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The Huang and Van Naerssen (1987) survey in Southern China proved conclusively that the more fluent Chinese L2 learners of English used more communicative strategies than their not fluent counterparts. This study was an attempt to repeat the Huang and Van Naerssen study in a different setting with L2 learners of different ethnic and cultural backgrounds. L2 learners of English at secondary level were chosen from four countries in which I had recently lived and worked. In addition an attempt was made to empirically test the validity of Schumann's (1978) acculturation hypothesis on models for which it was not originally intended. A correlation was being sought between the level of acculturation of L2 learners and their fluency in English.

A cloze test was given to the one hundred and twenty-five L2 learners in the study in order to gauge their level of proficiency in English. A survey was then presented to L2 learners in all four countries, Chile, Paraguay, South Africa and Botswana. Part One of the survey asked questions related to acculturation. Part Two asked the same communicative questions used in the South China study.

The results from the survey were inconclusive though the raw data for the communicative strategies and acculturation helped to show that the more proficient the student in English, the more likely he or she was to use communicative strategies or show a higher level of acculturation. The results were not statistically significant.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1 Aims and Scope

1.1 Aims

The purpose of this study is to examine in detail several learning strategies to see if they are used more frequently by successful learners of English as a Second Language (ESL), than by less successful ESL learners. For the purposes of this study, ‘ESL’ will designate English second-language specifically and ‘L2’ will denote all second language learning, regardless of the target language. While this study is concerned with ESL, much of the literature refers to L2 learning generally.

1.2 Scope

Four countries were chosen for the study. These four countries were chosen because was familiar with them. Also, even though English is widely spoken in many parts of South Africa, none of these countries could be considered to be core English speaking countries where L1 use of English is predominant. They can be described as periphery-English countries. There are two types of periphery countries, some examples according to Phillipson (1972:17), although his list is not exhaustive.

1. Chile, Japan, Paraguay where English is an international link language.
2. South Africa, Botswana, Malaysia in which English was imposed in colonial times.

I have also worked with Asian students in New Zealand and Aboriginal students in Central Australia but these students were not included in the survey. Australia and New Zealand are

---

1 The four countries chosen for the study were South Africa, Botswana, Chile and Paraguay. I have worked and lived in all four of these countries.

2 The use of 'I' instead of the more formal 'the researcher' is necessitated by the fact that the dissertation relies to some extent on the personal experience of the researcher.
both L1 English speaking countries and both the Asian and Aboriginal students are in a completely different relationship to L1 language and culture. The Asian students are in a similar position to immigrant learners of an L2. The Aboriginals are an oppressed minority culture, relating to a dominant L1 culture. All the countries under consideration for the survey have a dominant L1 language and culture other than English.

2 Motivation and Reporting Style

2.1 Motivation

I first became interested in strategies for second language learning after my own experience of learning Spanish while I was teaching English in Paraguay. As Savignon (1981:241) notes, "a persistent concern of the second language researchers has been the documentation of L2 acquisition in natural environments, the study of 'street learning' as it has been called". I became aware of the contrast between my own rapid success in learning Spanish "on the streets" and the lack of fluency in some of the students in my class despite the fact they had been in an English medium school for eight years. The students in my segundo curso class in Paraguay had been together as a class since they were five years old. Everyone had had the same teachers and the same education but some were very fluent in English and others were not. The question was, how could this be so? I kept a diary which will be a source of anecdotal information and experiences for the chapters on communicative learning and acculturation. Owing to the nature of the acculturation process and the difficulty of gauging it empirically, the chapter that deals with this subject is more reliant on anecdotal observations and less formal as a result.

I went to South America with the specific aim of learning Spanish. I was at the time, a qualified teacher of English and History but I had the intention of specialising in Teaching English as a Second Language. To do this effectively I thought I needed to learn a second language because I was at the time a monolingual L1 speaker of English. Spanish was to be my second language and I went about learning it in a methodical way. Initially I had planned to go to a Language Institute run by the Catholic Church in Bolivia. I had paid a deposit to the Institute and bought a ticket to Cochabamba, Bolivia. I had intended to spend six months of my life doing nothing else except learning Spanish as an L2. The Spanish spoken in the Andean Highlands of Bolivia is reputed to be closer to standard Spanish than any other variety in South America and the Institute run by the Maryknoll's, the best in the
Hispanic world. I stopped in Asuncion, Paraguay, *en route* to Bolivia, but owing to visa problems, I found myself stranded in a country and city that had not been a part of my original plan. The Principal of Colegio San Andres, Asuncion, made the suggestion that I work part time for her and study Spanish in Paraguay. In retrospect this was probably a good thing, as Paraguay had a number of advantages for a New Zealander learning Spanish. Primarily it was a healthy environment in comparison to other South American countries. It was also very safe and the crime rate was very low. All of this contributed to significantly lower levels of stress and culture shock than I had suffered on previous occasions in other foreign non-English-speaking countries.

In retrospect I actually did my best to acculturate, not that I knew it was called that at the time. I immersed myself in Paraguayan culture. After a couple of weeks' adjusting by living with other English speakers, I went to live with a Paraguayan family. I made a conscious decision to socialise with Spanish speakers only and to avoid the English-speaking community. In fact, at weekends I never spoke English. The only English I did speak was while teaching two hours and fifteen minutes of English lessons every morning. In the afternoons I took three hours of Spanish classes in a private institute for foreigners. I believe the low levels of stress I experienced in Paraguay assisted my L2 acquisition. After five months I was fluent in oral Paraguayan Spanish and also reasonably socio-culturally competent. I was far more fluent in Spanish than my students were in English after eight years in an English medium school.

In Botswana the main reason that the Cubans gave for their poor English, was that they did not have many/any native speakers to talk to. The implication was that the Tswana did not speak English well enough for the Cubans to learn it from speaking to them. It is important to note that Botswana was never a British Colony but rather a Protectorate. Tswana exposure to L2 culture then, has been minimal compared to neighbouring Zimbabwe. While it can hardly be empirically tested, the Cubans' poor English could have been due to their lack of exposure to L2 culture, among other variables, while trying to learn English. Most Community Junior Secondary Schools in Botswana would have been lucky to have had one expatriate teacher, let alone an L1 speaker of English. Some schools had no expatriates and hence no one who was either a L1 speaker of English or someone forced to use English rather than Tswana as the *lingua franca*. So lack of exposure to L2 culture and language was a common problem for all L2 learners of English in Botswana.
2.2 Reporting Styles

Because the motivation for this study stems from personal language learning and teaching experience, I shall use these experiences in an anecdotal way throughout the study to reflect on the theory and practices discussed. I am a mature student and I think my life experience is a "relevant and valid source of wisdom and knowledge" (Ivanic & Simpson:1992 165). This is perhaps a little unconventional but this area of research is still in the pioneering stage. Ellis (1992:14) maintains: "It is probably true to say that the research into learning style is very exploratory at the moment. The concept itself is a somewhat vague one and so not surprisingly the research has not been able to produce very clear results. However, it is arguably an important one for language pedagogy, where the importance of learner-instruction matching has long been recognised". One of my primary motives for doing this study is to obtain insights that could be used to improve instructional practice in the L2 classroom. If there is something that successful L2 students do that others do not do, it may be possible to teach this strategy to less successful students and thereby improve their rate of L2 acquisition. Ellis (1992: 8) notes:

[i]Increasingly ... many SLA; researchers have felt less of a need to apply their work to language teaching. Many of the studies reported in the current issues of journals deal with purely theoretical questions. For many researchers SLA is now a sub-discipline of linguistics. They view data obtained from L2 learners as a means of testing alternative theories of language ... What seems to have happened is that 'classroom SLA' has developed as a sub-field of SLA. Thus, whereas the early studies applied the results of studies of naturalistic acquisition, more recent studies have tried to examine how SLA takes place in a classroom environment. Krashen's Monitor Model, which was devised to address pedagogic issues, is essentially an extrapolation from studies of naturalistic acquisition - both first and second - carried out during the 1970s.

Perhaps, there is a need for studies of L2 learning that are a little less dominated by academic theories. There are pedagogic issues that need to be addressed and it needs to be discovered what it is that teachers and L2 learners can do that would improve performance in the L2 classroom.

If more practising teachers were to do research this could be a justification for the greater use of T in academic studies. Ivanic and Simpson (1992: 144) give some justification for the use of T, suggesting that, "the taking responsibility for your ideas commits you to truthfulness. The T makes you write your ideas, thoughts and convictions. Good academic writing is about progression; it is not static".
Indeed the use of 'I' in academic writing is becoming more common. There seem to be two approaches. There is the ego 'I' which is withdrawn, impersonal and disengaged. Then there is the committed 'I' which is more like the writer getting into a conversation with the reader about something he/she cares about. Ivanic and Simpson (1992) note that over the last thirty years there has been a shift towards greater use of the more informal 'committed- I'. Many academic articles that I have read for this study, particularly those from the United States, used this less formal 'committed-I'.

It has also become quite common for academics and researchers writing about L2 language acquisition to include their own L2 learning experiences in their academic writings. Agar (1997) writes of experiences very similar to my own. He writes of how he became orally fluent in Austrian-German as a teenage exchange student and then of how later as an adult he struggled to learn standard German for academic purposes. Savignon (1981,1983), Schulz (1991) and many other writers have used both their own experiences and those of their families.

3 Hypothesis

The hypothesis which underlies this study is thus based on my own experience and on my literature survey into strategies for second language acquisition, particularly the study-conducted by Huang and Van Naerssen (1987) in China. The hypothesis is that an L2 learner's success will correlate with his or her degree of empathy for the culture of the target language and his or her willingness to actively seek opportunities for interacting with target language speakers or media/texts.

4 Language Acquisition

4.1 Schumann's Hypothesis

The language acquisition theory that is of considerable importance to this study, is Schumann's Acculturation/Pidginization theory (1978). L2 acquisition, it is argued, is part of the acculturation process and the proficiency with which the ESL learner acquires the L2 is mirrored by the degree to which he or she acculturates. The original model in Gingras (1978) "was applicable to immigrant groups who acquire the target language in the environment in which it is spoken and without the aid of formal introduction" (Schumann 1986: 388).
Other studies have since been done using the model. There was varied success with these studies which led Schumann to state that two major issues had emerged from the research. One was that the model "which was designed to account for language learning by immigrant communities, may also be applicable to other groups" (ibid. : 389); It was mainly a study by Maple (1982) at the University of Texas with university-level foreign students that gave support to the idea that the model may be applicable to other groups. The students in question were not immigrants. The other issue was that the research involved "cannot be expected to be successful on small sample cases" (Schumann 1986:389). One of the studies involved only one Japanese student in Canada. (Schmidt 1983). So Schumann's model might be applicable to other groups.

Many of the Paraguayan students in this study had older brothers and sisters studying in the USA and they also intended to study in the United States if they could successfully master English. It can be argued that some students in this study might be regarded as younger models of those in the Maple study. It is also very common for successful Batswana students to study in either the USA or the United Kingdom, the successful students being sponsored by the state. This study involved more than 125 students, which is considered the lowest number for a statistically accurate survey (Mathematics Department, University of Cape Town, South Africa 1996),

Brown (1991) describes a optimal distance model of L2 acquisition. This is intimately linked with the acculturation theory. There are generally thought to be four stages of acculturation which persons go through in adapting to a new culture.

Stage 1 A period of excitement and euphoria that you could call the honeymoon stage.

Stage 2 In the second stage you get culture shock. This produces symptoms such as estrangement, hostility, indecision, frustration, sadness, loneliness, homesickness and even illness.

Stage 3 Is one of gradual and at first tentative and vacillating recovery.

Stage 4 This is the stage of full recovery after which the person has either adapted to or been assimilated by the new culture (ibid. : 158-159);

It is thought that in the third stage a person learning an L2 would be at an optimal distance for learning the target language; that is, he or she would learn faster and better. Johnson's
(1998:3) experiences of learning an L2 in Nigeria mirror the above four stages. She writes of the transition from stage two to three: "This phase of culture shock passes. It is replaced by a very realistic and productive phase of acculturation, during which you learn the target language and adapt to some of the cultural ways of your host country".

The above four stages mirror almost exactly my own experiences in Paraguay though for several reasons my Stage 2 culture shock phase was not as violent or as prolonged as it could have been. I attribute this to a number of reasons, the first being that the social distance between my own culture (New Zealand) and Paraguayan culture was not really that great. There were more than twenty New Zealand exchange students (Senior high school students, living and studying in the country for one year) in Paraguay in 1995. Another factor was that by this stage in my life (I was thirty one at the time) I knew exactly what culture shock was and I had learnt several strategies both to minimise and avoid it. A month that I had spent in Prague, Czech Republic, in 1993 had taught me a great deal about culture shock in a society that I had found very foreign. While it is important you have some access to your own culture and language, I was also aware of the fact that the seeking out the company of other English speakers was a symptom of culture shock. I made a conscious decision to avoid socialising with other English speakers in Paraguay. I was able to be so cavalier because I was spending a small amount of time each morning with other English speakers while at school. It is a careful balancing act to get it all right. According to Brown (1991) you have to be careful not to go into stage 4 without first mastering the L2. Learners can and do develop ways and means of coping with a fossilised L2 or with minimal knowledge of the L2. The other extreme is having a sufficient knowledge of the L2 for everyday life and having your acculturation process hampered by not learning the L2 at the optimal stage 3. This theory of L2 acquisition definitely applied to myself, an L2 developed in respect of people learning English in the USA. Learning a L2 in a naturalistic situation should be a fairly similar process no matter what the language.

As with Schumann's theory, there is some relevance to the situations of the learners in this survey. Their acculturation and learning of English may have been slower than for learners in an L1 country but it could also be argued there are fewer variables. The majority of the learners had been attending their schools for the same period of time and had experienced a similar exposure to English. Particularly in the case of the Paraguayan students, this raises
the question of why, despite all their English instruction, a sizeable minority, (six out of twenty in Segundo Curso), simply failed to learn English adequately.

I had observed learners in all four countries in three of the four stages of acculturation, as I knew some of the students quite well. There were several I could have placed at Stage Three. One, a girl in Paraguay, scored 45 out of 50 in the cloze test (used as one of the research tools in this study). Orally she was the most fluent in the class, fluent enough to appoint herself spokesperson and argue with the teacher on her own behalf and on the behalf of others. She was clearly aware of the differences between Paraguayan and English-speaking culture, her knowledge coming perhaps from American popular fiction, which she read and a few holiday visits to the United States. She would delight in teaching me about Paraguayan culture by pointing out some of these differences. She knew which Paraguayan customs English speakers would find most shocking; they dealt with death, sex or religion. Frequently her excuse for not having done her homework was because she had been to the family tomb to visit some of her dead relations. Not only was this student to tell me about her visits to the cemetery but she would also tell me about supposed Anglo-Saxon attitudes to death.

I often learnt about cultural difference not only from having things explained to me but by making mistakes. One day I thought it would be a good idea to buy flowers for my landlady. This I did from the flower sellers who had their stalls in front of a cemetery near my house. The location of the flower sellers' stalls should have given me a clue to the significance of flowers. I took the flowers home and Dona Sisi (my landlady), who was used to the strange ways of foreigners, was able to thank me before she explained that in Paraguay flowers were always only for the dead ("Solamente para los muertos"). I had been wondering why you could only buy flowers in front of cemeteries. I made many cultural mistakes but Paraguayans were an easy-going people and I learnt fast. I never made the same mistake twice. Cultural learning, then, is an integral part of L2 learning and can be fraught with difficulties and misunderstandings.

The other student I would have placed in Stage three was a South African boy (L1 Zulu) at St Gregory's College, Natal, who had lived in the USA for two years. He spoke English fluently with an American accent and scored over 40 out of 50 in the proficiency test. He was very clearly in a difficult cultural situation. Both of these students were, however,
unusual. They were proficient in English and had a great deal of knowledge about target culture.

The survey I conducted for this study has questions designed to test whether a student has a positive or negative attitude towards the culture of the L2 he or she is learning. My hypothesis is that there is a reciprocal link between fluency in English and a positive attitude to target culture. As the students in the survey had all been learning English for several years, fluency should have begun to emerge if it were going to happen. It could be a problem for the older L2 learner, if a positive attitude towards the target-culture is a prerequisite for learning the L2. However, in the case of the Paraguayans, they had all been in English immersion classes since five years of age. For their entire primary schooling the Paraguayan L2 learners were immersed in a British primary education programme in the morning. The teachers were British, often monolinguals. In the afternoon the pupils would do the Paraguayan primary programme in Spanish. In respect of discovering a link between acculturation and fluency, the Paraguayan students I taught are definitely better subjects than the more junior students from the schools in Botswana. What would be interesting and perhaps help disprove Schumann's hypothesis would be to discover significant numbers of fluent L2 students with negative attitudes and little knowledge of L2 culture.

