LOWERING THE AFFECTIVE FILTER IN A GROUP OF ADULT ESOL STUDENTS

by

Audrey Smith

A Practicum Report

Submitted to the Faculty of
the Abraham S. Fischler Center
for the Advancement of Education of Nova University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Educational Specialist

June/1994

ABSTRACT

Development and Implemsntation of a Program for Adult ESOL Students.
Smith, Audrey L., 1994. Practicum Report, Nova University, Abraham S. Fischler Center for the Advancement of Education.
Descriptors: Bilingual Education/Adult Education/Affective Filter Hypothesis/ESOL/Second Language Acquisition/Second Language Instruction/Cooperative Learning/TESOL/Krashen/Functional Language/Adult Student Relationsip.

This program was developed and implemented to increase adult ESOL students' chances to participate in conversations with each other, thereby increasing both their fluency and confidence. Additionally, a target group with both low language levels and low confidence was separated from the higher achievers in order to decrease their embarassment with speaking in front of the entire group. The objectives were an 80 percent success rate for the target group in the areas of how they viewed their own speaking abilities, their abilities according to a standardized oral test, and their level of anxiety while speaking English. There was improvement in all three areas, but the most objective measurement, that of spoken oral performance, not only met the 80 percent objective, but surpassed it. Obviously, this was the area of the most significant improvement.

AUTHORSHIP STATEMENT/DOCUMENT RELEASE

Authorship Statement

I hereby testify that this paper and the work it reports are entirely my own. Where it has been necessary to draw from the work of others, published or unpublished, I have acknowledged such work in accordance with accepted scholarly and editorial practice. I give this testimony freely, out of respect for the scholarship of other workers in the field and in the hope that my work, presented here, will earn similar respect.

Audrey Smith
Signature

Document Release

Permission is hereby given to Nova University to distribute copies of this applied research project on request from interested parties. It is my understanding that Nova University will not charge for this dissemination other than to cover the costs of duplicating, handling, and mailing of the materials.

Audrey Smith
Signature

7/1/94
Date

OBSERVER'S VERIFICATION FORM

Verfication of Practicum Activity

Dear Observer:

Practicum students in Nova's M.S. and Ed.S. programs are asked to provide external verification that the project activities reported in their final practicum documents took place as described. You have been designated an observer to fulfill their confirmation function by the student named below. On this sheet, then, please write a note attesting to your knowledge of the project activity described in the final practicum report to which this will be attached. (Note that you are not asked to evaluate or make judgments about the quality of the project.)

Practicum Title: Lowering the Affective Filter in a Group of Adult ESOL Students

Student's Name: Audrey L. Smith

Project Site: Ft. Lauderdale Date: 6/9/94

Observer's Name. Barbara Lewis Barbara Lewis
Please Print Signature

Observer's Position: ESOL Teacher Phone #: 748-0720

Observer's comment on impact of the project (handwritten):

Audrey's project helped my students greatly, especially the non-speakers. They enjoyed all the activities and projects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS, cont.

CHAPTER I

Purpose

The target group of twenty-five adult ESOL students attended Community School A, located in an upper middle class neighborhood. Although the community itself has a predominantly upper-income population, the socioeconomic status of the ESOL class was middle class; approximately fifty percent of the ESOL students did not live in the city where the school is located.

Ninety-six percent of the students were from South America, and they ranged in age from 17 to 63. Seventy-three percent of the students were between the ages of 25 and 45. All students had previously studied English in their native countries' public schools, and their reading and writing skills surpassed their conversational skills. The director of the community school (interviewed according to Appendix C:64) felt that most students attended ESOL class primarily for the oral, social, and survival skills they need to understand the significant Americans in their lives,

such as husbands and employers, as well as those people they encounter during such mundane activities as shopping, finding the correct bus, or making a telephone call.

The director of the community school provided the researcher with the following general background: The community school administration and reception area have a friendly and accommodating atmosphere. ESOL students, who speak 71 percent Spanish, 25 percent Portuguese, and 4 percent German, are greeted and registered in Spanish, the language that 96 percent can understand. The community school director also interacts with the ESOL students frequently during breaks, which are 20 minutes of the three and one-half hour ESOL classes. Moreover, during the class itself, he often helps students on an individual basis. Additionally, at certain times of the year, the day school coordinates with the night school by encouraging teenage Honor Society students to volunteer at night for one-on-one ESOL tutoring.

The ESOL program has been operating since the community school opened 11 years ago, and foreign students have expressed a great deal of emotional

comfort in attending this school. Their greatest bonding seems to be with the director and the ESOL teachers. ESOL students' general satisfaction with the environment is evidenced by their 75 percent return rate from one nine-week session to the next; there is a relatively small attrition rate between sessions, only 16 percent. This last figure is also reflected in other adult classes, and can certainly not be attributed to any deficiencies in the ESOL class itself.

The organization of teachers for the four nights of ESOL class was only slightly different from that of other evening ESOL programs; one teacher taught for two nights, another for one night, and a third for one night. The variety of teachers possibly had both positive and negative effects: 20 percent of the students attended all four nights, indicating a strong desire to learn English as well as satisfaction with the variety of three different personalities and teaching styles. A greater percentage, though, 40 percent, attend class only on one or two nights, whenever their favorite teacher is there. Of course, with adult students being mature, opinionated

individuals, they perceive each teacher as having different strengths, or styles, and given the students' privilege of voluntary attendance, they may attend at will.

The drawbacks of the program are few, but pronounced. Since the one ESOL class only comprises five percent of the total community school population, the ESOL program cannot receive a hefty amount of the school budget for materials. Also, the size of the group, usually about 24 in attendance, precludes any further divisions aside from the most common one-class, one-teacher arrangement. Students range greatly in the length of time they have resided in this country, the opportunities they have to speak the language on a daily basis, and their proficiencies in English. They also differ in the urgency of reasons for speedy English improvement; while some students simply want more friends, others may need the language for entering a university, keeping a present job, or being promoted to a better job. Obviously, each teacher has to be quite innovative to accommodate a group of such varied backgrounds and needs.

Observations and Practicum Goals

This proposal writer was committed to assisting one classroom teacher for 12 weeks, working two nights, or a total of seven hours a week. The first goal was to determine the extent of students' verbal communication.

This writer observed five adult ESOL classes, meeting two nights a week from 5:30 until 9:00. These two nights were chosen because the same instructor taught, usually with a similar format and strategies. The purpose of the observations was to gather base-line data about students' strong and weak points, as well as to understand the methodologies used to teach language skills.

Since a new 9-week session had just begun, students did not know each other or their teacher. However, each student was required to stand, state their name, their home country, and what their greatest problems were with English (grammar, conversation, vocabulary, reading, writing). Almost all students responded orally, if at all, in English, to the teacher's questions. Very few had flowing, two or three line responses. There was also a lack of two-way

dialogue-type exercises, or examples of conversations, used in the classroom. Rather, the typical "lockstep" method, with teacher-initiated questions followed by student responses, was used.

On subsequent evenings, students spent the first part of the night on individualized, SRA-type reading materials with self-correctable answers. One rationale behind this individualized approach for many evening ESOL teachers is the difficulty that all adult students who work different schedules have in always arriving at school by 5:30 or 6:30. Generally, whole group instruction, or even small group or pair work, is best accomplished after 7:00 p.m.

