisition/Foreign language learning* (pp. 140-152). Clevedon, Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters Ltd.
Wilds, C.P. (1975). The oral interview test. In R.L. Jones & B. Spolsky (Eds.), *Testing language proficiency* (pp. 29-44). Arlington (VA): Center for Applied Linguistics.
Wright, A. (1929). *Pictures for language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wright, A., Betteridge, D., & Buckby, M. (1991). *Games for language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wringe, C. (1989). *The effective teaching of modern languages*. London & New York: Longman.
Wunderlich, D. (1979). *Foundations of linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Zamel, V. (1982). The process of discovering meaning. *TESOL Quarter*, 16, 195-209.

Артемов, В.А. (Artemov, V.A.). (1969). *Психология обучения иностранным языкам (Psychology of teaching foreign languages)*. Москва: Просвещение.
Китайгородская, Г.А. (Kitaygorodskaya, G.A.). (1982). *Методика интенсивного обучения иностранным языкам (Methodology of intensive foreign language teaching)*. Москва: Высшая школа.

Китайгородская, Г..А. (Kitaygorodskaya, G.A.). (1986). *Методические основы интенсивного обучения иностранным языкам (Methodological foundations of intensive foreign language teaching).* Москва: Издательство Московского государственного университета.

Кузовлев, В.П., Коростелев, В.С., Пассов, Е.И. (Kuzovlev, V.P., Korostelyov, V.S., & Passov, E.I.). (1987). Иностранный язык как учебный предмет на определенном этапе развития общества (Foreign language as an educational subject at a definite stage of society's development). *Иностранные языки в школе*, 4, 3-8.

Леонтьев, А.А. (Leontiev, A.A.). (1982). Принцип коммуникативности и психологические основы интенсификации обучения иностранным языкам (Communicative principle and psychological foundations of intensifying foreign language teaching). *Русский язык за рубежом*, 4, 48-53.

Леонтьев, А.А. (Leontiev, A.A.). (1986). Принцип коммуникативности сегодня (Communicative principle to-day). *Иностранные языки в школе*, 2, 27-32.

Лозанов, Г.К. (Losanov, G.K.). (1970). *Суггестология и суггестопедия. (Suggestology and suggestopedia).* Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени доктора медицинских наук. София.

Пассов, Е.И. (Passov, E.I.). (1977). *Основы методики обучения иностранным языкам (Methodological foundations of teaching foreign languages).* Москва: Русский язык.

Пассов, Е.И. (Passov, E.I.) (1985). *Коммуникативный метод обучения иноязычному говорению (Communicative method of teaching foreign language speaking).* Москва: Просвещение.

Салистра, И.Д. (Salistra, I.D.). (1966). *Очерки методов обучения иностранным языкам. Система упражнений и система занятий (Essays on methods of teaching foreign languages. System of exercises and system of classes).* Москва: Высшая школа.

Серова, Т.С. (Serova, T.S.). (1988). *Психологические и лингводидактические аспекты обучения профессионально ориентированному иноязычному чтению в вузе (Psychological and linguadidactic aspects of teaching professionally orientated foreign language reading at a higher school).* Свердловск: Издательство Уральского университета.

Скалкин, В.Л. (Skalkin, V.L.). (1981). *Основы обучения устной иноязычной речи (Foundations of teaching oral foreign language communication).* Москва: Русский язык.

Скалкин, В.Л. (Skalkin, V.L.). (1983). *Коммуникативные упражнения на английском языке (Communicative exercises in English).* Москва: Просвещение.

Тарнопольский, О.Б. (Tarnopolsky, O.B.). (1989). *Методика обучения английскому языку на I курсе технического вуза (Methods of teaching English in the 1st year at a higher technical school).* Киев: Вища школа.

Тарнопольський, О.Б. (Tarnopolsky, O.B.). (1993). *Методика навчання англійської мови на II курсі технічного вузу (Methods of teaching English in the 2nd year at a higher technical school).* Київ: Вища школа.

Зимняя, И.А. (Zimnyaya, I.A.). (1978). *Психологические аспекты обучения говорению на иностранном языке (Psychological aspects of teaching foreign language speaking).* Москва: Просвещение.

# AUTHORS' INDEX

FL 025118

**U.S. Department of Education**
*Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)*
*National Library of Education (NLE)*
*Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)*

# REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

## I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Teaching English Intensively in a Non-English-Speaking Country: Theory, Practice, and Results

Author(s): Oleg TARNOPOLSKY

Corporate Source:

Publication Date:

## II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

X

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

*I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.*

**Sign here, → please**

Signature:

Printed Name/Position/Title: Oleg Tarnopolsky/ Head of the For.Lang.Dept./Prof., Dr

Organization/Address: Dnepropetrovsk State Technical University of Railway Transport/ ul.Chkalova,4,apt.8.Dnepropetrovsk 320029, Ukraine

Telephone: 38(056)770-10-69

FAX:

E-Mail Address: Tarnopolsky@ochag.dp.ua

Date: April 7, 1999

(over)

## III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

| |
|---|
| Publisher/Distributor: |
| Address: |
| Price: |

## IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

| |
|---|
| Name: |
| Address: |

## V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

OUR NEW ADDRESS AS OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1998
Center for Applied Linguistics
4646 40th Street NW
Washington DC 20016-1859

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

**ERIC Processing and Reference Facility**
**1100 West Street, 2nd Floor**
**Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598**

**Telephone: 301-497-4080**
**Toll Free: 800-799-3742**
**FAX: 301-953-0263**
**e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov**
**WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com**