_Anomie_ can be described as the first symptom of the third stage of acculturation. It is a feeling of homelessness, where one feels neither bound firmly to a native culture nor fully adapted to a second culture (Brown 1991:159). In Lambert's (1967) study it was exactly when the English speaking Canadians became so skilled in French that they began to think and dream in French, that their feelings of _anomie_ were highest. Lambert (1963) in his theory of L2 acquisition supports this phenomenon by saying that it is at the moment of greatest alienation (during one of the final stages of culture shock) that success in the language learning experience is obtained. At this point learners either retreat into their native culture and fail to learn the L2 or they resolve the sense of _anomie_ and go on to become bilingual and bicultural in their new environments.

As my acquisition of Spanish was such a recent experience I clearly remember when I first thought in my L2. It was such a shock when I first discovered myself thinking in Spanish
that I recorded it in my diary. I remember exactly where I was and what I was doing. At the time I had been in Asuncion about three months. As I had never learnt another language to this level before, and had only thought in English; it was surprising moment to discover myself thinking in Spanish. After this moment I also started to dream in Spanish as well, something I still do today from time to time while living in an English-speaking country. The implication is that dreaming in an L2 equates with a certain amount of proficiency. About the time I began to think in Spanish, my diary shows me struggling with transient feelings of homesickness and loneliness. I stubbornly refused to socialise with the English on the weekends and determinedly sought out Spanish speakers to practise my L2. I had to seek out people who could understand me or those who had the patience to try and understand me. Some L1 speakers, I noticed, had a greater capacity to understand foreigners than others, so I would socialise with people who easily understood my accent. After about four months I made a visit to Chile. This enabled me to visit the New Zealand Embassy in Santiago de Chile and catch up on news and that satisfied the homesickness. On my return to Paraguay it was like coming home in that I now was really beginning to understand the people, their culture and language. Whatever anomie I had felt prior to my visit to Chile simply vanished.

Savignon (1983:93) writes of her children having plenty of opportunities to experience this state of anomie in their early stages of learning French. Savignon's children, I would like to point out, had both parental and sibling support when it came to learning French. This must have lessened the opportunities for anomie and reduced their stress levels.

Though very few of the students in this study may have got far enough to experience a state of anomie, it was a distinct possibility. A Tswana teacher at Montsamaisa CJSS complained to me of several students who were in his opinion copying "Whitemen's" ways; that is, in their dress, manner of speaking and other new customs they had adopted. This was in his opinion an unAfrican thing. I spoke to the boys concerned and found them quite fluent in English and in my opinion quite African. Is this anomie, this drawing away from your own culture and towards that of your L2? In all this there is an implication that if learners can ameliorate their anomie they might increase their chances of learning an L2 successfully.
4.2 Bilingual Education

Bilingual education is a complicated process with many definitions. Malakoff and Hakuta (1990:38) list six methods of bilingual education in the USA alone:

1. Transitional bilingual education.
3. Submersion model.
4. English as a Second Language.
5. US immersion or sheltered English.
6. The Immersion model.

Gardner and Arnold (1985:4) write: "Bilingualism may be a goal of many language programmes but many students do not achieve anything like bilingual skill". Bilingualism is the ideal, something to aim for. Some get closer to the goal than others. As in sport, the striving can be just as important as the winning; not that everyone can win. For the students in this study bilingualism would have been a goal for which many of their teachers would have striven. It was not always a realistic goal. Few of the students could be classified as true bilinguals. This touches on Savignon's (1983:101) concerns over linguistic competence vs communicative competence: the "dilemma we face in the evaluation of student performance is clearly far from resolved".

The Paraguayan students were taught using the immersion method of bilingual education for their primary school years. It was effectively the same method of bilingual education that is used in Ontario, Canada, where White, middle-class, L1 English speakers were put into a French-speaking classroom and thus learnt to speak French. This was successful in Canada. On average, the Paraguayans scored quite highly on the cloze test.

Bilingual education is a complicated variable for this study. Three of the countries, Paraguay, South Africa and Botswana, could perhaps be described as having a form of so-called bilingual education but the countries were all using very different methods. There are also major differences between Botswana and South Africa in this respect. Primary education in Botswana is entirely in the vernacular (Tswana). The language of learning and teaching in secondary education is officially English but in reality, it is both English and Tswana. Botswanan teachers often use the vernacular to teach content subjects when the Ministry of Education says they should only use English. In South Africa on the other hand, primary education for African students often begins in the vernacular then switches over to English. For multilingual South Africa there are also many variables which complicate the
theory "that you need to be proficient in your first language to learn properly in English" (Snow 1990:69). This means you need to be able to speak, read and write proficiently in your L1. Hakuta (1990:50) writes: "Bilingual education is founded on the principle that knowledge and skills in one language will transfer to the other". The majority of learners in this study would be proficient in their L1s but there are exceptions. For instance, the language of the Kalanga in Francistown is simply not studied in Botswanan schools. Also, for a number of reasons, not every South African student becomes literate in his or her L1.

4.3 Acquisition versus Learning
Stephen Krashen's (1982) Acquisition vs Learning theory is also relevant to this study. Krashen's views are well known but controversial. He sees a difference between language acquisition and language learning. Acquisition is what takes place in communicative situations. It occurs when a learner picks up the language in the environment or in a communicative situation, something that is difficult, but not impossible, for some of the students in this study. Learning, on the other hand, takes place in a formal setting such as the classroom. Most of the students in this study would obtain input in their L2 in the classroom..

Another important distinction is between the "that" and "how" of language acquisition. "That" refers to the knowledge of language systems which the learner needs to internalise consciously or unconsciously before he or she can be proficient in the L2. The 'how' refers to how he or she uses that knowledge to communicate effectively (Ellis 1985:55).

5 Theoretical Framework of this Study
Three approaches that incorporate learning strategies that are thought to contribute to the success of ESL learners are considered in this section: communicative learning, reading for pleasure and acculturation. According to Oxford (1990:33), "[l]anguage learning strategies are specific actions or techniques that students use, often intentionally, to improve their progress in developing L2 skills. Strategies encompass a wide range of behaviours that can help the development of language competence in many ways".

5.1 The First Approach
The first strategy to be looked at is communicative strategies. This particular strategy is frequently deployed by more successful L2 learners. Bialystok (1978:75) suggests that it
plays a critical role in L2 acquisition. Huang and Van Naerssen (1987: 291) in their study in Southern China referred to communicative strategies as functional practice and found that such practice was the main indicator of their students success. They define functional practice as:

[a] Speaking with other students, teachers and native speakers in the L2.
[b] Participation in group oral communicative activities.
[c] Attending lectures, watching films and TV programs.
[d] Thinking or talking to self in English. *(ibid.* : 291)

Communicative learners take advantage of every opportunity to practise their L2. They consciously seek out L1 or other L2 speakers on whom they can practise their L2. However, there are variables in L2 acquisition, that are difficult to control. "Where" (or place) is perhaps the greatest variable of all and the location can simply mean there is either a large or small number of opportunities to speak English as an L2 outside the school. The main consideration is that a student sees an opportunity to practise his or her L2 and uses it. It might only be a conscious effort to watch films in English (where available) or to listen to the radio or music in the target language, but it is some extra effort made outside the classroom. In one study involving three subjects, all L1 German speakers, the learners all said that they listened to the British Forces Broadcasting Service (Pickard 1995: 35-37), this being the only real communicative activity available to them. While the study in Southern China may have shown the importance of functional practice among adult Southern Chinese students – a very homogenous and no doubt highly-motivated group – the present study goes further in that it looks at more racially, culturally and linguistically diverse groups of students.

5.2 Reading for Pleasure

A learning strategy this is also known as extensive reading (although the two are not necessarily synonymous); and is the independent reading done by L2 readers. What it is not is intensive reading which is the type of reading done by L2 readers in class under supervision from the teacher. This intensive reading is usually of more difficult passages that need teacher support for all the students to read and comprehend successfully. The importance of extensive reading as a strategy has been supported by the findings of a Fijian study (Elley and Mangubhai, 1983: 53-67), which is discussed in more detail later. Highly successful L2 learners seek out books, magazines, newspapers and other reading material
in the L2 and they read these for pleasure and in order to improve their knowledge of the L2. In environments without much L1 input from native speakers, it is not surprising that reading is such an important indicator of success. For (Pickard's 1995: 35-37), three German speakers, reading material in English was often their main exposure to English while they were living in Germany.

The Edinburgh Project was designed to promote extensive reading in many different countries. Davis (1995) was involved with the introduction of an extensive reading project in forty of the weakest Singaporean schools between 1985 and 1990, judging from poor external examination results. The project succeeded in raising the schools' English language pass rate at O-level above the national average. One of the main components of the scheme was the introduction of uninterrupted sustained silent reading and a book flood: that is, the easy availability of interesting books to read at a variety of levels. Davis admits that it is difficult to quantify results but that anecdotal evidence clearly points to significant improvements in English abilities owing to extensive reading programmes. Initially I had thought of asking the L2 learners exactly how much extensive reading they did by using a reading diary over a one week period. This would have made the reading for pleasure strategy a fairly straight-forward one to test for. The logistics of this exercise and the fact that I could not personally return to Paraguay, Chile and Botswana to collect the information, lead me to discount it as a way of evaluating the amount of extensive reading done by students. Instead I included nine questions in section II of the survey that asked the L2 learners specifically about what reading strategies they used.

5.3 Acculturation

The final approach which learners can consciously or unconsciously adopt is that of acculturation (Gee 1993; Gardner and Lambert 1972). There are conflicting views about language and culture, the question being whether they are two inextricably related entities or not (Alpetkin 1993). Learning the culture of L1 English speakers, whether British or American, together with learning the language is seen as alien and unacceptable in some countries (Wilkins 1975). In countries like Japan, Morocco and Venezuela attempts have been made to take the culture out of English language learning, to "de-Americanise" it. These attempts give rise to the question: Is it possible to learn the language of a people whose culture you do not like? Many (Schumann 1978, Maple 1982) believe that it is
impossible to divorce language learning from the learning of culture. Learning English or any language is considerably different from learning science and mathematics.

Gardner (1985) refers to two types of motivation for learning a second language: instrumental and integrative. In instrumental motivation the learner aims at proficiency in the L2 for utilitarian reasons. In this situation, acquisition of the L2 may cease as soon as the learner has the desired level of communicative ability; that is, fossilization (the arrested development of interlanguage) may occur. Of course fossilization is a general L2 phenomenon and is not restricted to learners in this category but it might occur more frequently. Research needs to be conducted in this area. In integrative motivation; the interaction with the target language and culture occurs from sheer interest: the learner feels no threat from the L2 culture and has a desire to integrate. The acculturation chapter is concerned with integrative motivation.

Chapter Two is concerned with acculturation rather than enculturation (when you learn your L1 culture). The theory behind this strategy comes from Schumann's Acculturation Hypothesis. Schumann claims that acculturation "is the major casual variable in second language acquisition" and that "the degree to which the learner acculturates to the target language group will control the degree to which he acquires the target language ... without acculturation language competence will be incomplete" (1978:29). Acculturation, it might be argued, is what occurs when non-English speaking immigrants go to live permanently in the United States, U.K., New Zealand or Australia. It could also entail the moving of an English speaker to a non-English speaking country. They learn the language and attempt to integrate fully into the culture of their new home, culture being defined as the customs and way of living of a particular group of people. Sometimes this can be done so successfully that the immigrants find themselves becoming divorced from their L1 language and culture. Acculturation, it can be argued, is what takes place in the making of a truly bilingual and bicultural individual. Lennon (1993:40) states:

Up to a certain level proficiency can be achieved by treating language learning as a cognitive task like most other subjects ... However for development in oral proficiency beyond the advanced level towards functional bilingualism [something more is probably required. That is,] the highest levels of oral proficiency will be barred to those who do not develop emotional involvement with language, so that it becomes part of their behaviour.
So with 'emotional' involvement with the language, it may be possible for a language learner to acculturate into the culture of the L2 in his or her own country. Citron (1995:105) observes some students have greater difficulty than others, stepping out of their own "cultural cages and understanding both that languages are not direct translations of each other and that they reflect the cultures of their speakers".

Gee (1993) comments on this phenomenon when he argues that acculturation is important. In an article entitled, *Dracula, the Vampire Lestat* and *TESOL*, he begins with a conversation between Jonathan Harker and Count Dracula (Stoker 1897/1981: 19). The Count says, "I know the grammar and the words but yet I know not how to speak them." (ibid.: 19). What is it, then, to teach a language? It is not a matter of teaching the grammar and the words only but of teaching how to speak them (Gee 1993); that is, some cultural understanding of a people is required, in order to use their language properly.

Interestingly, communicative competence in social interaction does not guarantee communicative competence in academic situations (Saville-Troike 1984). This was my personal experience in Paraguay. After five months, I was completely fluent in the spoken language in all social situations and I also consciously learnt and was taught Paraguayan culture. Knowledge of a language acquired through conversation is context-embedded and concrete; the language used in academic texts is context-reduced and abstract and the language of literature is complex and relies on literary as well as linguistic experience within the particular language.

So, to be able to use a language for a full array of functions – business, socializing, academic, personal – you need to be integrated into the culture of the language you want to learn and not remain a stranger to it. Many business deals are sealed in informal settings so knowledge of what is what is culturally and sociolinguistically appropriate is necessary, as is a knowledge of the business sub-culture. The study involves looking at the subjects for evidence of attempts to acculturate or even of some sympathy and positive feelings towards the L2 culture.
Research Subjects

The subjects under consideration in this study are high school students, the majority of whom are in the thirteen to eighteen years age group. The students are from four separate countries, in all of which I have worked. The four countries under consideration are South Africa, Botswana, Chile and Paraguay. The purpose in using these four countries was to have students with a mother tongue from a Western European language (Spanish) as well as students from completely non-cognate language backgrounds. There is a certain amount of relatedness between Spanish and English both in terms of culture and language. Spanish and English are also the world's two great colonial languages. Similarities in the languages can be accounted for by English borrowings from Latin and Norman French (both cognates of Spanish) and to a lesser degree to borrowing directly from Spanish. The students with other mother tongues (Zulu, Tswana, Kalanga, Sotho etc.) come from ethnic groups with languages and cultures very dissimilar from English. There is no relatedness between English and these languages.

The Huang and Van Naerssen (1987) study dealt with a homogenous group in China. This study tries to ascertain whether some of their conclusions hold true for a more heterogeneous group of ESL learners. The research deals with learners from many different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Two of the countries are to all intents and purposes monolingual or have one dominant lingua franca. In Chile the mother tongue of the vast majority of the population is Spanish. In Botswana the lingua franca is undeniably Tswana.

South America

6.1 Paraguay

South Africa and Paraguay are both effectively bilingual countries. (In this study the term "bilingual" will also include "multilingual"). Paraguay is the only truly bilingual country in South America. It could also be described as bicultural. The two languages are Spanish and Guaraní, both of which are now official languages. Guaraní was the native language of the Guaraní Indians who inhabited the territory that is now Paraguay before the arrival of the Spanish. Modern Paraguayan culture is an amalgam of Guaraní and Spanish culture, the vast majority of the population being mestizo in origin. Holmes (1992:103) writes: "Paraguay is the only Latin American nation with a distinctive national language - Guaraní. Guaraní is an indigenous American Indian language spoken
by over 90% of the population and it has co-existed for the past 300 years with Spanish (which is spoken by no more than 60% of the people)."

All the Paraguayan students in this study were at St. Andrew's College (Colegio San Andres), an Anglican and English medium school in Asuncion, the capital of Paraguay. In the primary section of the school, the students are taught in English most of the time. In the high school they switch over to Spanish so that they can do the Paraguayan curriculum. Then only English (2 hours 15 minutes a day) and religion are taught in English. The students are expected to speak English at other times during the day, though that usually only happens in the presence of teachers. The majority of students are from wealthy homes. Many of the students' parents are in government or business. The school has a good reputation in Asuncion. The grandchildren of the ex-dictator Stroessner attended the school, as did the grandchildren of the General who overthrew him in the 1989 coup. The convent schools had a tendency to attract the students from the older, more cultured families. Students of German origin go to the local German school. The students at St. Andrew's could be described as upper middle class and privileged, of a mainly White or Mestizo racial mix. The parents may be rich but on the whole they are often not very well educated. Education is not highly prized by the rich in Paraguay. The children's parents had wealth, power and privilege. While I was there St Andrew's fees were less than $200 US a month and, even though that was not a lot of money for the majority of parents, they were still reluctant to pay it. Education was not valued as it was not a means of gaining wealth and power as it can be in other societies.