Initially, the group was very quiet during reading, only approaching the teacher to submit an answer sheet or obtain a book at the next level. Gradually, though, there was more communication, which served to lessen the anxiety, in the classroom. When the observer saw students using Spanish dictionaries, she helped them understand the readings in Spanish, and then choose a correct answer from two to four comprehension choices. Although all discourse at this time was predominantly Spanish, it served to ease the

tension of a new class situation, and establish an atmosphere of cooperation among the students, the teacher, and the practicum writer. Some students with limited proficiency even approached the practicum writer and initiated lengthy conversations about problems finding work or housing.

From observing several students acting as tutors for their classmates, as well as speaking to individual students during the break, it became clear that there were students above the beginning, or even the early intermediate, levels of speech. On a one-to-one level, more students were willing to communicate with the observer in English. They were far more at ease in a private situation; on the other hand, when the teacher called on students during the main conversation period, later in the evening, some became so flustered that they resorted to having their native-language classmates actually translate for them.

It became the writer's hypothesis, then, that a good portion of the students possessed, in Krashen's terms (1983), a "high affective filter," or attitudes towards English, the class situation, or both, which promoted anxiety. This anxiety prevented the students

from seeking new information, or "input" (Krashen, 1983), and kept students on the defensive, rather than allowing them to relax more and use the language they did possess in English, regardless of possible grammar or pronunciation mistakes.

If it were, indeed, an affective filter that was preventing more verbal responses, rather than a knowledge of the language, then the first task was to establish which students were really proficient in the language, which were not, and whether actual proficiency was the greatest factor in the fear of speech that some students displayed.

Later, before the seventh session began, three evaluation instruments were administered to the students. Appendices A and B required only written responses. When necessary, questions were verbally translated into Spanish, and beginning students were even allowed to answer in Spanish. These two surveys were multi-purpose:

A. They obtained vital statistics about the students, such as their home countries, background in English, and present occupations.

B. They asked how students felt the class was structured or run, as well as what the students were learning, as opposed to, or similar to, what the students wanted to learn.

C. They measured students' opinions of their own speaking proficiencies in English.

D. They asked students about their comfort level with spoken English, both inside and out of class (Questions 12, 13, and 14, Appendix B:60).

After students' personal ideas were tabulated, each student was orally interviewed and given a language proficiency rating. Both the examiners' questions and the students' ratings were based on models used for the Foreign Service Proficiency Test, or the FSI Test (Appendix D:66) developed in 1956.

Significant correlations, discrepancies, or null correlations, are summarized below:

A. There was a null relation among the length of time a student has lived in the United States and all other variables. For example, two recent arrivals, both of whom had studied

English intensively in their home country and worked for an American firm, felt almost no affective filter, having "perceived affective filters" of 3+ and 4, and corresponding FSI scores.

b. Students' own perceptions of their English proficiency correlate closely with their actual FSI test results. Therefore, their anxiety did not stem from a miscalculation of their own abilities.

c. Fourteen members of the 25-member class had actual FSI ratings of 2+ or above, meaning that they could communicate adequately in elementary or intermediate conversations. However, 14 class members felt high speech anxiety, perceiving themselves as deficient in communication. In other words, 56 percent of the original class had average or above average speaking abilities, but 56 percent felt below average. In reality, only nine students were functioning below the 2+, or average, level. Therefore, 36 percent of the class, more than one-third, exhibited a

negative discrepancy between their actual and perceived abilities.

D. Almost all students, over 90 percent, felt a great discrepancy between the way they were spending their time in class and the way they wanted to spend their time. Most felt they were spending time "listening to the teacher speak English," or "reading quietly," when what they wanted to be doing was "practicing speaking English."

E. Ninety-two percent of the students, regardless of their proficiency levels, wanted to be in separate groups and separate rooms. As adults, they seemed aware that smaller groups would decrease anxiety, as well as increase their chances for individual attention. Moreover, in smaller groups, students would have more opportunities to converse with each other, rather than simply responding to the teacher.

F. Ninety percent of students, no matter how much nervousness they reported on the Pre-Post Survey, felt that practice with

"everyday conversations" would help them the most.

According to the above responses, what seemed to be hindering students' speech production and, in turn, increasing their speech anxiety, was more a function of classroom content and methodology than students' proficiency levels. In simple terms, they needed more chances to speak, in smaller groups, about topics which affected their daily lives.

This researcher decided to concentrate on the group of students that needed more speech production combined with a lower level of nervousness.

This target group was comprised of 11 members of the original class of 25. Nine students with FSI proficiency ratings of 2 and below were automatically placed in the group. Next, two students with proficiency scores of 2+ but "speech anxiety" levels (Appendix F:70) of 2 and below were added to the group.

The outcome objectives were as follows:

1. Over a period of 12 weeks, 80 percent, or approximately nine students, would increase their actual FSI ratings by at least one whole level.

2. Over a period of 12 weeks, students would feel more comfortable with speaking English; therefore, their "Level of Speech Anxiety" (Appendix F:70) would improve by at least one whole level. Again, this would be expected for 80 percent, or nine, of the students.
3. Over a period of 12 weeks, the Pre-Post Survey (Appendix B:60) would show an increase of at least one level for Question 3, which asked how students rated their own speaking ability. The success criteria, consistently, was expected to be at least 80 percent positive.
4. Over a period of 12 weeks, all students should change their answers to Questions 8 and 9 on the Pre-Survey, so that there would be no discrepancy between what they were learning and what they wanted to learn.
5. At the end of the 12-week period, besides taking the Pre-Survey again, students would complete an additional "Attitudinal Survey" (Appendix G:71). Hopefully, they would indicate feelings of improvement from having

more speaking within the curriculum, as well as working with students in a more homogeneously grouped class, as the two main reasons for the class' increased value to them.

The main purpose of this practicum project was to decrease the extreme speech anxiety felt by the lowest level students. This target group, all having proficiency levels of 2+ and below, was expected to feel more comfortable after intensive speech practice on everyday survival topics. Moreover, when separated from the higher-level students, the target group would feel less embarrassment about making mistakes.

CHAPTER II

Research and Solution Strategies

For purposes academic, social, and professional, students of all ages and nationalities have needed to study one or more foreign languages. However, much to the dismay of students and teachers alike, it has become apparent that traditional foreign language classes, based mainly on textbooks, translations, and written grammar exercises, have produced few students able to orally use the target language outside of the classroom.

Consequently, several researchers (Krashen, 1983; Reilly, 1988; Womack, 1990) have concurred that "formal language learning," or "knowing the rules," should be a goal of lesser importance than language "acquisition," or "picking up" the language by communicating in natural situations in the same way that children acquire their first languages (Krashen, 1983:18). Krashen feels that both young first language learners as well as older second language learners constantly and subconsciously add new words to their vocabularies

by receiving "comprehensible input" (1983:19) which is slightly above their present level of proficiency, or at the "i+1" level (1983:33). New words will be understood because they are in a context with a majority of other words that the second language speaker already understands.