6.1.2 Chile

Chilean School; under consideration in this study is St. Paul's School, in Viña del Mar. Viña is a wealthy, mainly middle class city on the Pacific coast of Chile, north of Valparaiso. While it is an Anglican school, it is not an English medium school. A few English-Chilean students attended the school; but the majority were Chilean mestizos. Like St Andrew's, the school also had a kindergarten and primary attached. The students were mainly middle class with professional parents. The school and students could not have been more different from those in Asuncion.
English was studied as a single subject in the mornings. The students had a very long day – 8.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m. The year before I visited the school in 1995 classes had gone on until 6.00 p.m. The English teachers worked until midday and just two staff members in the English department were native speakers of English. The other teachers were all Chilean. The L1 English speaking teachers were fairly well integrated into Chilean life and they spoke mainly Spanish with other staff members. I started a conversation in English with one of the Chilean-English teachers but we were forced to switch to Spanish as my spoken Spanish was better than her English.

The new principal was struggling to get more English spoken at the school; various policies were in the process of being implemented, one being to speak to the students at Assembly in English. Even to the casual observer the students' level of English was not as high as at St Andrew's. There were however a few native English-speaking students at the school, all from families of English origin. I attended one special class for the more senior of these students. A few Chilean (mestizos) students had also somehow developed a sufficiently proficient level of English to attend these special first language classes. It is important to note that there were opportunities for students to practise English with both L1 and L2 speakers.

6.2 Southern Africa

6.2.1 South Africa

Both of the South African schools under consideration are Anglican: St Gregory's and St Mark's. St Gregory's was established in 1990 on a farm seventeen kilometres from Estcourt, in what is now the province of KwaZulu-Natal, though the students came from all over South Africa, many from wealthy Johannesburg homes. The school is based in an old Anglican Convent but there are many new classrooms and dormitories and the school is well resourced. In May 1997 there were 99 students in the school, the majority from wealthy middle class backgrounds. All of the students were Black. Except for a few local scholarship students, the entire student body was boarders, parents paying a fee of about ten thousand rands a year.
The students spoke a mixture of first languages, mainly Zulu and Sotho but also Tswana. Several students spoke more than one language at home but only one female student said English was her L1 along with Afrikaans and Sotho, all the languages being equal in her opinion. This student was effectively trilingual and she scored the top mark in the English proficiency test. The student was from the Free State. She was, however unusual, as no other student said they had English as an L1. She was included in the survey as were the other students who said they used English at home.

St Mark's, in Jane Furze in the Northern Province, is a very similar institution to St Gregory's, also founded by the Anglican Church. About 99% of the student body are speakers of Northern Sotho. A large percentage of the students were also boarders but the fees were a lot lower than they were at St Gregory's. Despite the fees being considerably less, the parents had great difficult paying them. The students were from very different backgrounds from those at St Gregory's, in that most were not wealthy and many lived in the area.

6.2.2 Botswana

In Botswana the school chosen was Goldmine Community Junior Secondary School. This school had achieved good results in national examinations and was popular with local parents, being oversubscribed. The students came from very mixed backgrounds and there were many students from middle class homes. This was the neighbouring school to the one in which I worked, Montsamaisa CJSS in Francistown. Goldmine was chosen because it had a student body more representative of Francistown. Socially and academically the classes were mixed. Montsamaisa was a school for the students from the poorest classes. There were also very few students at Montsamaisa who were fluent in English. Streaming was still practised at the school at the form two level. I was also the only L1 English-speaking teacher in the school. In one class that I taught there was only one student (Zambian) who was fluent in English and her father was a teacher at the school. Goldmine was a more mixed school and I was also familiar with it. A colleague at this school was able to collect the surveys for me under my direction. They were gathered from an entire class of 40 students of mixed ability.
In Francistown, in the north east of Botswana where the students were studied, there are large numbers of Kalanga and a small minority of Ndebele speakers but all the minorities interact in Tswana when they are speaking to L1 Tswana speakers. In ordinary everyday life English is used very rarely. In the junior secondary schools the Botswanan teachers speak Tswana among themselves, and also very often with their classes, even though they are instructed by the Ministry of Education to teach in English. Tswana is the language most frequently used by Botswanan teachers to explain difficult concepts. Once I asked an ex-student what language his new English teacher spoke in class, as I had heard of English teachers at the neighbouring school teaching in Tswana. The boy's reply was that his teacher taught in English, Tswana, Kalanga and Ndebele. The teacher was a Kalanga. All Kalanga had to be trilingual as a matter of course and there was much anecdotal comment that Kalangas were always better at English than Tswana-speaking Botswanans.

7 Research Methodology

This study is based on a literature survey, empirical research involving the administration of cloze tests, the completion of a survey and insights from my personal experience both as an English teacher and a language learner. The empirical survey was developed from one used by Huang and Van Naerssen (1987).

7.1 Cloze

A cloze test was administered to all the students to test their level of English. The cloze test was seen as the easiest and simplest way of gauging English proficiency levels without complicated interviews and other cumbersome tests. Oller & Conrad (1971:184) state that the "cloze method is a very promising device for measuring ESL proficiency". In an early study by Durrell (1968), cloze scores correlated best with the listening comprehension section of TOEFL. McGuigan (1979) supports the use of the cloze test as a placement test for students. Bormuth (1967:45) found when studying the readability of texts "[t]hat for the liberated reading level involving material which students can read independently a minimum score of 50% on an exact word cloze test is essential". For an instructional level in which a student can read with the help of a teacher, the student needed a score of between 38-50%. Below 38% the student would just get frustrated with the text and give up. The mean
for the cloze test over the whole survey was approximately 56%, which means the majority of students could have been classified as being able to read the cloze passage independently.

The cloze procedure is also a good method of gauging readability of a given text. Oller (1983:353) writes: "What has been shown convincingly is that the cloze technique works much better than the other readability formulas". He suggests using a cloze test with a minimum of 50 blanks.

Another reason for using a cloze test was logistical: it was not always possible for me to return in person to a school from which information was to be collected and a cloze test could easily be administered by anyone.

7.1.1 Testing the Cloze

I tested cloze as a method on three students at Montsamaisa CJSS whose English proficiency levels I knew extremely well through having taught them for several months. I chose what I thought would be an extremely proficient student, a good to middling student and a very poor student who had extreme difficulty communicating in English. The cloze test was constructed from a simplified version of the Bessie Head novel, *When Rain Clouds Do Gather*. This novel is read as a course book for Form Twos in Botswana. Every tenth word was deleted until 50 words had been taken out of the passage.

The first student was one of the few fluent students in the school, a Zambian girl in Form Two. She had begun her primary education in Zambia and her father was a teacher at the school. She was a prolific reader of novels and showed great interest in the outside world and other cultures. As I expected, she scored well, getting 48 out of a possible 50 for appropriate word score. This girl's written English was also excellent and it was impossible to tell that she was an L2 speaker from her written work. The other two students were both boys from a mixed ability class at Form One level. They were both Botswana. The first boy could communicate in English. His primary leaving grade for English was an A. He scored 35 out of 50, which I thought accurately reflected his level in the class. The last student simply could not communicate in English. He had no oral English and almost no written English. He scored an expected 0 out of fifty.
The only word he was able to put in any of the gaps was "was", which he did about twenty times before giving up. His primary leaving grade had been a D for English.

I was convinced of the efficacy of cloze for my purposes but I decided not to use the Bessie Head cloze for the larger group because it was set in an African cultural context which I thought would give the African students an advantage. Johnson (1981) demonstrated that cultural origin of a text has a greater effect on ESL reading comprehension than does linguistic complexity. A passage was then chosen from the children's book *The Lion the Witch and the Wardrobe*, by C.S. Lewis. This book is the second in the Narnia series and the most popular and well known of all the Narnia novels. There was every chance that the novel might have been read by a student even in Chile where the Spanish translations had become available in the early 1990s though I was not aware of the book being used as a class setwork in any of the schools under consideration. As the storyline was about a group of middle class English children, I did not think it gave any group an undue advantage. I also thought the book contained excellent standard-English and the passage itself was uncontroversial. Oller (1979:364) advises against using texts that are intrinsically disturbing and emotionally-charged. One should also avoid using texts requiring technical knowledge and those containing controversial issues and arguments. The passage used was none of the above. Every tenth word was deleted. The cloze test was marked for appropriate, not exact, word, which means that if the word fitted semantically and syntactically into the gap in the cloze test, it was considered acceptable. This was a fairer option than marking for the exact word (see Appendix C).

7.1.2 St Gregory's in South Africa

The cloze test was first used at St Gregory's, administered and marked under my immediate supervision so I could check if there were going to be any problems. In all, 36 students – or a third of the school – were tested at random. Students were chosen out of several classes throughout the whole school, though the entire standard nine class was used as the number of students in it was small.
Once I had marked the tests, I consulted the teachers on how they expected their students to have performed. They were also asked whom they thought their most proficient students were. They were consulted without being shown the results. There were no surprises: the tests accurately reflecting the teachers' expectations of their students' proficiency.

In a largely L1 and L2 Zulu speaking student body, the best students proved to have L1s other than Zulu. The best student was a girl who spoke English as one of her home languages. She said it was her first language but she also spoke Afrikaans and Sotho at home. Her score was 44/50. The second best student was a boy whose L1 was Pedi. His score was 42/50. The third best student was a younger boy who had lived in Louisiana, U.S.A. for two years and who spoke English with a Southern American accent. He scored 40/50. As St Gregory's was a very small school in which the teachers knew almost the entire student body, the staff were able to comment that they would have expected these three students to perform the best on a proficiency test.

7.1.3 St Andrew's in Paraguay

In 1995 I taught one of the classes tested at St Andrew's School in Asuncion. There were 21 students in the class at the time and it was divided into an upper, two middle and a lower group according to their levels of English proficiency. I made this division as the students were effectively being taught as L1 English speaking students by L1 English speaking teachers and six of the students in my class at the lower level had serious problems communicating in English. For these six students I used a different text from that used with the other students, Cambridge New English Series 1, which much to my surprise was not too easy for them after about eight years in an English medium school. It surprised me that, despite getting some of the best English teaching available in Paraguay, by the best qualified L1 English speaking teachers, these students had effectively not progressed beyond an elementary level for all four main skills, whereas others in the class had near native speaker oral proficiency and much more proficient listening, reading and writing skills.
The marks for English as a subject at this level were not counted towards the Paraguayan qualifications, so a students' English marks were not yet as crucially important as those of their other subjects. In the end of year examinations there was no real correlation between students English marks and their performance in other subjects. Some did extremely well in other subjects and poorly in English and *vice versa*. Under the Paraguayan system, students all have to sit and pass examinations at the end of the year so as to progress to the higher class in the following year. If students fail an examination, they have to resit it until they pass. One of my most fluent English students failed some of her mainstream subjects and had to come back for supplementary examinations. Only three of my English students failed and had to sit a second examination. Two of them were male students from the lower group in 1995. In the cloze exercise in 1997 they scored 26/50 and 28/50. One of the most fluent female students from the upper group in 1995 scored 45/50 in 1997, which I thought an excellent result. The results of the two boys showed a distinct improvement over two years, which was to be expected with two and a half hours of English a day. But that still puts them below the figure of 30/50 (this was later changed to 40/50) or more that I determined as a sign of fluency. I would have expected the St Andrew's students to score higher proficiency levels than the students from other countries as their primary classes are taught in English. On the whole the majority of St Andrew's students in 1995 were reasonably proficient in reading and writing; most of their difficulties were with oral communication. When 40/50 was taken as the proficiency level in 1997, seven of the thirteen fluent students (scores higher than 40/50) were Paraguayan. The cloze test in 1997 was thus able to identify students who had not been fluent in oral English in 1995 (a rather depressing fact when one thinks that they had had an additional two years of tuition).

7.2 Survey

Information was collected by survey in five schools in four different countries. I had worked in or visited all the schools concerned. The Paraguayan class I taught in 1995 is included in the study. In 1995 there were 21 students in what was called the second year [*segundo curso*]; in 1997 the class had shrunk to thirteen students at fourth-year level. The entire class, which was of mixed ability, was surveyed. The entire fifth year, a class of sixteen
students, was also surveyed. The Heads of the English Departments did the surveys in their respective schools in Paraguay and Chile. I personally did the first survey at St Gregory's to make sure there would not be any problems and the surveys at St Mark's and Goldmine were done by colleagues, both of whom were well known to me.

For this study all the students were given an identical survey (see Appendix B). The survey was constructed in two parts and designed to test the prevalence of the three areas under consideration: communicative learning, reading for pleasure and acculturation.

Part One of the survey contained a mix of questions, some to elicit general information and others to test for communicative learning or acculturation. The majority of the questions were multiple choice, many requiring a simple 'yes' or 'no' response. While it may be possible to test for the use of the first two areas with some sort of empirical accuracy, acculturation is a more difficult matter. Owing to the large number of variables and the very nature of the acculturation process, the survey in this respect attempts to gauge whether the subject has the opportunities and the inclination to acculturate. It is also important to know whether or not the student has strong negative or positive feelings towards the L2 culture. Using the results of the survey it should be possible to show that fluent students making good use of communicative learning strategies, also have strong positive feelings towards the L2 culture. It can be hypothesised that fluent students would be highly unlikely to exhibit strongly negative feelings towards L2 culture. There are opportunities in Part One of the survey for students to give written answers in order to gauge how they feel about learning something about L2 culture.

Part Two of the survey contained 25 questions to which students were expected to give one of four responses: (often/ sometimes/ rarely/ never.) These 25 questions were largely modelled on the questions from the functional or communicative part of Huang and Van Naerssen's survey in Southern China (1987: 301-302). In some cases the questions in the survey for this study were identical to Huang and Van Naerssen's but in others the vocabulary has been simplified to allow for the fact that teenage secondary school students were being tested, not adult tertiary students, as in the South China study.
Outline of Study

Instead of discussing theories, empirical studies and the results of my own research in separate chapters, I have chosen to organise the chapters thematically, one for each strategy. Each chapter thus

- discusses the theory relevant to a particular aspect (communicative learning, reading for pleasure and acculturation);
- presents a survey of empirical studies in the field which most influenced my own thinking (so the survey is not necessarily comprehensive and is far from exhaustive) and details the results of the present study.

The study thus has the following structure:

   Chapter Two: Acculturation
   Chapter Three: Communicative Learning
   Chapter Four: Reading for Pleasure
   Chapter Five: Conclusions

Throughout I use personal language learning and teaching experience to reflect on the theories and practical studies.

Though students were chosen without regard to proficiency levels, for this study, the so-called fluent students, those who scored over 40/50, in the cloze test, will come under the closest scrutiny. Huang and Van Naerssen (1987) in their survey had three groups: upper, middle and lower, the most interest being focussed on the upper and lower groups. In this study, the survey results of the upper (fluent) group will be correlated with the results of the other students. The main hypothesis being tested here is that more successful learners of English as a second language will show greater use of communicative and reading strategies as well as evidence signs of acculturation and positive attitudes to L2 culture.
CHAPTER TWO

ACCULTURATION

1 Introduction

Acculturation is the process whereby you learn about the culture of the people whose language you are trying to learn as a second language. Enculturation is first culture learning, the culture you learn as a child while you learn your L1. Rivers (1968: 359) writes that acculturation involves:

Second-culture learning and adaptation. Except for those who begin learning as children, few of these second language learners are likely to become full-fledged members of the second language speech community, at least if all of the shared language use and interpretation criteria determining speech community membership are applied. In this second language context, it is useful to distinguish between participating in a speech community and being a member of it; speaking the same language is sufficient for some degree of participation but perhaps not for full membership. Immigrants often experience ambivalent feelings about their own group membership during the process of acculturation; such feelings may result in the rejection of one group or the other, dual community membership (perhaps switching between the two according to setting or domain; see Fishman, 1972), or some degree of synthesis of the two.

Acculturation does not necessarily need to take place in an L1 country. Acculturation is usually what is happening for most of the L2 students in the study. It is a complicated process and it can take place to varying degrees. The hypothesis that is being examined here is that if acculturation is a process that an L2 learner attends to, it could assist L2 acquisition. Roberts (1994:11) writes: "Language is no longer separated from social and cultural knowledge but 'lived' and developed within a community in which the student participates and studies". This is in reference to a new ethnographic approach to learning second languages adopted by some undergraduate courses at British Universities. Previously when British undergraduate students learnt second languages they would spend one year overseas learning their L2 in an L1 environment. They would have received no preparation for this year in a foreign country. The students were expected to learn about culture by "osmosis" in the L1 environment. Now students of the Applied Languages Degree at Thames Valley University have a new course modelled on a programme used by an anthropologist to prepare them for their year overseas. No longer is the teaching of culture
trusted to "osmosis." At present in most environments where English is taught as an L2, culture is often not consciously taught. If an L2 student wants to learn any culture he or she will often have to do additional work outside the scope of his or her L2 language course. Acculturation as a process, is now starting to be recognised and included in other reputable L2 language programmes too.

2 Language Learning Theory

Acculturation is seen as important in the teaching and learning of languages in cases in which learners need to know the language in order to use it for a relatively full array of functions and want to be integrated to some extent into the society whose language they are learning, that is, if they do not want to be known as strangers (Gee 1993:202). While this statement is mainly true for immigrants to English-speaking countries, it could also be said to be true for anyone seeking functional bilingualism. Successful L2 learners take on a new identity, which Trivedi (1978: 92). claims is "an identity with both bilingual and bicultural features. Thus, foreign language teaching is seen as pedagogical process aimed at changing the learner's behaviour by injecting new norms and values into it". A fluent L2 learner needs to be sophisticated enough to be able to function in complicated social situations without giving or taking offence.

Stern (1992: 83) argues that:

[c]ultural competence implies implicit mastery of the norms of society, the unspoken rules of conduct, values, and orientations which make up the cultural fabric of a society. It further implies the ability to recognize culturally significant facts, and a knowledge of the parameters within which conduct is acceptable or unacceptable. Cultural competence does not necessarily mean conformity. Cultural competence merges into communicative competence. What is commonly called communicative competence also implies knowledge of many aspects of society and culture.

Communication can be very difficult if there is not some cross-cultural understanding. A good example of how misunderstanding can occur without cultural knowledge is the following: L1 health workers in North America and New Zealand attempted to encourage vaccination of children by using the owl on health posters. The slogan was 'Be wise like the owl and immunise your children'. In L1 English-speaking culture the owl is a symbol for wisdom. However, in both New Zealand Maori and Native American culture the owl is a harbinger of death. It calls your name just before you are about to die. The majority of
mothers from the minority cultures who read this health poster would understand the grammar and words on the poster but, because of lack of cultural competence, many would miss the true meaning. L2 students learning English need to learn that for L1 speakers of the language the owl represents wisdom. Likewise Bennett (1997:19) notes that the people of the Micronesian Island of Truk can be observed living more in the present than in planning for their future. The Trukese language lacks any elaborate future tense, so if the Trukese were to be taught English as an L2 this factor would have to be noted by their English teachers to assist them in their task. Both the Trukese and the English language teachers if they were L1 speakers would have to note this experience of a different reality, as it is an English cultural trait to plan and prepare for the future.

What Stern says about cultural competence not necessarily meaning conformity is important in light of the fact that the educational systems in some countries, such as Japan and Venezuela, do not like the teaching of culture along with the English language because of the fear of cultural contamination. In many foreign countries (Chile, Argentina, China etc.) where English is taught, the local teachers of English are mainly concerned with teaching the grammar and words of the language. This is particularly so in countries where the grammar-translation approach is the main method of teaching English. Often educators in these countries cannot teach students how to speak English or anything about the culture because they simply do not have that knowledge or do not want to teach the culture. This is the kind of knowledge that only a native speaker or a true bilingual might have. More often than not, teachers of English in non-English speaking countries are not fluent in the language that they themselves are trying to teach which is why they feel more comfortable with a method that places emphasis on the teaching of grammar.

Paulston (1992:120) argues that it is possible to become bilingual without becoming bicultural,

becoming bicultural is not just a cognitive process which can be carried out apart from the members of the culture. In this aspect becoming bicultural differs from becoming bilingual. It is perfectly possible to learn a foreign language from non-native speakers. As a matter of fact, I never did have an English teacher who was a native speaker. It is possible to become bilingual without becoming bicultural, while the reverse is not true.
Paulston's comments need to be qualified: it depends what she means by bilingual as this is a relative concept. One could be 'bilingual' but a 'fluent fool'. Bennett (1997:18) writes:

A fluent fool is someone who speaks a foreign language well but does not understand the social or philosophical content of that language. Such people are likely to get into all sorts of trouble because both they themselves and others overestimate their ability ... Eventually fluent fools may develop negative opinions of the native speakers whose language they understand but whose basic beliefs and values continue to elude them.

This lack of correlation between L2 language proficiency and acculturation was evident in all four countries used in this study.

At one private language Institute in Asuncion, Paraguay, where I did substitute teaching for a friend, I was only able to hold a conversation in English with one of a dozen teachers. Though this teacher was fluent in English, he had, in fact, learnt the language on the streets of New York, a fact immediately obvious to any L1 speaker of English but not to his employer or his students. It was Bronx English, full of New York slang and colloquialisms that would have been difficult for many L1 English speakers to understand. The teacher referred to female students as baby, male students were dude. The language usage would have been offensive if the listener had not been able to recognise the fact the teacher was an L2 English speaker (with some language problems) and dissociate his choice of words from his personality.

With many Chilean students it was often more of a confidence problem than a language problem. There was a reluctance to take risks or to expose oneself to ridicule by making grammatical mistakes. The Chilean teachers of English that I observed teaching would often correct their students on a small point of grammar while they were speaking. Over correction of L2 students by teachers is not now considered good practice (Swan and Walter 1994). It may account for Chilean students' lack of confidence.

Students at the Colegio San Andres, Paraguay, were more confident and less worried about making grammatical errors, though this could also be a reflection on their social position not just better teaching methodology.
In Chile, as in Botswana, the majority of English teachers were L2 speakers of the language, many of whom were not confident in English. In Colegio San Andres, Asuncion, Paraguay the teachers were L1 speakers of English. In the South African schools in the study, the majority of English teachers were L1 speakers of English. This is a variable in the study that does need to be noted. Most South African learners of English as a second language could be said to want English for a relatively full array of functions. It would also be true of the other nationalities.

Krashen (1982) theorises that there are two kinds of learning: acquisition or incidental learning or development by exposure to models, and overt or intentional learning which usually takes place in the classroom. The crucial issue for this study then is the extent to which second language acquisition is the product of overt instruction and the degree to which it needs to take place in natural contexts (Gee 1993).

Schumann (1978) points out that unlike other school subjects, languages can be and are mastered without study and without instruction. He mentions that throughout history the majority of people who would have learnt a second language and become bilingual would have done so without study or instruction. A reason for differences in language acquisition could lie in the process of acculturation, which is intimately linked with this natural learning process. Schumann (1978:29) defines acculturation as the "social and psychological integration of the learner with the target language group" and identifies two types of acculturation:

1. In type one, the learner is socially integrated with the TL group. As a result he develops sufficient contacts with TL speakers to enable him to acquire the TL. In addition, he is psychologically open to the TL such that input to which he is exposed becomes uptake.

2. Type two acculturation has all the characteristics of type one but in this case the learner regards the TL speakers as a reference group, whose lifestyle and values he consciously or unconsciously desires to adopt.

Both types of acculturation are considered enough to enable acquisition but there is a distinction. In type two acculturation, it is not necessary to adopt the lifestyle and values of the TL group. Type two acculturation is relevant for this study. Type one is relevant for immigrants in L1 English-speaking countries. Paulston (1992:128) remarks that becoming
bicultural is an eclectic process, "and what a bicultural program should hope to do is to allow the student the right to pick and choose his own individual make-up as a bicultural person from the two cultures and the members of those cultures he is exposed to in the school". There is a link then between acculturation and becoming truly bilingual.

Gardner (1985) argues that integrative motivation, (the desire to learn the language so as to integrate oneself with the target culture) is preferable to instrumental motivation (the desire to learn the language in order to get a better job.) That is, you will learn better with an integrative motivation. The problem with instrumental motivation is that learning of the L2 might stop, once the learners' 'instrumental goals were satisfied' (Schumann 1986:383).

When it comes to learning an L2, culture was not always considered important. Some educators would prefer their students to be instrumentally motivated when learning an L2 because of the implications behind learning another culture.

Perhaps Alpetkin (1984) is right to suggest that monolingual/monocultural English teachers are not the best option. Alpetkin argues against the use of monolingual teachers in foreign countries. What Alpetklin says is valid about some monolingual teachers. How can clumsy, intolerant monolinguals make tolerant comfortable bilinguals out of their L2 students when they are not so themselves? While there is some truth in what Alpetkin says about monolingual teachers, it is also an unproven assumption. Empathy and tolerance in the L2 student are thought to assist L2 learning (Allport 1954). It would seem logical that tolerant L2 students would be more open to learning both a new L2 language and culture. What Phillipson (1992) and Murphy (1988) highlight is the fact that how you view culture in language learning depends on who you are. Someone from a minority culture or small country (Phillipson is a Dane) could be expected to have misgivings about cultural domination. Denmark is a small homogenous country and it no doubt fears cultural domination from both English and German. But, as Stern (1992) states, cultural competence does not necessarily mean you have adopted the L2 culture. It seems logical that a person could know how to communicate in his or her L2, understand the L2 culture but not be culturally integrated into the L2 society.
True biculturalism/bilingualism is not the goal of all learners of English as a second language. Some L2 learners want English for specific purposes and not for a full array of functions. Skills can also develop unevenly in an L2, for a number of reasons. Schumann proposes "that any learner can be placed on a continuum that ranges from social and psychological distance to social and psychological proximity with speakers of the TL" (1986:379). In the four countries under consideration in this study, the majority of the ablest students would have full bilingualism as a goal, not that they would all achieve such a goal by studying at a tertiary level in English. As a result they would find themselves at widely different positions on the continuum. Kramsch (1993:256) argues that foreign-language learners at educational institutions,

have been socialized and schooled to view the acquisition of knowledge in various ways, according to the values prevalent in their society. In American schools, learning a foreign language is presented as a call for action: the acquisition of a skill that will get you a better job. In African countries the teaching of foreign languages with wide circulation: such as French, English or German, serves the goals of national unity and the needs of nations and individuals to be in contact with more powerful trading partners. Language learners use the foreign language for multiple purposes that often challenge the established educational canons of both the native and target cultures.

On reflection, this could be why a Botswanan male teacher at Montsamaisa Community Junior Secondary School in Francistown complained that a group of young male students, whom I saw as fluent, were, in his opinion, copying the ways of White men. The teacher somehow perceived this group of fluent L2 speakers to be less African as a result of their becoming fluent in English and adopting a few L2 cultural mannerisms, though this probably had more to do with the prejudices of a conservative teacher than anything else.

Saville-Troike (1996:359) makes a distinction between second language learning, auxiliary language learning and foreign language learning. Second language learning is equated with acculturation in L1 English-speaking countries. Auxiliary language learning involves learning the language for political or technological purposes. This is particularly true for Africa and India where English is not only used as a language of government and education but also for communication with international peers. Saville-Troike's third category is foreign language learning. This is a situation where students are learning an L2 or L3 in their native culture. There would be little opportunity for students to interact with members of the L1 community and the learning is merely an academic exercise. Different levels of competency are required for each of these categories. It may even be possible to start in one category.
and move up to another. It is now common practice for many L2 learners of English to learn their L2 at secondary school in an auxiliary or even a foreign manner, later going on to perfect their L2 in an English-speaking country, thereby making their English a second language as defined by Saville-Troike. The majority of the students in this study could clearly have been placed in the auxiliary category though some, like a Paraguayan student, who goes to study in the United States, would then find themselves placed in the second-language category.

Nunan (1999:3) does not fully support Saville-Troike's language categories and in commenting on the ESL/EFL distinction remarks:

>n]onetheless, I find the distinction increasingly problematic, for a number of reasons. In the first place, the contexts in which L2s are taught and used differ considerably, as do EFL settings. Teaching English in Japan, for instance, is very different experience from teaching in Brazil. Also impinging on the distinction is the growth of English as a world language (EWL) ... This has lead to greater diversification in the contexts and situations in which it is learned and used as well as in the nature of the language itself. It has also provided many more opportunities for learners to use the language for authentic communication.

Byram and Morgan (1994) state that research has also demonstrated that young people acquire some information but very little knowledge of the foreign culture through language classes.

In all four countries in the study, the mastering of English was equated with success. In South Africa and Botswana you would be considered a failure (in education) if you failed to master your L2. Both of these countries were former British territories, so English was the language of the former colonial ruler. Botswana was also a special case in that it was once a British Protectorate not a Colony. There was no war of independence and the former colonial ruler is still seen in a positive light. Success in the education system is synonymous with success in English. The most successful Botswanan would gain a government scholarship to study in the UK and at a less successful level they might gain a job with the bureaucracy which uses English as a means of communication. The UK was also the former colonial ruler of South Africa and at least 10% of the population speaks English as an L1. The best students at St. Gregory's and St. Mark's could end up studying at an English medium university such as the University of Cape Town (considered one of the oldest and
best universities in Southern Africa). This is a world away from Jane Furse in the Northern Province or Estcourt in Kwa-Zulu Natal.

Paraguay and Chile were both former Spanish colonies. The successful learning of English is considered important but not essential. Many successful L2 learners of English at Colegio San Andres would study in the United States. This was because they were students from an English medium school. However, successful students from other schools would often go to study in Argentina or Spain. Doing well at school and being successful at learning English were not as synonymous as they would be in Southern Africa. In Chile the learning of English was much more important than in Paraguay. Chile has an open, international economy. A successful Chilean might get a job with a multinational company, or study in the United States. For any of the students to learn in these new L1 environments, they would need to know something about the culture of L1 speakers of English. There is a premise that they would need to be both bilingual and bicultural. Crago (1992:500) concludes: "Hence language teaching and learning are intertwined in a fundamental manner with culturally integral ways of communication".

2.1 Reflections on Personal Experience

My personal experiences as a language student in Paraguay support Schumann’s acculturation hypothesis. I had gone to South America with the sole purpose of learning a second language as I explained in Chapter One. I was booked into a well-known language institute run by the Catholic Church in Bolivia. Asuncion, Paraguay was a stopover en route to Bolivia. Owing to a visa problem I ended up staying, studying and working part-time in Paraguay.

In retrospect, I would say I had strong integrative tendencies. Owing to past experiences both as a teacher and a student, I had a fairly good idea of what I had to do to make sure I was successful. I knew I would experience culture shock and I knew I had to do something to minimize its effect. I also needed to find a local Paraguayan family to live with as I believed I needed to immerse myself in the language and culture in order to learn effectively.

For my first two weeks in the country I was able to stay with an English Anglican Bishop and his wife. I knew from past experience that the first few weeks in a new country can be the most difficult and I wanted to stay with people who knew my L1 and the local culture.
The stay with the Bishop and his wife proved an invaluable experience. They had lived in Argentina and Paraguay for just less than twenty years and were able to give me a good introduction to Paraguayan life as well as being able to show me around. After my first fortnight, I went to stay in the apartment of a fellow New Zealander while I looked for somewhere suitable to stay. I found living in the apartment (effectively on my own) not conducive to my speaking or learning Spanish. Some days I could get by with speaking very little Spanish at all. After a month in Asuncion, I moved into the house of a Spanish-speaking family. The household consisted of a divorced woman, her son and two nephews. The mother and son spoke Spanish as a first language the nephews Guarani as they were from the country. The woman spoke no English but had been used to having foreigners come and stay. This was an important factor, I now realise, in my learning the L2 successfully. My landlady was used to foreigners and their strange ways and able to make allowances and understand when necessary. This all meant less stress for me. It was at about this time that I decided it would be a good idea not to socialise with the English-speaking community. They were there if I needed them but I wanted to concentrate on making Spanish-speaking friends and do my utmost to integrate myself into Paraguayan culture. Owing to the nature of Paraguay, many middle class jobs were done by expatriate Chileans, Argentineans, Bolivians, Brazilians etc. Because of this fact the majority of people I got to know were expatriate Latinos.

It is because of these factors that I would say I was engaged in Schumann's type two acculturation. I constantly went out of my way to put myself into situations where I could engage in conversation. After five months I was fluent in oral Paraguayan Spanish. In fact, after three months, my Spanish was better than that of some members of my host family who spoke Guarani and not Spanish as their L1. After five months I was seeking out more intellectual middle class individuals so I could discuss more philosophical subjects in a more sophisticated Spanish. Though I was not exactly aware of what I was doing at the time, I had chosen acculturation as a learning strategy.

I like to think I had a positive attitude to L2 culture and that I did my best to bridge the social and psychological distance between my own and my L2 culture. I believe that distance was not as broad as it had been in other foreign countries in which I had lived in the past. If something inexplicable happened, I would seek out someone who knew the local culture in order to understand what was going on.
It is important to note here that Schumann's acculturation hypothesis is designed exactly for this kind of situation.