Some researchers have disagreed with this "Input Hypothesis" (Long and Porter, 1985:214), claiming that second language (SL) learners need to go beyond merely hearing an abundance of understandable messages; rather, they must also have the chance to produce new language, or "output" (Long and Porter, 1985). Shimatani quotes Swain and agrees that "students learn to use ... forms and ... meanings through comprehensible output" (1988:10). This is in accordance with Schachter's idea that output, or language production, is of the utmost importance, for until a SL learner speaks, he has no indication if his "means of expression works" (1985:249).

Since the main goals of Krashen's "Natural Approach" are understanding input and achieving fluency in the target language, he prefers that SL learners expose themselves to a great deal of input,

concentrating very little on its accuracy, or grammatical form. In real native speaker (NS) - non-native speaker (NNS) conversations, Krashen feels that there is no time for the NNS to think about form and meaning simultaneously; in fact, he feels that focusing on the former will impede the latter (1983:31).

Krashen's "Monitor Hypothesis" states that a speaker's conscious knowledge of grammatical rules is only useful for "self-repair," which often happens after speech has already taken place (1983:30). The "Monitor," or "editor," (1983:30) checking for the formal rules that have been consciously learned in a classroom, actually forces the NNS to hesitate before or during a conversation. On the contrary, if speakers strive for mainly communication and meaning, they can eventually achieve fluency, after hearing enough input. Brumfit strongly agrees with this idea, stating that teachers who correct students' speech are impeding fluency, which is the ultimate proof of language acquisition (1984:56-57).

Not all researchers, though, feel that NNS's should or want to throw away grammar, morphology, and syntax. Shimatani (1988) points out that no studies

prove that L2 (second language) adults learn in the same natural way as children. Van Patten, as quoted by Shimatani, has conducted studies showing that L2 learners can remain at a very basic and inferior stage of communication, or "fossilize" (1988:8) if they neglect monitoring their speech for accuracy and trying to improve it. In the same article, Shimatani agrees with Swain that Krashen's "comprehensible input" will never be enough to produce "grammatical competence" (1988:10).

Both Krashen (1979a) and Reilly (1988) admit that adults can learn syntactic and morphological structures faster than children. Lightbrown not only agrees with Van Patten's "fossilization" idea (1985:179), but adds the interesting fact that adult learners, especially the literate ones exposed to formal education in foreign countries, can learn the rules of grammar more easily because the lessons and "processes" of grammar instruction parallel those which they already have experienced (1985:176). Brown's study, which gave identical lessons to older adults and younger children, indicated that the adults asked for information and

explanation about specific grammatical points, while children and adolescents did not (1985:280).

However, whether Krashen's Monitor Theory is extreme or not, one of his intents in giving grammar a back seat is that it gives the L2 learner less to worry about. Krashen is in line with other researchers in his belief that anxiety, or what he calls the "affective filter," is one of the main obstacles in the path of L2 students (1983:20b). Accordingly, he feels that L2 classes should strive to create a positive, nurturing atmosphere where students can be more relaxed and open to input. For SL acquisition to occur, the student should be as uninhibited as possible, or have a low "affective filter" (1983:19b).

Although Shimatani feels that a low stress level does not necessarily foster learning (1988:11), Laine agrees with Krashen that anxiety slows the SL acquisition process, and nervous students will try to avoid the new language completely by falling back on their native languages (1987:64). Laine goes on to say that a person with general "trait anxiety" will have an impermeable "language ego" (1987:16,51), making it almost impossible for that student to attempt using the

target language in class. Even more important, Laine repeatedly stresses that intelligence and motivation are not usually the crucial factors in second language acquisition, but that many other "psychological hindrances" come into play.

In general, virtually every psychological trait that retards a student's progress socially and professionally also makes that student less open to a new language. Schumann feels that an introvert in general may be too shy to practice a new language (1986:380). Adult learners, especially, are afraid of ridicule, and often revert to their native languages to get attention and praise (1986:382). Reilly agrees that the best L2 learner should be outgoing and have "ego permeability," or the openness to learn both the language and the lifestyle of a new culture (1988:11).

Of course, all aforementioned feelings are usually displayed by students with poor self-esteem. Laine quotes Burns, and agrees that a person's self-concept determines, "what you think you can do" (1987:25). Burns also believes that the "social self" (1987:29), or how a person thinks that others see him, can either help or hinder a foreign language student. Students

with poor self-esteem try to protect themselves in a language classroom, which they see as "threatening" by using their native tongue as much as possible (1987:32).

Reilly and Laine agree that almost all students, regardless of their psychological traits, view the SL classroom as having an element of risk, with the high anxiety students feeling the greatest amount of fear. In fact, Laine states "an association between high anxiety ... and ... low performance at school" (1987:20). Both authors agree that to be successful, an SL student must be open, or willing to take a risk.

Despite such strong innate obstacles, Womack and Bernstein feel that the only remedy for a fear of speech is more speech practice in the classroom situation, which a student may perceive as his "territory" (1990:107,109). Likewise, Long and Porter (1985:208) attribute the slow process of many L2 learners to the small amount of class time they usually get to practice the new language. In large ESOL classes, very often one teacher talks while 30 listen, limiting a very small remainder of time to "30 seconds per student per lesson" (Long and Porter, 1985:208).

Obviously, the traditional "lockstep" classroom is not geared toward optimum speech practice for students who desperately need English for survival purposes. Teachers of these classes usurp one-half to two-thirds of the class period (Long and Porter, 1985:208), leading critics such as Brumfit to argue for "a reduction of teaching input" (1984:51). Even worse, teachers usually judge students' speech by the "grammatical standard ... of the mature adult native speaker" (Brumfit, 1984:76). Moreover, in this type of environment, a very large group is taught the same lesson at the same pace, regardless of students' individual abilities.

The remedy most often advocated to encourage more speaking practice is students working in small groups, or pairs (Laine, 1987; Womack and Bernstein, 1990; Long and Porter, 1985; Brumfit, 1984: Bassano and Christison, 1987). The advantages of cooperative learning are many. First, small groups tremendously decrease the potential stage fright of speaking in front of a large group. Contrary to the larger "lockstep" classroom, all students can be involved in the small-group conversation, rather than waiting for a

short turn to speak. More important, students of lesser abilities can work together at their own rate, rather than embarrassing themselves in front of more experienced speakers of the language (Long and Porter, 1985:210). For shy or introverted students, a very small group provides an "intimate" rather than a cold environment (Long and Porter, 1985:211).

According to Brumfit, the greatest benefit is the similarity of small groups to normal, everyday conversations (1984:69). Moreover, in a large class, group work greatly increases the chances of students "both producing and receiving language" (1984:75). Furthermore, students can have speedy feedback, and more fluency should result from students correcting each other for accuracy, rather than individually having to wait for one teacher's corrections (1984:78).

Researchers have explored the advantages of small groups of three or more students versus "dyads." Ideally, students within a small group or pair should not speak the same language, allowing for more "interlanguage talk" (Long and Porter, 1985). It is also best to pair advanced students with intermediates, and intermediates with beginners; the conversations in

Long and Porter's study (1985:215) lasted longer this way.