The most successful student in my class was an American missionary who had never left the United States before. He was highly motivated and had nothing else to do for a year except learn Spanish and an indigenous language. He put himself into situations where he could learn Spanish incidentally. He said in the morning he liked to study his books but then he liked to have a break and stroll down to the local shops where he would talk with anyone who would listen. He said he was interested in Paraguayan culture and obviously it was something he was highly motivated to learn about because of his job. Missionaries are what you might call a special case. They are highly motivated people. This missionary in my language class had indeed stepped out of his culture cage: he would have had to, to be able to be successful in his proselytising.

He was a vivid contrast, however, with one of the teachers at Colegio San Andres. This man, a 35-year-old, working class, northern Englishman, had learnt next to no Spanish after an eight-month residence in Asuncion. He was not good at attending language classes, saying he was often too tired or too busy at school to be able to. Several of the long-term English community residents liked to use him as an example of a person in severe culture shock. This Englishman, whom I will hereafter refer to as the bad language learner, highlights a problem. I and others have used him as an example of a person in culture shock, but how do you measure something such as culture shock? Funnam (1994) notes that most investigations of culture shock are descriptive and focus on the symptoms of sufferers. Little study has been done on the subject of those for whom the shock would be more or less intense. People suffer culture shock to greater or lesser degrees and it is often perceived that older and less educated individuals suffer more. Adventurers like myself often revel in it and it is thought a little culture shock can assist both L2 language acquisition and personal development.

For the bad L2 learner, in my Spanish class in Asunción, what would have been routine activities at home in the UK had become stressful. Schumann (1978:32) reports that it is this stress "which diverts energy and attention from second language learning. The learner in, attempting to find a cause for his disorientation, may reject himself, his own culture, the organization for which he is working and the people of the host country". The bad language
learner had severe difficulties doing something as simple as his grocery shopping. Several times he was taken shopping, as part of a language learning experience, by other members of the English community. Something other new arrivals could manage easily enough on their own with very little Spanish, he found extremely difficult. Others found shopping a challenge and a valuable learning experience; the bad language learner just found it stressful. It does need to be noted that the vocabulary for many common food items is often colloquial and differs from one Spanish-speaking country to another, so it is difficult to learn this language from books.

2.2 The Language Learner and Culture

The bad language learner only socialised with English-speaking people. Once, when invited to a party, he commented that he would go only if English was going to be spoken there as he simply could not abide going anywhere they spoke Spanish.

His constant criticisms of Paraguayans and their culture, where there were differences from the English, marked him as a person who was having great difficulty stepping out of his 'cultural cage'. On one occasion he was critical of Paraguayan men taking the trouble to pick up their wives and girlfriends after work. In his opinion it was because the men were extremely jealous and did not trust their wives to find their own way home. This led to a staff-room conversation, about how adulterous the Paraguayans were. When I first heard this remark, about the jealousies and adulteries of Paraguayans, I remember just accepting it and not commenting. Later, after having close friendships with Paraguayans, I came to realise that not walking your wife or girlfriend to the bus stop or picking her up after work would be construed by a Paraguayan as not caring very deeply. The practical Englishman would not consider doing this but to the Paraguayan it was simple courtesy. It is interesting how something as simple as picking your wife up from work can be viewed so differently. I can now see it from both sides but there was a time when I could not. Citron (1995:105) claims that "having a mind open to other ways of looking at the world might help one to learn a new language". Allport (1954:436) suggests knowledge of oneself is associated with tolerance (of people different from oneself) as a behaviour in a person. He also links tolerance with empathic ability, which assists language learning. The bad language learner had very little tolerance and empathic ability. Skill in human relations is not however, specific to any given culture.
Although I have given an example of only one individual, the bad language learner in Paraguay does help to show that a badly-acculturated individual can also be a bad communicator and have an extremely low level of proficiency in his or her L2. Widespread research indicates that attitude affects language acquisition.

What was most annoying to the English community in Asuncion about Paraguayans was their conception of time. The bad language learner mentioned above would have a new story every day about some local's abuse of time. I understood very early on that Paraguayans had a very different concept of time from mine and I did my best to adapt. According to Citron (1995:107) a native speaker of English "who can conceptualize time as something other than the valuable commodity in US culture will be better able to master a language in which one can 'pasar' [spend] rather than 'gastar' [lose] 'tiempo' [time]'". In fact, it is not just Paraguayan but most Latin cultures in which perceptions of time are entirely different from what they are in Anglo-Saxon society. Once when, I arranged a meeting with a Paraguayan I did not know well, the person actually arrived on time at the restaurant, looked at his watch and said, "I came on time as everyone says you have to be on time when you meet an Englishman". This person spoke English and had visited the United States so he knew something of L1 English-speaking culture.

Time in Australian Aboriginal society is not so much measured by things like hours and minutes but referred to as phases. Cool time for example is the early evening, before the sun sets but after it has begun to cool down. I understood this perfectly well when I was working in Aboriginal communities but I found it extremely difficult trying to explain this to monolingual Anglo-Saxon teachers who were trying and failing to teach their students respect for time. Some people's minds just do not seem to be open to the concept that the way they do things is not the only way of doing things. It may be that it is necessary to be able to appreciate this before one can learn an L2 successfully.

3 Literature Survey

3.1 Inuit

In many L1 English-speaking countries there are minority indigenous cultures that speak English as an L2. Crago's study dealt with the Inuit in Arctic Quebec. The Inuit in this study live in an L1 French-speaking province, which is in an L1 English-speaking country. While
this is a uncommon situation, it does have some bearing on the learning of an L2 in general. Crago (1992:488) mentions that: "The acquisition of a second language implies the acquisition of a second culture for many learners. For these children school becomes a form of secondary socialization where the pragmatics of the first language interfere with learning of the second language". Crago's research raised important issues about culture in second language learning. The study was done in two remote Inuit communities where the indigenous language was in everyday use and only a very small number of English/French L1 speakers lived in the community.

One problem Crago highlighted in her study is the fact that monolingual L1 teachers had a problem understanding that well brought up Inuit children should not speak in front of adults. Inuit parents would not want their children speaking in class and parents apologised to teachers when the teachers commented that their child was speaking in class. This was obviously not what an L1 speaking teacher would want, as in English-speaking classrooms participation by the child is stressed. This is a cultural misunderstanding between teachers and students which would interfere with the delivery of education. One teacher in the Crago study became so frustrated with the non-communicative Inuit boys that he shook them to try and get a response. This highlights how important it is that the teacher understands something about the culture of the students he or she is teaching.

Crago mentioned that the Inuit parents did not like their children doing extracurricular activities. They liked their children home by 3.00 pm so they could "wipe out" the culture/language they had learnt at school that day (ibid. : 497).

3.2 Aboriginal

I have worked as an English teacher in several Australian Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory of Australia. In these communities English is either a second or foreign language and there are very few L1 speakers of English. Though the situation is different in the different aboriginal communities, there are many similarities between the Aboriginal communities and the Inuit communities in Crago's study. For both the Inuit and the Aboriginals the schools were often the sole representatives of L1 culture in the communities. Dixon (1980:114) points out that "[m]any Aboriginal children regarded School as a Whiteman's game, which had little relevance to the pattern of living and little usefulness: only a minority did learn to read and write". In the smallest communities the teacher is often
the sole representative of L1 language/culture. The idea of including my secondary Aboriginal students in this study was considered but decided against owing to the small size of the sample and the fact that the Aboriginals, like the Inuit, were a minority culture in an L1 English-speaking country. It does need to be noted that the communities of the Inuit and Aboriginals are effectively islands in seas of desert and tundra. It is this that enables their L1 languages to survive. I remain indebted to my teaching experience in Aboriginal schools for some of the understandings I have of acculturation and the role of culture in L2 language learning.

In Aboriginal as in Inuit schools it is particularly noticeable that the learning of English is also the learning of a second culture. The teachers are also usually monocultural and monolingual. Keeffe (1992:100) states that "to go from Alice Springs to Punpunya and Walungurru is to go from White Middle Australia to Black Central Australia". It is like going to a separate country. The aboriginal students themselves refer to the land around their communities as their country and are fiercely proud of it. As a white, Anglo-Saxon, L1 speaker of English you go there as a foreigner.

Yet it is in the schools that the indigenous Australians learn how the majority L1 speakers live (in Middle Australia) and how they are expected to live by the majority L1 speakers in the rest of Australia. In the past, in some communities in the Northern Territory, the missionaries would have been the cultural/language shock troopers. Today employees of the Education Department (teachers) teach/impose the dominant culture/language. One sees this in something as simple as the observation of time. An Anglo-Saxon teacher tries to impose on the Aboriginal child, the concept of strict time observation which is not something that exists in Aboriginal culture: "The Aboriginal lifestyle is more spontaneous, you do what you want when you feel like doing it" (Keeffe 1992:98). The Aboriginal children are also taught at school by the representatives of the dominant culture how to blow their nose, comb their hair and other matters of personal hygiene to the levels required by the dominant culture. However, when these Aboriginal students get home, there is often a parent to contradict what the teacher has taught that day at school. Some parents do not like their children going to the 'White' schools; often the children themselves did not like going there. Attendance is extremely low and sporadic in Aboriginal communities and parents have been known to hide children to prevent them going to school. Keeffe (1992:100) comments: "schools fail
Aboriginal students because they fail to recognise their cultural differences at every level of practice – timetable, curriculum, pedagogy, classroom organisation, staffing, discipline".

So-called successful students would be those who successfully learnt English language and culture in their communities and were therefore able to travel to Darwin/Toronto/Alice Springs/Montreal and live and communicate there. The majority would never accomplish this. It remains a fact that even today the majority of Aboriginal students in Australia's Northern Territory are not successful communicators in English. They have failed to acculturate themselves into the dominant culture. Many, perhaps as a result of this failure, cannot even speak English but if they do not ever leave their remote communities, they do not need to.

3.3 Other Studies
I have used Aboriginal and Inuit as examples but that which is true for them could perhaps apply to any minority culture. Pfeiffer (1975:133), in another study involving Navajo Indians in the South West United States, writes of the Navajo context as follows:

Navajo children are taught in a foreign language: they are taught concepts which are foreign, they are taught values which are foreign, they are taught lifestyles which are foreign: and they are taught by human models which are foreign. The intention behind this kind of schooling is to mould the Navajo child (through speech, action, thought) to be like members of the predominant Anglo-Saxon mainstream culture ... . The children grow up in these schools with a sense of:

1) Confusion regarding the values, attitudes and behaviour taught at home
2) Loss of self-identity and pride concerning their selfhood - their Navajoness
3) Failure in classroom learning activities
4) Loss of their own Navajo language development and loss of in depth knowledge of their own Navajo culture.

This is similar to the situation in Australian Aboriginal communities. Often a monolingual Anglo-Saxon teacher will know about Aboriginal culture but not pay it any regard. A representative of the dominant culture can do this. In Paraguay, Chile, Botswana and South Africa, L1 speaking English teachers are in a much less powerful position than they would be in indigenous communities in Australia or North America. Yet Inuit and Aboriginal
students fail to learn English just as many students also fail to learn in the countries considered in this study. Certainly in all locations L1 teachers are failing to teach their students L2 language and culture. Yet in all the locations some do learn.

Crago's study apparently resulted in L1 teachers in Inuit communities being instructed in Inuit culture, because the lack of knowledge by the teachers of their students' culture was seen as hindering their abilities to teach language/culture effectively. One could speculate that the fact that most of the teachers in the Northern Territory's Aboriginal schools are monolingual and monocultural (with little or no understanding of Aboriginal culture) contributes to the spectacular failure of Aboriginal students to learn English? It must be difficult to teach your own culture to students when you fail to recognise the fact that that is exactly what you are doing. This is only exacerbated by the fact that many of the teachers fail to acknowledge that the students have a different culture, though today the Northern Territory Education department does attempt to teach some aboriginal culture to its new teachers. In writing about the failings of 'guest teachers' in foreign countries Alpetkin (1984) states: "while espousing the idea that foreign language acquisition is a means to increase cross-cultural awareness and sensitivity, the guest teachers are often unable to understand the host culture or to speak the local vernacular". It does not matter where the L1 English teacher works, as it seems this problem of their being monolingual and monocultural follows them around. It is problematic to expect your students to become fully bilingual and bicultural if you are not so yourself? The situation of minority L2 cultures in majority L1 English-speaking countries serves to highlight the link between language and culture. Not only is it important that all L2 learners of English learn L1 culture but it is also important that their teachers know something about the culture of their students.

It needs to be noted that the link between language and culture is not universally accepted. There is something to Phillipson's (1992:28) arguments in *Linguistic Imperialism*. He writes of schools in Africa, "Schools were the principal instrument for alienating indigenous minorities from their languages and culture ... it is schools in Africa which are stifling local languages and imposing alien tongues and values". When you think of the Kalanga in Francistown (their language is not taught in schools) there is some truth in what he writes, but it is a partial truth. It is hard to make any generalisations about Africa, though what Phillipson wrote about African schools is more true for Francophone Africa than
Anglophone Africa. The French were always much more successful at assimilation than the English.

Bilingualism goes with biculturalism in that, in order to have one, you need the other. Schumann’s study of Alberto, a 33-year-old Costa Rican who had made little progress in English despite intensive instruction, shows that Alberto’s lack of linguistic development could be attributed to his social and psychological distance from the target culture and to the fact that his limited English was sufficient for his communicative needs (Nunan 1992:79). Alberto’s motivation could be described as instrumental and his progress was indeed arrested as soon as he had sufficient language for his everyday needs.

There was also a Philippine study that showed that the instrumental approach can be successful with parental support. English is very important in the Philippines as it is a language of learning. Gardner and Lambert (1972:141) state that in "settings where there is an urgency about mastering a second language – the instrumental approach is extremely effective ... for another subgroup of Filipino students an integrative orientation toward the study of English had a striking effect on proficiency, especially the audio-lingual aspects".

The importance of culture in bilingualism can be seen in Puerto Rico’s failure to make its population bilingual: 80% of the population of the Island remains monolingual in Spanish. Concepts of nationhood and the contradictory pressures of Puerto Rican nationalism vs US nationalism have led to this situation. This along with the ability of Puerto Rican culture to withstand the spread of English has been stronger than the wiles of educational planners to overcome it (Resnick 1993:270-271).

Having a positive attitude is important and can aid L2 learning. Jacobsen and Imhoof (1974), in a study in Japan, demonstrated the importance of attitudes toward the L1 language community. In an investigation of 600 Protestant missionaries in Japan, Japanophilia was among the three best predictors of speaking proficiency for both men and women. In an American study by Oller, Hudson & Liu (1977) in which educated Chinese speaking ESL students were looked at, subjects who rated Americans as "helpful, sincere, kind, reasonable & friendly," did better on a cloze test of English as a second language (Krashen 1977:27). In another study, (Mueller & Miller, 1970:316), it was found that attitudes towards French people varied according to grade. There was a correlation between
a positive attitude to French people and higher grades. Those students with a more positive attitude towards French people did better in class. In one study foreign students at a training school in the United States were asked,

to name those Americans from among their fellow students whom they thought would be most likely to succeed, and be accepted, if they entered US foreign service in the foreign students' home country. This request brought forth strikingly homogenous agreement: certain Americans would be welcome in any foreign country; certain others were wanted by none ... taking the extreme group the researcher looked for differentiating characteristics, the crucial factor was empathic ability ... Those who could put themselves in others' shoes – they could size up other people-sensitive to the others' frames of mind (Allport 1954:435).

It seems logical that this type of person would succeed in a foreign environment although it would need to be proved in a study. An ability to acculturate would require some tolerance and a certain amount of empathic ability in the L2 student.

Perhaps this accounts for Gardner's (1985:43) report that, "girls tend to demonstrate significantly more positive attitudes than do boys. It is generally recognized that girls are more successful language learners than boys". For some reason this was more obvious in Chile than in any other country in which I worked. In 1991 when I was to work in an English medium school in Chile, the senior class was streamed into three separate levels of English ability. I was given the top class of 20 students, 17 of whom were female and only three male. When I commented on it, the other English teachers informed me that it was the same phenomenon in all Chilean schools. Girls were always, for some reason, better at learning languages and more represented in the higher levels.

Evidence can be found to support or refute the hypothesis that acculturation aids acquisition, but the results of studies cannot always be generalised. One major study in which a well-acculturated individual was found to be a good communicator but poor at grammatical English involved only one person. This was Schmidt's (1983) study. It involved a 33-year-old Japanese artist called Wes. Wes was a good communicator even if he could not speak English correctly.

In another study, Kelley (1982) studied six Spanish-speaking adults. They had all gone to the United States as adults and all had lived there for more than nine years. In this study no positive association was found between language proficiency and degree of acculturation.
But over time people's attitudes can change. One student in the study, who was the most acculturated and least proficient, had only recently become motivated to learn more English. Another, who was most proficient and not very well acculturated had, been highly motivated in his early years in the United States making a real effort to learn his L2 and integrate. The problems with studies are that they can take only a freeze frame picture of the situation as it is at the time of the study.

Becoming bilingual and bicultural is seen by some as a good thing. According to Gardner and Lambert (1972:137), however, many Spanish-American immigrant families suppress the use of Spanish in the home in order to better prepare their children for life in the English-speaking world of America. This type of logic is now being seriously challenged. For example, Padilla and Long (1969) are convinced that early bilingualism has a facilitating rather than a depressing effect on academic success. They found that Spanish-American students who were successful at College (ie: those who completed a graduate program of study) typically came from homes in which both Spanish and English were used whereas Spanish-American College dropouts typically came from homes where English only was spoken.

A similar study by Peal and Lambert (1962) with French-Canadian ten year olds from bilingual homes supported this. Students from bilingual homes had clear advantages. Quebec is a unique place and its Anglo population is in a unique situation. Pettigrew (1986:178) reports as follows:

In 1976 the Parti Quebecois came to power in Quebec. There was large-scale L1 English-speaking emigration from Montreal. Maybe those who left for dominant English-speaking provinces tended to harbour the deepest fears and distrust of francophones and, perhaps, the most prejudice against and rejection of their French-speaking fellow Canadians. These are explanations for the fact that Quebec's Anglophones who have remained are disproportionately more open to contact with francophones, have better French language and cultural skills, and are therefore better equipped.

One of the most interesting and relevant studies conducted on the topic of acculturation, was by Maple (1982) at the University of Texas, Austin. There were 190 Spanish-speaking students in the study. They completed three questionnaires and 30 of the students were interviewed to corroborate the results. No fewer than four means were used to assess their English proficiency: "pre-semester and gain scores on the CELT (Comprehensive English
Language Test for Speakers of English as a Second Language), composition and TOEFL scores and final course grades" (Maple 1982: in Schumann 1986: 388). The study was done in the Intensive English Program at Austin and it sought to test the hypothesis that social distance correlates negatively with L2 acquisition. Maple's (1982: 5-6) conclusions were that:

findings support the hypothesis that social distance correlates negatively with L2 acquisition. Multiple regression equations based on social distance variables accounted for 15 to 29 percent of the variation in the various CELT gain scores. These results suggest that the component variables of social distance are as follows (in descending order of importance): attitudes, social class, cohesiveness, intended length of stay, size of L1 group, enclosure, perceived status.

For the present study Maple's is particularly relevant because "he got these results from a population for which the model was not intended". That is, the model as described in Gingras (1978) was applicable to immigrant groups who acquire the target language in the environment in which it is spoken and without the aid of formal instruction (Schumann 1986:388). Maple was testing foreign students most of whom had had formal instruction in English prior to coming to the United States.

The students in the present study are also not a group for whom the model was intended. They have all had formal instruction in English and are not resident in L1 English-speaking countries. If, however, the model can work for Maple's students, maybe it can also work for the students in this study.

4 Empirical Study

I have chosen to include the results of the empirical study with each chapter rather than writing a separate chapter. In the light of the discussion on the theory and practices underlying the theme of the chapter, I not only give the results of the survey but try to reflect on them as well. I sometimes give extra background information on the target groups used in the study.

The raw statistics are included as Appendix A.
4.1 Problems with Designing Survey Questions

Schumann (1986:389) writes: "[m]easures of the various factors involved in acculturation may be difficult to devise. This is particularly true of the psychological factors such as cultural shock, language shock and ego permeability". Some questions in the survey have been designed to determine the subjects' attitudes towards L2 culture. Their answers will indicate how positive or negative those attitudes are. Buttjes (1990:75) explains that "assessing the degree of intercultural competence i.e. how far pupils have moved ... from monocultural to intercultural ... (Murphy: 1988) is still connected with practical and theoretical problems".

Take a question like number 18 in Part One, for example:

"What things do you like about the culture of English-speaking people?"

Many students did not attempt to answer this question, particularly those with lower cloze scores. Several with low cloze scores wrote in good English that they did not want to say anything. This could indicate a number of things, but the obvious one is that they could not think of anything they liked about English culture, either because they did not know enough about English culture to comment, or nothing specific about English speaking culture in general sprang to mind. For whatever reason, it is highly unlikely that these students would want to adopt the lifestyle and values of English-speaking culture. For question 18, no answer implies lack of acculturation, particularly when it seems to be linked with a lower cloze test score. In Botswana there was a minority of students, obviously fluent in English, who would delight in questioning their native speaking teachers about life in England/ Australia/ New Zealand, etc. They would also often ask the teachers in a semi-serious manner if the teachers would take them back to the UK with them. These students were not short of ideas when it came to listing things they liked about English-speaking culture.

The next question, number 19 of Part One, asked about things the students did not like about English speaking culture. Remarks about the British sense of humour were quite common. Like everything, humour is also a cultural concept. Paraguayans and British laugh at completely different things, though it was both African and Latin students who made comments about humour. It takes some thinking to come to the realisation that other cultures have senses of humour different from your own. It is, I believe, a sign of acculturation that some students have come to realise this. So often language students find
it difficult to come to terms with the fact that people in other cultures do things differently from the way in which they do things themselves.

If I reflect on my own language learning experiences, I clearly remember a point in my own acculturation in Paraguay where I caused offense to a close friend (Paraguayan) by joking in the same manner as I would with a fellow Anglo-Saxon. It made me aware of the fact that, when dealing with a culture different from your own, it is important to be cautious about humour until you begin to understand the new culture. One of the Paraguayan teachers at Colegio San Andres had lived for many years in the United Kingdom and had a Master of Arts in English from a British University. Yet he commented that he still had problems understanding English jokes and humour. It was when I found myself understanding and laughing at the jokes of a compère in a Spanish nightclub that I realised I really was fluent in the language.

Question 19 in Part One elicited a number of responses touching on the issue of racism. This was from African students only, particularly students with lower cloze scores. One girl with 23/50 on her cloze score commented "They hate blacks, they see them as inferior to them. Not all of them". If an African student has recently experienced racial abuse from an L1 speaker of English, the attitude of the learner towards the TL group will be different from what it was before the incident and perhaps from what it will be afterwards when the L2 learner has met other more tolerant and reasonable L1 speakers of English. Individuals would also respond differently to episodes of racism. The remark, which was perhaps qualified for my benefit, shows a negative attitude towards L1 people and culture. Question 19 also had answers that barely warrant comment but go to show we all have prejudices and make generalisations about other cultures no matter what our ethnic cultural background. Still, it leaves the problem of how one adequately weights the answers to the other acculturation questions.

4.2 Results

Some, but not all, of the questions in Part One of the survey were used to compute a score for culture. The questions used were 8a, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 31, and 20, 21, 29, 30. The lower the score indicated in the result, the higher the acculturation level. The following are the frequencies for the various questions.
4.3 Percentages

Question 8a asked: 'Do you want to visit an English-speaking country?' 98.5% replied in the affirmative. Question 8b then asked: 'Which country?'. The countries in order of popularity were the USA (44.6%), the UK (37%), Australia (8.5%), Canada (5.4%) and New Zealand (3.8%).

When asked: 'Do you like the way the British and Americans do things?' (Question 9), 72% preferred the American to the British way (27%). This could partly be due to the greater exposure of the students to American culture through American television programmes.

Question 10 asked: 'With whom do you prefer to speak English?'. The majority (47.7%) said native speakers of English. Only a minority (26.2) said they preferred speaking English with people from their own country and an equivalent percentage (26.2) said they preferred speaking English with other foreigners.

For Question 11, the students were asked: 'Have you ever travelled outside of your own country?'. 46.6% answered yes. So almost half the students had experience of other countries and cultures. Another 11.5% of students answered yes to Question 13: 'Have you ever lived in any country other than your home country for more than six months?'. Many but not all of the most fluent students were in this category. Of the top three students at St Gregory's, one had spent two years in the United States, the other two had never left South Africa. The most proficient Chilean student had also spent time in the United States as a young child but he did not make the proficient category #33/50 in the cloze).

Question 14 asked: 'Do you like to speak English with strangers?'. Three quarters (76.6%) answered in the affirmative. A willingness to speak with strangers/foreigners would assist the uptake of the L2 language and culture, and is also an indication of tolerance and acceptance. Still, a quarter of all students were unwillingly to speak with strangers. The fact a majority liked to speak English with strangers could have been due to their affective filter being lower. As in response to: Question 15 'Do you like to speak English with native speakers of the language?', 84.3% answered in the affirmative.

The next few questions helped show the students' lack of knowledge about culture. In response to Question 16 'Do you understand what is meant by the term culture without
having to read the definition given?", 77.8% answered in the affirmative. When asked in Question 17: 'Do you know anything about the culture of English-speaking people?', only 41.7% responded in the affirmative. This means there was a lot of ignorance about the culture of the people whose language they were trying to learn as an L2. This would have some effect on the students' competence when it came to communicating in their L2.

The next few questions tested for the students' exposure to other languages and cultures. It was also a way of indirectly testing for tolerance of and empathy towards others. In response to Question 20: 'Do you socialise with people of different cultures and languages?', a staggering 84.5% answered in the affirmative. Then for Question 21: 'Do you socialise with English-speaking people?', an impressive three-quarters (73.4%) said that they did. Another quarter (24.2%) said they had no opportunity to do so. These students were then asked were asked in Question 22: 'If you answered "no opportunity" to question 21 because you know no English speaking people, would you socialise with English-speaking people if you had the opportunity?', a further 91.1% of students answered in the affirmative. There may have been a lack of knowledge about L2 culture but most of the students were socialising with English speakers or were looking for opportunities to do so. Unfortunately the amount of socialising was not quantified.

The next few questions attempted to gauge students' attitudes to English as a language. Question 23 asked: 'Why are you learning English?'. The categories were Business (8.5%), Education (50%), Because I want to (36.9%). Only a very small minority (4.6%) said it was because they had to, though this response really belongs with Education as a category. Though in reality the study of English was compulsory for all, it was encouraging that a third of the students said they were learning English because they wanted to. When asked in Question 24: 'Do you think learning English is important?', the importance of English was not lost on anyone as 98.5% answered in the affirmative.

Just why they thought English was important is seen in the answers to Question 25: 'How do you plan to use your English when you leave school?'. The categories were University (25.2%), Work (34.6%), and Further study (40.2%). English was seen as important by more than two thirds for their future education. This is a strong instrumental motivation. This is as expected, as integrative motivation would be more likely among L2 students learning English in an L1 country.
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Question 26 asked: 'Would you like to go and live in an English-speaking country?'. This was asked to see if students had any potential for acculturation or integrative tendencies. 82.9% answered in the affirmative, though a high score might be expected with such a relatively young sample. If the immigration departments in the United States and Australia are to be believed, half the world is dreaming of wanting to go to another country to live. But that is perhaps all it is, dreaming. Going to live in the United States or Australia does not necessarily mean you want to become American or Australian, though you may share certain values with Americans and Australians, such as a belief in democracy, equal opportunity and the chance to get rich while not having these values in your own country. To share these values would assist you to acculturate if you did go to live in either of these countries. To the following related question, 88.5% answered in the affirmative: Question 27 'Do you want to learn more about the culture of English-speaking people?'. So the interest was there to learn more about L2 culture, not that it was always possible for students to learn much English speaking culture in the classroom.

Question 28 asked: 'Does anyone else in your immediate family speak English?'. Three quarters replied in the affirmative (75%). When asked: (Question 29) 'Do you speak English with anyone else in your family?', 68% replied in the affirmative. So a majority of students had someone else in their homes who also spoke English as an L2. Though when asked in Question 30 'Do you worry about offending native speakers of English by making mistakes in your English while talking to them?', a minority (39.8%) said they were worried, the majority (50.8%) said they were not concerned about offending native speakers of English. This could indicate that a majority were perhaps not interested in acculturation. However not worrying about offending an L1 speaker of English could also indicate other things such as a desire for fluency over accuracy, lack of self-consciousness etc. The L2 learners were interested in learning about English culture as the answer to Question 31 show. When asked 'Would you like to learn more about the cultures of English-speaking people so you can avoid giving offense while speaking to native English speakers?', 75.5% answered in the affirmative, though a sizable minority answered no or that they did not think it important to learn English culture. Overall the survey shows that the majority of students were interested in learning about English culture but that their motivation was perhaps instrumental rather than integrative. Students were also given the opportunity to write comments about English speakers and their culture. There were some prejudicial comments about English-speaking
people but they were confined to students with low scores on the proficiency test. No proficient student wrote negative comments about English culture.

This first table of results below considered fluency to be 30/50 in the cloze test. There was very little difference between the means of the fluent and non-fluent groups. The fluent group and the female group both scored "lower" means, showing they were a little more acculturated. There was no statistical significance in the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>mean values for acculturation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[fluency is greater than 30/50 on the cloze test.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>number of cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not fl</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.297</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluent</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.287</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.346</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The correlation coefficient between CULTURE and CLOZE (for 30/50) is -0.1127. As expected, the higher the cloze score, the better (lower) the acculturation score but this is not a statistically significant result (p-value = 0.200. If p-value < 0.05 then the correlation is significant.)

For the T-test, the t-value = 1.30 and the sign = 0.197 (not <0.05), so there was no significant difference between the fluent and non fluent groups on this variable. The results were also tested for gender in light of the fact that empathy, often considered a female trait, was thought to be a motivating factor. For acculturation the t-value = 1.59 and the sign = 1.118, so there was no significant difference between the gender groups.

When a score of 40/50 was taken as the cut off point for fluency, only thirteen students were considered fluent. The results for the acculturation part of the survey were as expected: the higher the student scored on the cloze, the better the acculturation scores. Only one student in my former Paraguayan class scored above 40/50 in the cloze. (The female student concerned got 45/50). Her score for acculturation was also the best in the class (segundo
curso, Colegio San Andres, 1995) but it was equivalent to the mean. The Paraguayan student who obtained 45/50 was the only fluent student I knew personally and I would have expected this student to score well in the acculturation part of the test. There were six other students in the other Paraguayan class who scored more than 40/50 on the cloze test. This means the majority of so-called fluent students were Paraguayan.

When 40/50 was taken as the cut off point for fluency, the results were better. There was one point between the fluent and non fluent students, rather than 0.5, but the results were not statistically significant.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Variability of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CULTURE</td>
<td>Not fl 118</td>
<td>20.9746</td>
<td>2.412</td>
<td>.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluent 13</td>
<td>19.9231</td>
<td>2.139</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Difference = 1.0515

Levene's Test for Equality of Variances: F = .420 P = .518

t-test for Equality of Means 95%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal</th>
<th>t-value df 2-Tail Sig</th>
<th>CI for Diff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>129 .134 .698</td>
<td>(-.329, 2.432)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal</td>
<td>1.66 15.57 .117 .634</td>
<td>(.295, 2.398)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the results for 40/50 the t-tests and correlation coefficients (listed above) are very similar to the results for 30/50.

5. **Conclusion**

The results of the survey were as expected. If a student did well on the cloze test, he or she obtained a better (lower) score on the acculturation test, indicating that he or she was more acculturated. Female students also scored better than males, which supports the anecdotal evidence of the Chilean teachers. The results were, however, not statistically significant. The main reasons for this probably lies in faults in the survey: there were problems in the questions asked and in the weighting given to various responses. Some of the open questions that elicited a written response from the student provided interesting and useful information, but it was not information that could be used when weighting questions for scoring on acculturation levels. Stauble (1981) experienced similar problems in his study.
He found no linear increase in acculturation scores as language proficiency increased. Stauble's study involved Spanish-English and Japanese-English second-language learners. It was found, however, that the more proficient learners did have more L1 English-speaking associates. Stauble (1981) gives two main reasons for there being little association:

1. There was a small sample.
2. The fact that the research design provided no principled basis for weighing the various aspects of acculturation, assessed by the questionnaire.

The second of these problems is the main one with the current survey, though the total sample is not small, having approximately 125 subjects. Despite this drawback, the survey clearly showed that the higher the cloze score, the better the level of acculturation. The questions and the weightings they are given need to be adapted, though. The other problem is that acculturation is an intangible quality that is perhaps inseparable from other qualities such as attitude and motivation. To be well-acculturated can mean you have a good, positive attitude to the L2 culture, which would assist you when learning an L2. There is a need to be internationally culturally competent. Fantini (1997:51) writes: "language is much more than just a tool and language study much more than just an academic subject, but a means to enter into another world view, and as such, an imperative for today's world and the century ahead". It has been shown that language proficiency differences in people of a similar aptitude may be attributed to attitudinal and motivational differences (Lum 1960: 109-114, Gardner & Lambert 1972:266-272). Empathy, respect, flexibility, non-judgementalness, openness and tolerance for ambiguity are also extremely important (Allport 1959, Fantini 1997). L2 learners are greatly assisted in learning a second language by having a positive attitude towards the L2 culture and people. No proficient L2 learner with a negative attitude towards L1 English culture was found amongst the students surveyed but there were many non fluent students with negative attitudes to the L1 people and culture. However, as with acculturation, none of these qualities is static over time. Any attempt at measuring them can only be a freeze-frame snapshot of a particular moment in time. L2 learning is an extremely complex process with many different variables.