Both Womack and Bernstein and Long and Porter agree that groups should be "goal oriented" or "task-based," and each member should need information from at least one other member to complete the assignment. Long and Porter refer to a previous study by Varonis and Gass on group work versus dyads. The most "negotiation," or repeated attempts to communicate with each other, occurred in dyads where the SL learners spoke different native languages and were of different proficiency levels. Interestingly enough, all studies done with group work concur that the "level of accuracy" maintained by unsupervised students working together is as high as "lockstep, teacher - monitored responses" (Long and Porter, 1985:223).

A great amount of research has shown that teaching content can greatly affect students' motivation to learn or pay attention. Gass and Varonis feel that lessons should be based on "real world knowledge" which students are also "familiar" with (1984:69,74). Womack stresses that since the average student's attention span is very brief, it is important to give a student

"ego-centered stimuli," or lessons of immediate importance to that student's life (1990:108,109). Brumfit agrees that L2 students must be taught so that they can function and communicate in society, do their jobs, and master most social interactions (1984:27,28). Krashen stresses that by organizing the lessons by "interesting and relevant topics," rather than grammar, two purposes can be accomplished. First, there will be a lowering of students' affective filters, since they will be interested enough to voice their opinions. Next, the goals of the class will be mainly communicative, rather than grammatical (1983:20-21).

With some minor differences of opinion, most of the sources cited suggested the same basic causes and the same remedies for strategies to increase the speaking abilities of adult ESOL learners. First, many obstacles to initial speech in a second language lie within the learner himself, grounded in his own self-concept and psychological traits, with the prime determining factor being his anxiety level, or "affective filter."

In order to decrease the reticence, or fear of speaking, experts in the field have suggested that students work more in small groups or pairs. Hopefully, each student can work with another student who speaks a different language and has a slightly different level of English proficiency. Along with topics that relate to students' everyday lives, these tactics together should improve both the quantity and the quality of the language produced.

Strategies for Target Group

From the original group of 25, a target group of 11 was chosen, with the main goal of decreasing their speech anxiety levels, or affective filters. The following strategies were used:

1. Within their more homogeneous, smaller, class, the target group students each became part of a dyad or small group of three students, as recommended by Womack and Bernstein, Long and Porter, Brumfit, and Bassano and Christison.
2. It was not possible to pair students with partners who spoke a different language, since almost all spoke Spanish, but they at

least had partners of slightly different proficiency levels.

3. Students did a great deal of group repetition before practicing dialogues in pairs, as requested by the adults in Brown's study (1985).

4. Students had choices about the kind of class they wanted, or the major focus of the class, also requested by the adults in Brown's study (1985). Topics studied were relevant to the everyday needs of the students. Various authors indicated that such topics motivated students more. These writers were Laine (1987), Lightbrown (1985), Schumann (1986), Krashen (1983), and Womack and Bernstein (1990).

5. There was minimal correction of language for grammatical accuracy. This was basically according to Krashen's Monitor hypothesis, and Krashen's major premise has been supported by Brumfit (1984), Brown (1985), and Lightbrown (1985).

6. There were some grammar assignments, since they indicated that they learn grammar easily, and enjoy it. This was confirmed in the writings of Reilly (1988), Krashen (1983, 1979), Brumfit (1984), Brown (1985), and Lightbrown (1985).

CHAPTER III

Method

In planning the implementation of this program, it was vital to remember that the target group was quite low in English proficiency, confidence, or both. When new words, phrases, or dialogues were introduced, repetition was almost always the first step. In this way, students heard the pronunciation and copied it, without the embarrassment of possibly making a mistake in front of the entire group. Also, short, dialogue-type questions and answers, even for grammatical practice, were modeled on the board before the entire class prior to one student asking another student. Weaker students usually took the easier parts of question-answer practices, and sometimes more experienced students were called in front of the class to ask questic , rather than the teacher. In this way, there was optimal practice for both weaker and stronger speakers, so that the latter group did not become bored.

Most speaking activities were done in dyads, or pairs. Ideally, such activities were task-based, so that each person needed some type of information from the partner, and there had to be communication between them. Of course, it was best to pair a beginning student with one more facile with the language; however, this was not always possible. When the writer knew that two non-speakers were practicing a dialogue together, she tried to work more with that pair, giving them private pronunciation reinforcement before they said their dialogue in front of the whole class.

As Krashen mentioned, overuse of the Monitor, or correcting function, can prevent, or retard second language acquisition. Therefore, although correction was used more extensively with grammar exercises, both in the written and oral forms, there was almost no correction by the teacher during verbal utterances that the rest of the group heard. Rather, the emphasis with students' speech was on fluency and intelligibility. Finer points, such as accent reduction, were stressed as little as possible, providing other students understood the speaker.

Before any dyad, or small group, presented a spoken product to the class, they had some time, usually ten minutes, to practice. This way they had the opportunity to both practice, and often memorize, for fluency, but also listen to and correct each other in the privacy of their small work unit. However, since this particular target group spoke almost exclusively the same native language, Spanish, the teacher circulated often during practice to encourage that English, not Spanish, was used for communication within the dyads.

No matter how much this writer tried to reduce anxiety, the act of attempting to speak a second language for almost two hours was stressful for beginning learners. Therefore, other activities were included to break the monotony and give students the opportunity to use other skills which could have been stronger, such as writing and heterogeneous group work in the form of games and contests. These heterogeneous groups were sometimes formed by merging with the original class. The two smaller, homogeneous groups were blended and then divided into teams. When they competed, as groups of four, to win contests or games,

weaker students were not embarrassed, since it was the group product which counted, rather than each student's individual failures or strengths.

Also, during such informal, game-type activities, newer students learned from more experienced ones, simply by "picking up," or acquiring, new language in a non-threatening situation.

At least once a week, some type of written work was collected from the target group. Assignments ranged from such simple products as lists of one-word dictations, to full sentence dictations, or open-ended sentences which the students completed. Writing was always collected at the end of class, and returned the following class period, with some comment in English by the teacher.

To implement all these tasks, they were broken down into units which the researcher hoped to accomplish within 12 weeks, including the final student post-surveys and attitudinal surveys.

The writer's class time with the target group was two nights a week, from 7:00 to 9:00. Within this time period, from 7:00 to 7:30, the students had a coffee

break. Therefore, the total class time per week was three hours.

The following was the researcher's original teaching plan, including materials, for the 12-week block, after the Basic Data, Pre-Post Survey and oral FSI tests:

Week One, Session One

1. Divided the original class of 25 into two groups, taking the lower-level target group into a separate classroom. Time: 10 minutes.
2. Introduced the group to the possessive pronouns. Did oral practice with questions like: "Whose desk is this?" or "Whose book is this?" Time: 15 minutes.
3. Did oral practice with location words, such as "on, in, under, over, in the corner, etc." For oral practice, students broke into two teams. One team asked where an object was, and the other team responded in sentences. Time: 50 minutes.
4. Had students, in pairs, complete three exercises on possessive pronouns, from Betty

Azar's Basic English Grammar. Corrected two exercises on the board, one orally. Time: 35 minutes.

Week One, Session Two:

1. Reviewed, orally, possessive pronouns and location words. The group was divided into two parts, with one part asking questions and the other part answering. Time: 30 minutes.
2. Introduced contractions, such as "I'm, she's, he's ..." Did oral practice with questions and statements. Answers were "Yes, I am, No, she isn't, etc." Time: 20 minutes.
3. Did oral practice with these contractions and location words from Side by Side, Level 1, Chapter 2. Time: 20 minutes.
4. Did a short oral reading from the same chapter. Students completed a check-up true-false quiz at the end. Teacher collected the quiz and, for homework, assigned the Side by Side pages to have written answers.

Week Two, Session One:

1. Did oral practice review with location words, possessive pronouns, and contractions. Teacher initially asked the questions, gradually transferring both questions and answers to students. Time: 30 minutes.
2. Introduced, and had students take notes on, the present progressive verb tense, with -ING endings. Did oral practice, asking students to respond to "What am I doing?" as other students pantomimed. Time: 20 minutes.
3. Distributed picture sequence from Picture It. Had students write the verb only for each picture. Time: 20 minutes.
4. Had students repeat whole sentences for each picture, using the present progressive tense.

Week Two, Session Two:

1. Students repeated, orally, sentences from Picture It sequence. Time: 20 minutes.
2. Students practiced, in pairs, whole sentences about pictures. Time: 15 minutes.

3. Pairs recited, in front of the class, their sentences for the pictures. Time: 25 minutes.
4. Teacher put open-ended sentences on the board, using verbs from story sequence. Students finished those sentences, which were collected. Time: 30 minutes.

Week Three, Session One:

1. Students did a task-based interview in dyads, answering questions about each other's favorite books, music, hobbies, etc. Each student completed a questionnaire (Appendix H:72) about the other, then reported to the class.
2. Teacher dictated sentences with the word "favorite," such as "My favorite hobby is ..." Time: 10 minutes. Sentences and questionnaires were collected.

Week Three, Session Two:

1. Students finished reporting on their partners' interests and personal preferences. Time: 30 minutes.

2. Students did oral repetition practice on present continuous tense. Material was from Side by Side, Chap. 3. Time: 30 minutes.
3. Students, in pairs, practiced questions and answers to this chapter. Time: 20 minutes.
4. Students wrote and submitted answers to the chapter. Some finished it for homework. Time: 20 minutes.

Week Four, Session One:

1. Students received labelled picture of a car and its parts (Appendix I:75). They repeat names of parts. Time: 20 minutes.
2. Car parts were combined in sentences with phrases "doesn't work" or "isn't working." Students repeated sentences. Time: 10 minutes.
3. In pairs, students role-played a mechanic with a customer, who reported a problem with his car. Time: 20 minutes.

Week Four, Session One:

1. The entire original class, together, reviewed names of the car parts in a repetition drill. Time: 15 minutes.
2. Students from the target group were paired with more advanced students, and they practiced questions and answers about car problems. Time: 20 minutes.
3. Individual pairs presented their dialogues in front of the class. Time: 15 minutes.
4. Students received picture stories from Picture It about a man getting a flat tire. They repeated sentences, and then copied verbs only on each picture. Time: 40 minutes.

Week Five, Session One:

1. Entire original group reviewed sentences for the tire-changing story. Time: 20 minutes.
2. Students copied sentences on a separate piece of paper. On each picture, though, they had only the verb. Time: 15 minutes.
3. In heterogeneous dyads, pairs practiced explaining how to change a tire, with each

students citing alternating sentences. Time: 25 minutes.

4. Each pair told the story in front of the class. Time: 30 minutes.

Week Five, Session Two:

1. Target group reviewed personal pronouns, location words, and present progressive tense orally. Time: 30 minutes.
2. Four different students read two short stories orally from Side by Side, Level 1. Time: 15 minutes.
3. Students took short reading and comprehension quizzes on the stories. Time: 15 minutes.
4. Assigned a short story using the present progressive tense, based on a picture in Side by Side, Level 1. Time: 30 minutes.
5. Collected stories to correct.

Week Six, Session One:

1. Orally review personal pronouns and present progressive tense. Time: 30 minutes.
2. Had students complete an exercise on creating questions and answering them in the present

progressive tense from p. 38 of Azar's Level One book. Since the exercise is difficult, students could read the answers as they were read aloud by the most advanced student. Time: 30 minutes.

3. Had students orally answer questions about a picture in the Azar book, p.45.
4. Next, they could write the answers and submit them. Time: 15 minutes.

Week Six, Session Two:

1. Three-part formative evaluation.
   a) Ten dictated sentences.
   b) Ten written answers to oral questions.
   c) Thirteen vocabulary words. Teacher pointed to classroom objects and students wrote the words. They could use dictionaries. Test time: 35 minutes.
2. Introduced vocabulary words, on the blackboard, for ailments and illnesses. Practiced pronunciation. Time: 20 minutes.
3. Distributed Unit 17 on health problems from Lifelines, Level 2. Did oral repetition

practice. For homework, students wrote the problems in sentences. Time: 35 minutes.

Week Seven, Session One:

1. Had all students together from original class. Put them in approximately seven groups of three each, with at least one advanced student in each group. Time: 15 minutes.
2. Distributed a vocabulary list of approximately 50 words. Students got meanings of unknown words from dictionaries or classmates. Time: 25 minutes.
3. Gave each group a picture card with eight pictures, and played bingo, calling out words from the vocabulary list. All students in a group helped each other locate the pictures, and the group covering all pictures first won BINGO and a prize. Time: 50 minutes.

Week Seven, Session Two:

1. Orally reviewed parts of body and common ailments from week six. Time: 35 minutes.

2. Made up simple eight-line dialogues for students to practice in pairs. They role-played a patient and a doctor. Time: 15 minutes.
3. Listened to some volunteer students in pairs. Time: 15 minutes.
4. Did 20 dictation sentences on parts of the body and problems. Had a student read the dictation. Time: 25 minutes.
5. Had a student write correct sentences on the board.

Week Eight, Session One:

1. Orally introduced pronunciation of past tense verbs from Side by Side, Level 1, p. 129. Had students repeat single words, then make sentences. Time: 25 minutes.
2. Did repetition drills, with five students together playing each character, for a dialogue about health problems. Time: 20 minutes.
3. Had students in pairs, write original dialogues on the board, modeled on the one in the book, p. 131. Time: 20 minutes.

4. Had students come up individually and voluntarily and read their dialogues to the class. Collected the written dialogues for corrections.

Week Eight, Session Two:

1. Returned corrected dialogues and had students rehearse them in pairs. Time: 20 minutes.
2. Had volunteer pairs do their dialogues in front of the class. Time: 20 minutes.
3. Reviewed time expressions for the past, such as: "two weeks ago, last week." Time: 15 minutes.
4. Students worked in pairs on grammar exercises with past tense, Azar book, p. 120-121. Collected papers. Time: 30 minutes.

Week Nine, Session One:

1. Students read story, aloud, from Side by Side, pp. 132-133. They then listed all past tense verbs, dividing them into two columns, regular and irregular. Time: 35 minutes.
2. Oral practice with past tense questions and did-didn't answers. Time: 15 minutes.