One other problem with the survey was the differing ages and educational levels of the students. For example at St. Gregory's, students were surveyed at random from all the levels at the school. A year five student would not have scored well on the proficiency test even
if he or she did have a positive attitude to the L2 culture. It may have been best to concentrate on one particular level of students in all the countries; for example, all final year students.

The survey has shown that there is perhaps something in the hypothesis that higher language proficiency is indicative of a certain amount of acculturation and a positive attitude to L2 culture. Further study,! perhaps linking attitude and motivation with acculturation, is warranted.
CHAPTER THREE

COMMUNICATIVE LEARNING STRATEGIES

1 Introduction

This study was originally motivated by the research of Huang and Van Naerssen (1987). Their results supported "the critical role of functional practice in language learning as previously suggested in Bialystok (1978, 1979)" (1987: 287). Functional practice in this study will be referred to as communicative learning strategies. Functional practice/communicative learning strategies include activities which mainly focus on using language for communication, such as:

- speaking with other students and native speakers,
- listening and reading for comprehension,
- attending lectures,
- watching films and TV programmes,
- thinking or talking to oneself in English (ibid.: 289).

Most of the questions in part two of the survey were designed to test for communicative strategies and, for the majority of those questions, I am indebted to Huang and Van Naerssen.

The questions assume that communicative strategies are largely dependent on L2 learners' oral and aural skills. Halliday, McIntosh & Strevens (1964:259) maintain that it is best for L2 learners to learn all four skills and to have an oral learning phase first before learning to read. The four skills are reading, writing, listening and speaking. L2 learners of English in non English-speaking countries find speaking and listening skills the most difficult to develop. Even in South Africa it is difficult for many students to find opportunities to speak English outside of the classroom. However, because of the prestige of English in South Africa and its widespread use as a lingua franca, L2 speakers often develop an oral proficiency that outstrips their cognitive academic language proficiency in English. In fact many illiterate people in South Africa speak English as one of four or five languages in which they have varying degrees of linguistic proficiency. Bialystok (1978:75) claims that "communicational exposure is one important way of improving proficiency by increasing the learner's experience with forms and meanings that can become incorporated into his or her
own use of the language". It does not matter if the partner in the communication is an L1 or L2 speaker of English as the following example shows, often external factors influence the willingness to engage in communication. At St. Mark's, where the overall English proficiency levels were of a high standard, one student commented that the students did not like to speak English among themselves because they were afraid of being called a "coconut". This, she explained, meant you were Brown on the outside and White on the inside. This statement implies that students at St. Mark's were aware, to some extent, of the L2 culture that comes with using an L2 and it is a form of resistance to the L2. Yet despite this, in all the countries of the study, if a student so desired he or she was able to watch films and videos in English, listen to the radio, and speak to fellow L2 speakers of English.

Savignon (1983:27) writes that "L2 learning, like L1 learning, begins with the needs and interests of the learner". L2 learners want and need languages for different reasons. Even development in each of the four language skills is not always possible, depending on where and how the students learn the L2. It is common for multilinguals to develop selective functionality. Sridar (1996:50) argues:

Multilinguals develop competence in each of the codes to the extent that they need it and for the contexts in which each of the languages is used. For example, a multilingual student might have an excellent reading, writing, speaking, and comprehending knowledge of one or two languages but might be more comfortable using one language for academic or professional purposes and another for intimate or emotional expression.

Halliday (1973:22) explains:

The social functions of language clearly determine the pattern of language varieties, in the sense of what have been called 'diatopic' varieties, or registers: the register range, or linguistic repertoire, of a community or of an individual is derived from the range of uses that language is put to in that particular culture or subculture.

An L2 learner who needs English for educational purposes will acquire a different form of English as an L2 from someone who just wants a limited command of English for interpersonal communication, travel or for being able to listen to music and view films in English.

In retrospect, there was a commonness of purpose among all the L2 learners in this study. The goal is English for educational purposes. Rubin (1968) comments on Paraguay in this
context. Paraguay is the only truly bilingual country in South America. Most Paraguayans are bilingual in Spanish and Guaraní. Spanish is used in the government, in business transactions, and with foreigners, whereas Guaraní is used with friends, family, and servants. Many Paraguayan students study at a tertiary level in the United States, so English is in effect required for further education and international business. In fact, the higher up the social scale you go, the more important Spanish and English become. Many Paraguayan campesinos (peasant farmers) in the countryside mainly speak Guaraní and only have a limited amount of Spanish.

I would not go as far as to agree with Saville-Troike (1996:359) that, when L2 students learn "a foreign language within the context of their native culture ... their learning remains largely an academic exercise" but, owing to the fact L2 students get few opportunities to interact with L1 English speakers, speaking and listening should be the weakest of their four language skills. Anecdotal evidence strongly supports this assumption in all four countries involved in this study.

In terms of knowledge of English, communicative competence is a relative not an absolute concept. Communicative competence is what one knows, and all the knowledge one has of one's L2, both conscious and unconscious. Communicative performance, on the other hand, is what one does, what one can actually produce in a conversation or test of one's L2; only performance is measurable (ibid.:9). Savignon (1983:100) points out that "levels of competence wax and wane with changes in exposure and emphasis".

For this survey oral communicative performance was not tested, because of the logistics of such an exercise. The task of conducting oral interviews with more than 100 students in four different countries was too expensive and too daunting. Instead of an oral examination, a cloze test was administered to gauge the students' level of proficiency in English. In the situations where this was carefully monitored, owing to personal knowledge of the students, it was found to be an extremely accurate indication of oral/aural fluency and reading and writing abilities in English. The survey was designed to test for communicative strategy use. It was hypothesised that the greater use of communicative strategies should equate with better proficiency levels in the L2. The results are examined in section four of this chapter. This chapter itself is an integral part of the study, at the very core of what Huang and Van
Naerssen were trying to prove in their South China survey. The main difference is that the present study contains a larger and ethnically and geographically more diverse sample.

2 Theories of Language Learning

There are different and sometimes conflicting theories of language learning. In this section I survey some of these theories and focus on those most relevant to this study. Halliday (1993) states that for children, ontogenesis of language is the same as the ontogenesis of learning. So when children learn language they are learning the foundation of learning itself. Halliday interprets learning as essentially a semiotic process. Semiotics is the study of sign systems and their use. Fawcett, Halliday & Lamb (1987:34) write: "A semiotic act is any act, linguistic or otherwise, that projects cultural meanings and can be interpreted as the realization of such meanings".

Nativists, on the other hand, saw human language as a sort of biologically-inherited coding. In this they believed the language learning of small children is in their genes. Language learning was not seen as a cultural process and second language learning was seen as a quite different process altogether. Nativist beliefs which originated with Chomsky (1973) are now not so fashionable, though there is still some support for these beliefs. Asher (1972:134) theorises that it is: "a reasonable hypothesises that the brain and nervous system are biologically programmed to acquire language, either the first or second, in a particular mode". Many now see a link between language and culture, Sampson (1997:3) writes, "the languages all human societies possess are cultural developments", and the learning of L1s and L2s are now seen as similar processes.

Ervin-Tripp (1974:205) writes, "in all second language learning we will find the same processes, over-generalizations, production simplification, loss of sentence medial items, and so on". In a study of American children learning French in Geneva, Ervin-Tripp (1974) found that the subjects used similar strategies to acquire their L2 as their L1.

2.1 Halliday's Theories

My experience with L2 learning leads me to support Halliday's functional theories of language learning and use and I shall therefore discuss them in more detail below. While there are other models and research in language learning, as they are not that different from Halliday's researches I have focussed on him in this section. Halliday (1993:116) lists 21
features that are aspects of child language development that he thinks are critical to a language-based theory of learning.

To generalise, Halliday (1993) postulates a three-step model of human semiotic development:

(protolanguage) generalisation, abstractness, metaphor, with a three to five year gap between the post-infancy steps. If L2 learning were the same as L1 learning, the L2 learners would be expected to pass through something like these 21 steps as they progressively learnt their L2.

L2 learners (if they are in a L1 country) may make their first communications with the use of mime. Next they use single words, for example, going to a bakery and saying simply 'bread'. This one word may in effect mean, 'I would like to buy some bread, do you have any?'. It equates with the child uttering 'Mummy' meaning, 'Mum come and play with me'. The big breakthrough for an L2 learner occurs when he or she gets to the L2 equivalent of Step seven and has developed a grammar in the L2. Halliday calls Step Seven: "Magic Gateway" Strategy: Finding a way in to a new activity or to a new understanding. This is the crucial first step into a fully developed grammar. It is the most crucial step in the entire language learning experience (ibid.) Step Eight would be the next major stage when learners become able to generalise. Generalisation (Classifying, Taxonomizing): Naming and classes ("common" terms) and classes. A common word now functions as an annotation of an experience. A child sees a large vehicle and calls it a 'bus', its mother then confirms that it is a bus or says "no it is a van", thereby classifying it (ibid.). By the time an L2 learner becomes able to use metaphor, he or she has developed a high level of competency. Halliday's Step Twenty: Grammatical Metaphor (Nominalizing, Technologizing): From commonsense grammar to the grammar of objects and technical hierarchies posits that children come to grips with metaphor at around nine years of age (ibid.). The idea of L2 language development progressing in steps like L1 development is therefore tenable. These steps relate to initial language learning, whether L1 or L2 and after several years of learning English the learners should have reached the highest level in their L1s and be on their way to this level in their L2s.

Many texts designed to teach English as an L2 recognize the fact that L2 learners pass through various stages on their way to full bilingualism in their L2. Richard-Amato (1996:24) notes: "Similarity between speech addressed to children in their first language.
(motherese) and speech addressed to foreigners (foreigner talk) is evidence that others at least perceive the strategies of L1 and L2 acquisition to be similar in many ways. As a result certain points of grammar and features of a language are sometimes taught before others. Halliday (1973: 17), in a discussion of child language acquisition, has also developed a series of models.

In its instrumental function, language is used for the satisfaction of material needs: this is the 'I want' function. The regulatory is the 'do as I tell you' function, language in the control of behaviour. The interactional function is that of getting along with others, the 'me and you' function (including 'me and my mummy'). The personal is related to this: it is the expression of identity, of the self, which is related to this: it is the expression of identity, of the self, which develops largely through linguistic interaction: the 'here I come' function, perhaps. The heuristic is the use of language to learn, to explore: reality the function of 'tell me why'. The imaginative is that of 'let's pretend', whereby the reality is created, and what is being explored is the child's own mind, including language itself. The representational is the 'I've got something to tell you' function, that of the communication of content.

The L2 learner will go through the 'I want' phase first of all, to meet immediate needs. This is why some foreign language teaching focuses on survival skills. Some foreign language text books introduce the L2 learner to the L2 culture as a tourist. The first lessons are about directions, ordering food and the other things tourists or temporary visitors to a foreign country need to do. The language is taught as if is from a Berlitz type phrase book and it would be the phrase book bought by tourists that would best represent this approach. As the L2 learner progresses in L2 language acquisition his or her use of the language will also become more sophisticated as it does in the case of children learning their L1. The idea of L2 learners learning their foreign language skills in the same order as L1 children learn is now widely accepted. There are similarities but there are also many differences. The audio-lingual method justifies its learning of the four skills in the order listening, speaking, reading, writing, because that is the order in which a child learns an L1. But L1 children are different from teenage or adult L2 learners. For a start they are less inhibited and less prone to embarrassment, important issues in L2 learning. Adults also know how to read and write in their L1. Rivers (1968:56) explains:

Adolescent or adult students have been trained to study with books and pen. Now they may be denied these aids and asked to produce strange sounds which make them feel rather ridiculous. Their minds are full of their first language, many of the concepts of which do not appear to parallel those of this new language. It is obvious that they have neither the motivation nor the unique situational opportunity of the languageless infant.
In a classroom dominated by communication, the analogy with L1 language learning seems more logical.

2.2 Second Language Development

As already stated, progress in learning an L2, as in an L1, is not always uniform. Students do not always learn what they are meant to, when they are meant to. Cohen (1991:107) asks: "How many times does a teacher exclaim 'Why, we already covered that in class.' or 'But you learned that last Friday'? Indeed the teacher may in fact teach a number of things that are not learned by the students, or at least not learned in the way that the teacher envisioned. The teacher may have a certain agenda and the student an entirely different one". Students all have different ability levels and learn at different rates. Sometimes this may be faster than the teacher's learning plan and at other times slower. There are many methods for teaching an L2 and they often posit different orders for teaching the four skills, speaking, listening, reading, writing. The approach should in effect be influenced by a number of variables, among them the purpose for learning the L2, the place in which the L2 is being learned and the type of student doing the learning.

One of the main issues in L2 learning, is the differential success and varying levels of fluency and linguistic development achieved by L2 learners. A study by Stauble (1978) explores a possible analogy between the process of decreolization (the process whereby a creole language incorporates more and more features of the model standard language) and second language learning. Stauble found there was a link between L2 learning and decreolization. In both processes not all learners achieved a linguistic development essentially identical to the model language. In order to understand this linguistic development, extra-linguistic factors need to be taken into account. One of these factors is acculturation (ibid : 50-51). Decreolization is significant in that much of the input would be through communicative (oral) means, as is also the case for L2 learners in an L1 country. Yet Stauble notes there are significant extra-linguistic factors. The students in this study, it should be noted, would have had much less opportunity to use communicative type strategies than subjects in a decreolization process or L2 learners in an L1 country such as the United States.

When it comes to communicative strategies, notes Ellis's (1993:9), "no one really agrees on a definition of learning strategy and, as a result, there is also no agreement on exactly what these learning strategies are, how many of them there are, what they consist of etc.". This

The communicative approach to learning an L2 is now so widely accepted that some language schools in L1 English-speaking countries refer to themselves as having a communicative approach to teaching language. The learn-by-use theory is accepted by most communicative schools (George 1983). Dornyei and Thurrell (1991: 16) assert: "the communicative approach to language teaching has been welcomed and adopted in many parts of the world".

2.3 Communicative Competence

Schulz (1991: 24-5) suggests that, based on the present state of L2 acquisition theory and research, curriculum planning and teaching activities should be guided by three basic questions:

[1] How can we supply students with the optimum amount of interesting, comprehensible input?

[2] What can we do to provide students with opportunities to interact in the language in real communicative contexts and with real communicative purposes?

[3] What can we do to increase students' motivation so that they are willing to see additional input and interactive opportunities and continue their efforts beyond the year or two of classroom instruction which convention considers adequate for becoming communicative in another language?

Some text books used in schools to teach English to L2 students also stress this communicative approach. The texts used in Colegio San Andres, Asuncion, Paraguay were in this category (Swan & Walter 1994). Unfortunately in South Africa, in what were once known as "White English medium" schools, the L1 and L2 students are sometimes in the same class, using the same materials with little consideration being made for some students' L2 status. Though many schools do make the distinction this is not universal and often the most able are put into L1 classes. In 'black' schools, English is the medium of instruction and most students study English as a subject at the L2 level. South Africa is a large country and the education system is going through much change. As a result, it is difficult to generalise about what is actually happening.
Theoretically, the very fact that L2 learners are taught subjects other than English in their L2 should in itself be a form of language training. However, we need to take into consideration Krashen's theories on comprehensible input as a criterion for language acquisition. L2 students using the same texts as L1 students, without teacher mediation or consideration of the fact that they are learning through an L2, could in fact, fall further and further behind, neither mastering the content nor improving their language proficiency. We are made aware of another factor by Halliday, McIntosh & Strevens (1964:253): "Teaching in a language is a remarkably effective means of teaching a language: but it carries with it the implication, sometimes overlooked, that all those who teach subjects in the foreign language need to be able to perform adequately in it themselves". In South Africa at least, using English as a medium of instruction in all except Afrikaans-medium schools means that about 70% of the population is trying to learn through an L2 and being taught by teachers who are often not proficient in English themselves. Under such conditions students are fortunate if they master the content through a mix of English and various L1s. Their English proficiency can hardly improve under such circumstances.