3. Each student reported to class about their partner. Time: 25 minutes.
4. Homework assigned: Past tense sentences with 11 irregular verbs. Time: 10 minutes.

Week Ten, Session One:

1. Heterogeneous, whole class, worked together. Pairs were created with stronger and weaker students. Time: 10 minutes.
2. From Lifelines, Level 3, all students repeated the names of common household appliances. Time: 10 minutes.
3. The whole class repeated short dialogues involving reporting appliance problems. Time: 20 minutes.
4. Practicum student composed a 10-line dialogue on the board, and assigned each pair of students a different appliance. Time: 10 minutes.
5. Student pairs practiced their dialogues. Time: 15 minutes.
6. Pairs verbalized dialogues in front of the class. Time: 25 minutes.

Week Ten, Session Two: (original target group)

1. Reviewed names of household appliances and how to state problems. Time: 20 minutes.
2. Had students practice asking each other what the problems were with their appliances. Time: 15 minutes.
3. Brought in pictures of household appliances and furniture. Students, in pairs, helped each other write about their pictures according to color, size, function, and price. Time: 25 minutes.
4. Each student stood in front of the class with his picture. Other students asked questions, and the student answered. Time: 30 minutes.
5. Written summaries were collected and checked.

Week Eleven, Session One:

1. Using Lifelines, Level 2, Chapter 14, had students repeat necessary vocabulary and sentences for reporting housing problems. Time: 25 minutes.
2. Had students practice dialogues in pairs, role-playing a tenant and a landlord.

Assigned each pair a different problem. Time: 20 minutes.

3. Each pair spoke in front of the class. Time: 15 minutes.
4. For pages 67 and 68, had students write sentences about the household problems they see in each picture. Time: 30 minutes.

Week Eleven, Session Two:

1. Combined both levels into a whole class, forming high-low ability dyads to work together.
2. Showed students how to form comparatives of common adjectives, such as sunny-sunnier, hot-hotter. Had students take notes in a chart form. Time: 25 minutes.
3. Gave students a questionnaire form, had them answer questions about their own country, with the responses including the comparative form of adjectives. Time: 20 minutes.
4. Had each pair of students practice asking and responding to questions about their own country, with the responses including the

comparative forms of adjectives. Time: 20 minutes.

5. Had pairs of students begin speaking in front of the class. Time: 10 minutes.
6. Collect all questionnaires.

Week Twelve, Sessions One and Two:

1. Re-interview each of the eleven students for a possible new rating on the FSI Test.
2. Re-administer "Pre-Post Survey," Appendix B:60.
3. Administer "Final Class Attitudinal Survey," Appendix G:71.

Two sessions were set aside because the forms were not in Spanish, and most students needed translations of the questions. The practicum writer tested and helped pairs of students outside of the regular classroom, where the entire original group was having the same lesson with its instructor.

Changes in the Original Implementation

This original plan went mostly according to schedule, but the researcher had to devote more time to problem areas. Consequently, small parts of the

general plan had to be omitted. Specifically, the "Week Ten" plan was entirely omitted.

Students indicated that they needed more time with spoken tasks, such as whole-class repetition and dialogue practice in dyads. Luckily, the individual sessions had been structured with written exercises, involving grammar and dictation, at the end. Sometimes, there was no time to assign a grammar exercise, and if the group completed it, the time element made it impossible to correct the exercise with the entire group. Instead, the researcher collected the exercises, corrected any errors, and returned them at the next class meeting.

CHAPTER IV

Results

The initial testing and assessments had been done during a peak enrollment period for adults, the beginning of the winter term. Given the open-entry, open-exit nature of the adult ESOL program, three of the target group were not longer in attendance by Week Twelve, and although approximately four new students joined the group, there was no time for either the researcher or the regular classroom teacher to administer the FSI Test or the Pre-Post Survey to these four students. They simply entered the lower group, approximately midway through the twelve weeks, based on a quick verbal assessment by the classroom teacher. Therefore, when the final evaluation instruments were tabulated, the researcher based the results on the remaining eight, rather than the original eleven, students. Expectations, though, already mentioned in Chapter I, remained the same. A numerical summary of the results is mentioned in the "Post Survey" (Appendix J:76).

Of the eight students, five improved by one to one and one-half levels on their "Perceived FSI," as measured by Questions 3 and 7 on the "Pre-Post Survey" (Appendix B:60). This was a total of 63 percent. Seven improved on their actual FSI oral test, a total of 88 percent. Six, or 75 percent of the students, reported gains of at least one level in speech anxiety, as measured by Questions 12 and 14 on the "Pre-Post survey" (Appendix B:60). As compared with the original objectives, the actual FSI scores were more positive than expected; the "Level of Speech Anxiety" goal was very close to the targeted 80 percent; and although the "Perceived FSI" did not reach the 80 percent mark, two students had improve by half a level, so, according to the original criteria, could not count towards the 80 percent goal.

All eight students agreed, on the anonymous "Attitudinal Survey" (Appendix G:71), that the class had become better since it began in February. In answer to Question 3 on the survey, seven students felt that the opportunity to speak themselves, rather than read or listen to a teacher, was an important improvement. All eight listed the smaller class size

as very helpful, and six replied that their spelling and writing had improved. Four students mentioned that they had made friends, and three that they liked the "teacher." For the purposes of this study, the last two responses were not significant, since they were not part of the objectives or original assessment instruments.

CHAPTER V

Recommendations

Research has shown that adults' abilities to acquire a second language is not linked solely to their intelligence. Rather, it is closely tied with ~~both~~ their personality traits, such as risk-taking and extroversion, and their comfort level in the learning situation.

This practicum concentrated on making adult students first willing to speak English at all, and later enthusiastic about learning and using the language. To summarize, the basic strategies used were dividing the whole class into two ability levels, using content lessons pertaining to students' daily lives, and giving students more opportunities to speak in situations that caused considerably less embarrassment or stress than speaking alone in front of a heterogeneous group of over twenty students. Such opportunities were provided by having students ask and answer each other's questions, interview each other, practice dialogues in dyads, and perform that dialogue

with a partner in front of the class, rather than alone.

In the whole-class situation that was originally observed, some of these methods were difficult because of so many levels of second-language speaking ability combined with only one teacher. In the near future, though, this situation may or not be alleviated. Therefore, recommendations for implementing these teaching methods should be practicable with or without extra personnel.

Of course, a volunteer or practicum student would be ideal as extra manpower and a way of separating students of varied abilities. However, if the class must remain one unit, pairing a more experienced speaker with a new speaker will help. Additionally, groups of three and four students can be assigned projects together, such as describing what is happening during sequences of pictures. The same lesson can also be altered for different students. For example, an advanced student can write sentences in the present perfect tense, while a beginning student can answer with the far simpler present tense.

It is always possible to teach a content unit where all students can learn new vocabulary, such as the parts of a car or household appliances. Both units include vocabulary very technical for most ESOL students.

At all costs, the ESOL teacher should have students do most of the speaking, rather than being in the passive role of listening. If teachers are uncomfortable in changing the traditional "lockstep" role, then more in-service workshops can be organized through the County.

Above all, when students indicate both satisfaction and progress with their ESOL class, enrollment will not only stabilize, but increase. With more money from the government provided per student, it could be possible for the school to hire an additional ESOL teacher and divide the class into at least two levels.

REFERENCE LIST

Bassano, Mary K., and Mary Ann Christison. "Developing Successful Communication Groups." In Michael Long and Jack C. Richards, Eds. Methodology in TESOL. New York: Newbury House, 1987.

Brown, Cheryl. "Requests for Specific Language Input: Differences Between Older and Younger Adult Language Learners." In Robin C. Scarcella and Michael H. Long, Eds. Issues in Second Language Research. Cambridge, Ma: Newbury House Publishers, 1985.

Brumfit, Christopher. Communicative Methodology in Language Teaching. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Dudley, Sid, and D. Shawver. "The Effect of Homework on Students' Perceptions of Teaching Effectiveness." Journal of Education, October, 1991, pp. 21-25.

"PSI Proficiency Ratings" Appendix A. In Michael H. Long and Jack C. Richards, Eds. Methodology in TESOL. New York: Harper Collins Publishers, 1987, p. 407.

Gass, Susan, and Evangeline M. Varonis. "The Effect of Familiarity on the Comprehensibility of Nonnative Speech." Language Learning, Vol. 34, No. 1, 1984, pp. 65-87.

Krashen, Stephen D., Michael A. Long, and Robin C. Scarcella. "Age, Rate, and Eventual Attainment in Second Language Acquisition." TESOL Quarterly, December 1979, pp. 573-582.

with Tracy D. Terrell. The Natural Approach. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Regents, 1983.

Laine, Eero J. "Affective Factors in Foreign Language Learning and Teaching: A Study of the 'Filter'." Eric Clearinghouse on Cross-Language Studies, 1987. ERIC ED 292 302.

Lightbrown, Patsy M. "Great Expectations: Second Language Acquisition Research and Classroom Teaching." Applied Linguistics, Vol. 6, No. 2, 1985, pp. 173-178.

Long, Michael H., and Patricia A. Porter. "Group Work, Interlanguage Talk, and Second Language Acquisition." TESOL Quarterly, June 1985, pp. 207-228.

Maley, Alan. "I Got Religion! Evangelism in Language Teaching." Studies in Language Learning, Vol. 4, pp. 77-84.

Reilly, Tarey. "Maintaining Foreign Language Skills." ERIC Clearinghouse on Language and Linguistics, 1988. ERIC ED 296 573.

Shimatani, Hiroshi. "An Examination of the Monitor Theory." ERIC Clearinghouse on Language and Linguistics, 1988. ERIC ED 297 592.

Schultz, Renate. "Second Language Acquisition Theories and Teaching Practice: How Do They Fit?" The Modern Language Journal, 75, i, 1991, pp. 17-26.

Schumann, John H. "Research on the Acculturation Model for Second Language Acquisition." Journal of Multicultural and Multilingual Development. Vol. 7, No. 5, 1986, pp. 379-392.

Swain, Merill. "Communicative Competence: Some Roles of Comprehensible Input and Comprehensible Output in Its Development." In Robin C. Scarcella and Michael H. Long, Eds. Issues in Second Language Research. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House Publishers, 1985, pp. 235-253.

Wilds, Claudia, P. "The Oral Interview Test." In Testing Language Proficiency, Randall Jones and Bernard Spolsky, Eds. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975, pp. 29-44.

Womack, Morris M. and Elinor Bernstein. Speech for Foreign Students. Springfield: Charles Thomas Publishers, 1990.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Basic Student Data

1. Name
2. Country of origin
3. Native language
4. Age
5. Telephone number
6. Address
7. Length of time in the U.S.
8. Amount of time in ESOL class
9. Main reason for learning English
10. Job, at present, in this country
11. Job goal for the future
12. Outside of school, with whom do you speak English?
13. Do you have any American friends?

APPENDIX B

Pre-Survey, Adult ESOL Class

1. Name.

2. Number of nights attending class, average.

3. How do you rate your English speaking ability, on a scale of 1 to 5? One is the worst, five is the best. Circle a number.

   1 2 3 4 5

4. This class begins at 5:30 and ends at 9:00. What time do you usually enter class?

5. Why do you arrive at this time?

6. Circle your main goal in this class:

   A. Speaking English to communicate on the job and socially.

   B. Reading English to understand it.

   C. Listening to English and being able to understand it.

   D. Writing English in better sentences, with better spelling.

   E. Understanding directions at your job.

7. How do you rate yourself as an English speaker compared to the other students in this class, or your classmates? Circle the number.

   1. Terrible.

   2. Slightly below the average student.

   3. Average, compared to the rest.

4. Above average.

5. Excellent: I can help almost all the other students.

8. How do you spend <u>most</u> of your time in this ESOL class? (Circle one letter only)

A. Practicing speaking.

B. Reading quietly.

C. Reading out loud.

D. Listening to the teacher speak English.

E. Listening to other students speak English.

F. Listening to other students speak Spanish.

9. Look again at Question 8. How do you <u>want</u> to spend your time in this class?

<u>Write the letter</u>:

10. If the school had more teachers, would you like the class to divide into two groups, with one group an upper level, and the other group a lower level? Circle your choice:

A. Yes B. No

11. If the school had more teachers, would you like two groups, in two separate rooms, or two teachers helping all students in the same room, as you have now? Circle your answer.

A. Two groups in separate rooms.

B. All groups in the same room.

12. How nervous are you when you speak English?

    1. Very nervous.

    2. A little nervous.

    3. Not at all nervous.

    4. Confident, but conscious of mistakes in speech.

    5. Very confident.

13. If you are nervous about speaking English, what would help you the most? (Circle only 2)

    A. Reduction of accent.

    B. More vocabulary.

    C. Grammar exercises.

    D. Listening comprehension exercises.

    E. Practice with speaking in everyday conversations.

    F. Practice speaking alone in front of the class.

    G. Practice speaking with a partner in front of the class.

14. Are you nervous when the teacher calls on you in class?

    Circle one: Yes No

15. Do you prefer to have papers collected and corrected by your teacher, or to keep all your papers without corrections? (Circle one)

    A. Keep all papers.

B. Have papers reviewed and corrected by the teacher, and then get the papers back with teacher comments.

16. Would you like some short homework assignments from the class? (Circle one)

A. Yes B. No

APPENDIX C

Background Interview with Site Administrator at Community School A

1. How long has the ESOL program been in effect at this school?

2. What do you feel is the socioeconomic status of most students?

3. What is the average number of ESOL students registered per quarter?

4. What is the attrition rate during a typical nine-week session? Please answer by number of students or an average percentage.

5. What is the approximate carry-over percentage of students from one nine-week session to the next?

6. What percentage of students attend for all three teachers on all four nights?

7. What percentage of students attend for only one teacher?

8. On what level are the majority of students in the program? (Beginning, Intermediate, Advanced)

9. What do you feel is the overriding motivation of most students in attending ESOL class? (communication with spouse or family, job purposes, social reasons)

10. How do you feel this program is better than other ESOL programs?

11. What are the drawbacks of this program?

12. How would you like to improve the program?

13. What percentage of all night school students are ESOL?

14. Do you feel that students have the opportunity to receive individual attention?

15. Do you feel that the students could benefit from guest speakers? What kind? (of speakers)

APPENDIX D

Model FSI Test Questions

From: Wilds, Claudia, P. "The Oral Interview Test." In Testing Language Proficiency. Randall Jones and Bernard Spolsky, Eds. Arlington, VA: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1975, pp. 30-31.

1. At least one of the two examiners should be a native-speaking language instructor.

2. The oral interview "appears as a relaxed, normal conversation."

3. To determine what level of difficulty to use for the questions, the interviewer begins with "simple social formulae ... [such as] introductions and comments on the weather, questions like 'Have you just come back from overseas?' or 'Is this your first speaking test here?'"

4. Depending on how the student, or "examiner," who could be a government employee, answers the opening questions, the examiner can quickly plan the rest of the test accordingly. In other words, the examinee who has trouble with the beginning questions has a "ceiling" so that the questions will not get more difficult.

5. The low-level learner is asked to provide information as simply as he can about: his family or his job. This is impromptu conversation.

6. Progressing satisfactorily beyond this level, the next level of proficiency could require giving street directions, or playing a role, such as renting a house or taking a telephone message.

7. At the final level, the examinee can talk about current events on the very "detailed aspects of his job."

8. After a student has clearly passed, the first two ratings of an interview, and can both understand and give communications, then he is guided into a natural, free-flowing conversation during which grammar, vocabulary, and conversation can be simultaneously checked.

9. An experienced pair of raters can decide on an approximate score within five or ten minutes, and the rest of the interview is spent narrowing the score down to an exact one.

APPENDIX E

FSI Test Questions

Orally rated by:

A. Fluency

B. Grammar

C. Vocabulary

D. Comprehension

E. Accent

Oral Test Questions (all to be answered in questions):

1. What's your name?
2. Where do you live?
3. How long have you been in this country?
4. Why did you move to this country?
5. Do you have any relatives in this country? Who are they?
6. What program do you like to watch on television?
7. How long have you studied English?
8. What was your job in your country?
9. What is your favorite sport?
10. What is your favorite food?
11. Tell me what you like about this country. (several aspects)
12. Tell me what you do not like about this country. (several aspects)

13. Tell me what you miss about your country.

14. Tell me about your ideal husband/ wife/ boyfriend/ girlfriend.

15. What do you usually do when you are not working?

APPENDIX F

Selected Results of Student, Pre-Survey and FSI Test

(The 11 students who became the target group are check-marked)

Student (Number-25 students total)	Perceived FSI (as the student perceives his own level)	Actual FSI (as 2 teachers perceive student's level)	Level of Speech Anxiety 1 - worst 5 - best, most confident	Length of Time in U.S.
1.	4+	2+	2	1 yr.
✔ 2.	3	1	1	1½ yrs.
✔ 3.	1	0+	2	2 wks.
4.	3+	4	1	3 mos.
✔ 5.	1	3+	1	1 yr., 6 mos.
6.	4	4	5	3 mos.
7.	3+	3+	3+	2 mos.
8.	4	3+	4	2 mos.
9.	4	3+	4	2 mos.
10.	2+	2+	2	6 mos.
11.	2+	2+	2	3 yrs.
12.	4	3+	5	7 yrs.
13.	3	2+	2	5 mos.
✔14.	1	1	4	6 yrs.
15.	4	3+	5	6 yrs.
✔16.	2	1	3	2 mos.
✔17.	2+	1	1	6 yrs.
✔18.	2	1	5	2 wks.
19.	3	2+	2	10 yrs.
✔20.	1	1	2	3 mos.
✔21.	1	2	3	3 mos.
22.	3	3+	1	6 yrs.
✔23.	0	1	1	1 mo.
24.	3	3+	4	5 yrs.
✔25.	2	2+	3	1 yr.

APPENDIX G

Final Class Attitudinal Survey

1. Has your class changed at all since February? Circle one answer.

   Yes No

2. Has your class become better, or more useful to you? Circle one answer.

   Yes No

3. Try to list three changes in the class which you feel have helped you to learn. Please list them in order of importance. If you would like to add more than three, you may.

   A.

   B.

   C.

APPENDIX H

Two-Person Interview, Entire Class

Verb Selection: LISTEN TO, READ, WATCH, SEE, SING, DRIVE, HAVE, EAT, DRINK, PLAY, LIVE IN, BUY, WANT

Use the verbs above to help you complete the questions!

Ex: What kind of fruit do you eat?

He eats pears.

*** The question is asked in the second person, YOU, directly to your partner. However, the answer is answered in the third person, "he, she," because the answer will later be given orally to the class.

1. What kind of music do you _____?

   He/She _____ _____ music.

2. What kind of house do you _____ _____?

   He/She _____ _____ a (an) _____ _____.

3. What kind of magazines do you _____?

   He/She _____ _____ magazines.

4. _____ _____ _____ songs do you _____?

   He/She _____ _____ songs.

5. _____ _____ _____ food do you eat?

   _____ _____ _____ food.

6. What kind of newspapers do you _____?

   _____ _____ _____ newspapers.

7. What kind of car do you _____?

   _____ _____ a (an) _____.

8. What kind of books do you _____?

   He/She _____ _____.

9. What kind of restaurants do you _____?

He/She _____ _____ restaurants.

10. What kind of sports do you _____?

He/She _____ _____ and _____.

11. What kind of men/women do you _____?

He/She _____ _____, _____, _____ men/women.

12. What kind of T.V. shows do you _____?

He/She _____ _____ and _____.

Favorites

1. What is your favorite food?

His/her favorite food is _____.

2. What is your favorite car?

His/her favorite _____ is a _____.

3. Who is your favorite singer?

His/her favorite singer is _____.

4. What is your _____ T.V. show?

_____ _____ T.V. show is _____.

5. What is your _____ subject in school?

_____ _____ subject is _____. (Math, English, Science, Art, etc.)

6. What is your favorite color?

His/her favorite color is _____.

7. Who _____ _____ _____ person?

His/her _____ person is his/her _____.

8. What is your _____ sport?

_____ _____ _____ _____ _____.

9. What is your _____ time of day?

His/her favorite time of day is _____. (the morning, afternoon, evening, nighttime).

10. What is your favorite thing about Community School A?

His/her _____ _____ is _____.

11. What is your major complaint about Community School A?

His/her major complaint is _____.

APPENDIX I

Listening Chart for Student Interviews

Name	Music	Car	Sports	Shows	School Subject	Color	Men/ Women
1.							
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							

APPENDIX J

Selected Results of Student, Post Survey and Second FSI Test

(Student numbers correlate to their numbers on the original Pre-Post Survey [Appendix F:70])

Student (Number)	Perceived FSI (as the student perceives his own level)	Actual FSI (as 2 teachers perceive student's level)	Length of Level of Speech Anxiety 1 - worst 5 - best, most confident
2.	3+	2+	3
5.	2+	3+	3
14.	1	2+	4
16.	3	2	4
17.	3+	3	3
21.	1+	3	3
23.	1+	2+	2
25.	3+	2+	4