2.4 Krashen's Theories

Krashen (1975, 1981a, 1981b, 1982, 1996) is one of the leading theorists behind the communicative approach but he is controversial as well as influential. He stresses that L2 acquisition is essentially an unconscious or subconscious process which happens naturally when learners use language as a medium of communication. Krashen (1996:11) writes, "we acquire language by understanding messages (the input hypothesis) in a low-anxiety environment (the affective filter hypothesis), and that comprehensible input results in language acquisition, subconscious tacit competence. Conscious language learning is limited in function". "Learning", according to Krashen, refers to the conscious knowing of grammar rather than learning to perform. Krashen emphasises that the speaker's attention is on the message. What is said is generated by the acquired system and conscious learning is available to the performer only as a monitor. This is the monitor theory (1981a:2) and possibly it explains why many communicative textbooks begin their unit of work with a scripted conversation in an unstructured social setting, accompanied by photos and sometimes even videos, in an attempt to show English in an everyday natural environment, even if that environment is artificially created. According to Cohen (1991:107), a natural environment occurs whenever the focus is on
the content of communication rather than on the language itself. Ordinary conversation is natural ... likewise — reading for information or entertainment, or film or television viewing are also natural uses of language (Burt 1983:39).

If Krashen's views are accepted wholesale, then we need not worry about what kind of conscious learning the learner indulges in. If however, we view conscious learning as having a significant role to play, then the insights we can gain from successful second language learners have value in enhancing the learning of the less successful learners.

It was stated in the previous chapter that the majority of L2 language learners throughout history would have learnt in a natural way, although it is without teachers and/or formal instruction. However, today few L2 learners of English learn in a purely natural way. Although it is possible for L2 students to travel briefly to L1 English-speaking countries. Some students involved in the study had actually done this. Bialystok (1990:75) states that "immersion experiences in the target culture would likely have their maximum effect on implicit knowledge and other knowledge". It might also occur in a society such as South Africa where English is an official language, an important lingua franca and a prestige language.

2.5 Language Learning

All the students in the present study were undergoing formal instruction. Gee (1989: 136) asks in one article, exactly what is it that English teachers teach?

It is not at all clear what "English" is supposed to mean as an answer to the question "What do English teachers teach?" It surely cannot mean "English grammar" of the sort that is in grammar books: many native speakers of English, including many teachers of English, don't know grammar in this sense, and they surely speak and understand English all the same.

Perhaps it is supposed to mean "English grammar" in the sense in which children internalize a grammar of language in their early years.

Theorists like Krashen (1985) argue that grammar can not be overtly taught, that it has it is acquired by exposure to people speaking the language in natural social situations. Gee (1989) concludes his article by stating that English teachers aim to give students the ability to use English correctly in a variety of social contexts, though he still has his doubts as to whether this can be achieved outside a natural context. These comments of Gee's perhaps explains why L2 teachers in many modern communicative language schools are instructed
not to correct students' English if they understand it and to avoid correction and/or over correction at all costs. This is also why some teachers no longer teach grammar.

There are five tenets of the communicative approach to L2 teaching, according to Savignon (1983:25):

[1] Language use is creative. Learners use whatever knowledge they have of a language system to express their meaning in an infinite variety of ways.

[2] Language use consists of many abilities in a broad communicative framework. The nature of particular abilities needed is dependent on the roles of the participants, the situation, and the goal of the interaction.

[3] L2 learning, like L1 learning, begins with the needs and interests of the learner.

[4] An analysis of learner needs and interests provides the most effective basis for materials development.

[5] The basic unit of practice should always be a text or chunk of discourse. Production should begin with the conveyance of meaning. Formal accuracy in the beginning stages should be neither required nor expected.

Language teachers, Gee (1989:138) writes, "can at the right moment, point to the right fact, focus the learner's attention on just the right thing, out of the myriad of things he or she could pay attention to at that moment". As a language teacher it can be too easy to go off at a tangent and explain something too complicated before the student is ready to learn it. As a good teacher not only do you need to know what to teach but when to teach it. Krashen's strict division between learning and acquisition is one of the controversial aspects of his theory. Many critics believe that learning can enhance or lead to acquisition. McLaughlin (1987), believes that only children can successfully learn an L2 in a natural context.

The learning of new vocabulary and grammar rules may have its place. George (1983:27) points out that "the conscious learning of both words and structures may hypothetically, contribute to their communicative use in comprehension first and in production later". It is common practice before teaching a comprehension piece (a short story, a few paragraphs of a novel, an article) to first teach key words and new words the teacher suspects his or her students may not know. If I reflect on my own experience as a teacher, I would say that George (1983) is right to claim that new vocabulary words taught in this way may later turn up in writing or spoken English. In Zimbabwe I always taught key words before using a
piece of writing as comprehension in class. The students would learn the meaning of the keywords in the passage before they began the reading. Later the keywords would reappear in spelling/vocabulary tests (a test in which students had to spell the word and then write a sentence using it correctly to prove they knew how to use it) as a way of assisting their intake. Essays written after spelling/vocabulary tests would contain many of the new keywords as if the students were trying them out. If a new word were particularly popular, it would appear continually in conversations. Zimbabwe was the first country where I taught English, and the success I had with comprehension, keywords and spelling/vocabulary tests convinced me it was a good way to teach new vocabulary. However in all the other countries in which I worked teaching English to L2 students, the students did not show the same amount of uptake/ intake as the Zimbabwean L2 students. This was probably due to the fact that Zimbabwe has a large number of L1 English speakers and English is used in everyday life to a much greater extent than it is in neighbouring Botswana and South Africa, although there might be many other factors as well.

2.6 Testing Language Proficiency

What George (1983) says about teaching vocabulary blurs the lines between formal and functional practice and shows how difficult it could be to devise an empirical study testing for this. If valid, it may mean that the cloze test would be useful as a means of testing proficiency in all cases. Under the circumstances the cloze test may have been the best means available. It was not a grammar test but a test of underlying linguistic competence. An answer was marked correct if a student found either the correct or an appropriate word to replace the missing one. Of all the students in this study I knew of only a few who had extremely good oral English and poor written skills. Obviously good oral and poor written skills would be much more of a problem with L2 learners in L1 English-speaking countries. This was the position I found myself in learning my L2 in Paraguay. My oral Spanish was vastly superior to my written Spanish. The majority of students in this study would have found their communicative competence superior to their performance. Krashen (1996:18) maintains that the teacher, when examining an L2 learner's conversational abilities, "should focus only on the exchange of information, not grammatical accuracy", particularly in the early stages of learning an L2. George's (1983) comments may be more relevant for more advanced learners. Once you have a basic vocabulary and a good knowledge of English grammar it is advantageous to increase your vocabulary by adding more difficult words but in the early stages of learning it is perhaps best to focus on communicating accurately.
There are other ways of determining language proficiency. Agencies in the United States such as language schools of the Foreign Service Institute and Defence Language Institute developed ratings which describe a range of language proficiency standards (Stern 1992: 64):

[1] Elementary proficiency  
[2] Limited working proficiency  
[4] Full professional proficiency  
[5] Native or bilingual proficiency.

At all five levels, language proficiency was defined for each of the four skills: speaking, listening, comprehension, reading and writing scales – and indicated what communicative functions could be expected to be carried out at a given level, for example, "can read newspaper articles of personal interest, can deal with visitors, can take part in a training programme offered in the second language" (ibid.). None of the students in the present study would have reached level five on this particular scale. A few approached level four but these students were studying at a secondary level. The point here is that it is difficult to define exactly what a proficient student is?

2.7 Aspects of Language Learning

When learning a new language, learners appear to pass through at least three communication phases, according to Oller and Amato (1983: 40):

- one way, listens to or reads, the target language but doesn't communicate back. Listens to speech, and radio programmes, watches films and TV, reading books and magazines.
- partial two way, replies in four or five words or non-verbally.
- full two way, learner speaks target language.

In this study the L2 learners involved were in all of the above categories. This was particularly relevant in a school like Colegio San Andres where the students had been in the same classes since five years of age and had the same teachers and opportunities to learn English. The relevant question here is, why were they all at different levels after eight years? Did the more successful students use more of the listed communicative strategies?
Rubin in a 1975 study proposed that one of the main characteristics of a good language learner was the willingness to take risks. If you take more risks, you use more strategies. This view seems to also emerge from the Huang and Van Naerssen study. Rubin (1987:27) lists other activities which create opportunities for practice. The list includes: "creates situation with natives in order to verify/test/practice; initiates conversation with fellow student/teacher/native speaker; answers to self; questions to other students, spends extra time in the language lab; listens to television/radio, attends movies or parties or uses advertisements, reads extra books often first in native language, then in target language". Any L2 student using all of these strategies would be a fairly adventurous risk taker. A good L2 learner would attempt to adopt some if not all of these strategies. I am now aware that a bad learner would not bother and his approach would, as Stern (1975:314) suggests, remain "passive, unsystematic, and fragmented".

Of all the L2 learners, I knew the Paraguayans best and it was among those students that I noticed that the minority with full two-way communication were doing virtually all the communication and all the written work in the class. The more fluent students just kept getting better and enthusiastically did all the communicating with me and other staff members, for their fellow students. In effect, the top third of the class progressed rapidly while the bottom third did not seem to progress at all. At the time I saw it as a problem and called this top group of half a dozen students the "translators". Eventually I put them in their own group and gave them more difficult work in an attempt to avoid having weaker students copy their written work. I noticed they had more communication strategies than other students, which is why this study and this chapter came about.

The question was, did they have more communicative strategies because they were more fluent or were they more fluent because they had more communicative strategies? How did they get to a full two-way communication level while the rest of the class after the same education, remained on the other two levels? Savignon (1983: 23) writes, "Language use consists of many abilities in a broad communicative framework. The nature of the particular abilities needed is dependent on the roles of the participants, the situation and the goal of the interaction." My justification for separating the top third of the class, was to motivate the rest to improve. At the time I reasoned that, because the weaker students were being peer tutored by a student who was stronger and they were merely copying work and not doing it, they might benefit from being forced to do it themselves. I am now aware that from
a communicative point of view this was probably the wrong thing to do. The communicative approach favours peer tutoring. That is, the stronger student tutors the weaker. It is also preferable to have groups of mixed ability, where weaker students get to practise their L2 with someone who can help and stronger students get extra work. In light of this, it would be interesting to do an empirical study to see if L2 learners with differing levels and amounts of instruction in their L2 would show that communicative strategies were a factor in greater L2 proficiency (proficiency being variable). Stern (1983: 412) has called, "for further research in different social contexts, under different levels of proficiency".

In my experience, English teachers in all the schools (Colegio San Andres 1996, St Paul's 1996, St Gregory's 1998, St Mark's 1998) involved in the study were quick to admit that they thought their more proficient students used more communicative strategies than less proficient ones, though Green and Oxford (1995: 292) have noted, "people at different levels of proficiency are likely to use different kinds of strategies, partly because they are dealing with various kinds of materials and situations". If this is true, it complicates the situation, although Bialystok (1978:82) maintains that "individual differences may be attributed to the extent to which various language learners use the learning strategies" There are other factors, too, such as intelligence, but interestingly enough teachers (Colegio San Andres 1996) thought that superior intelligence was not a necessary requirement for L2 proficiency.

The problem for the L2 English teacher worldwide is that he or she is often forced to teach in the way currently in vogue in his or her school, although personal experience may not necessarily support this. George (1983: 40) believes that "the tragedy of ELT over the last three decades stems from the fact that innovations have come from theoreticians who hardly taught before developing their theories or methods. Some of them never taught, most of them never at the lower levels or in unfavourable circumstances". Some theorists give little consideration to factors such as the culture, learning preferences, home and/or school circumstances, gender or age of learners.

The communicative approach does not turn language teachers into culture teachers. Murphy (1988: 147) states: "In the communicative approach the teaching of cultures is implicit ... culture as such is not taught but is assumed rather to come with the language". Sociolinguistic competence is vital. In oral situations there are conventions which govern
choice of register, tone, degree of formality etc. Unless an L2 learner is exposed to L1 speakers, he or she will rarely learn these conventions? Japanese L2 speakers of English can be particularly monotonous in their tones and register when they speak English. This could easily be misconstrued by L1 speakers of English as a lack of enthusiasm or interest, which may not be the case, but the impassive Japanese L2 speaker of English needs exposure to the L1 speaker to learn how to speak English appropriately. Using appropriate tones when speaking English is not just a simple matter of phonology but of culture as well. The Japanese speaker of English needs to learn it is not culturally appropriate to speak English in the same way Japanese would be spoken.

Television programmes can assist in exposing students to L2 culture in environments where learners do not have much other exposure. The Paraguayan students disliked the television programme *Coronation Street*, because it showed a culture very different from their own. Newspapers and magazines can also introduce learners to the contemporary culture of the target language speakers. Cultural tolerance could also be fostered by using a range of texts to show how cultures differ from one another. Using a range of English texts across a period of time could also help show how dynamic culture is and how it has changed over time.

Just why some L2 students learn so well with the communicative approach and others do not, has yet to be formally determined. It has been noted that L2 students whose L1 is a cognate language with English, learn English as an L2 better than L2 students from a non-cognate background. Phillipson(1991:179) writes: "The Dutch-Scandinavian project in Umea has shown that relatively little teaching may be needed to achieve reasonable success in communication between speakers of closely related languages". French and English are also very similar, in written form the similarities are even more obvious. Recognising cognates can be a learning strategy used by the successful L2 learner. However Rubin (1987:16) is right to note that, "although cognates may be deliberately used in language texts, if they are not explained many students never see the relationship of these cognates to words in their own language. Once the students' attention is drawn to the relationship, the same kind of conscious intervention is assumed to be helpful in the process of learning". Hammer (1978) showed that the ratio of good cognates to false (words that are confusingly similar in appearance but radically different in meaning) was eleven to one for English. It is also easier for L1 English speakers to learn German than it is for them to learn Japanese or Chinese, because English is one of the Germanic group of languages. Likewise French and
Spanish speakers find it easier to learn another Romance language than students from a Japanese or Chinese background. Spanish is a relatively easy language for English speakers (vice versa) to learn because of the large number of cognate words, usually with Latin roots. Lobo's (1966) thesis was able to expand a 10,000 Spanish word vocabulary from 3000 English cognates. So from day one in language learning, Spanish and English speakers have many mutual advantages.

Attitude can also be important; for instance, some lingering historical bitterness could make learning English as an L2 unpopular. In South Africa you would find this among some Afrikaans speakers learning English. The Second Anglo-Boer war (1899-1902) may be long over but in some rural areas particularly, it is still being fought/remembered as though it were yesterday. Antipathy towards English might be present in some parts of France too owing to troublesome Anglo-Franco relationship and rivalry that goes back centuries.

We can thus see that factors such as personality and attitude or motivation could play a very important role in L2 acquisition. A person who resented English would hardly strive to communicate with English speakers or to become acculturated. In terms of the theories discussed in this chapter, the following factors could be barriers to language learning in the communicative approach. Factors such as learning style and cultural differences, could influence one's approach. With regard to learning style, extroverts and introverts may perform better with different pedagogical approaches; the extrovert preferring group class activities that involved many communicative experiences. Another activity suitable for extroverts would be class trips that involved getting out into the L1 English speaking community and using English. The more introverted L2 learner may not favour group communicative activities in the classroom and may prefer to study English in his or her room rather than go out onto the street and actually use it.

3 Empirical Studies
In this section I am going to discuss empirical studies into the use of communicative strategies and the results which indicate that students who use such strategies become more proficient in the use of English. Green and Oxford (1995) write:
Our primary descriptive findings point to the need for more study of the relationship of learning strategies to language proficiency. Studies addressing the issue of causality (which we suggested above) is probably bi-directional, with well-chosen strategies, helping to develop L2 proficiency, but with proficiency level also influencing strategy choices) would be especially welcome.

No attempt will be made to give a comprehensive account of all the research undertaken in the field. I have concentrated on a few studies which have influenced my own research.

Huang and Van Naerssen (1987:287) preface their study at Guangzhou as follows:

This is a report on several aspects of a research study designed to investigate the learning strategies in oral communication employed by Chinese EFL students in the People's Republic of China. Sixty graduating (fourth year) English majors in a tertiary level language institute were given an oral test as well as a learning strategies' questionnaire. In order to obtain more in-depth information, interviews were done with the ten highest and the nine lowest achievers in the oral communication test. The results support the critical role of functional practice in language learning as previously suggested in Bialystok (1978, 1979). Reading practice also stood out as the most significant prediction of oral proficiency when examined along with speaking and listening practice.

The present study focussed mainly on functional practice though the Huang and Van Naerssen study (ibid. : 289) also looked at formal practice which "included such activities as listening to and doing drills, listening in order to improve pronunciation, memorizing and reciting texts, imitating, retelling stories, reading aloud, and reading in order to learn vocabulary items or grammatical structures". Apparently at the centre of formal practice is memorisation, a very Chinese way of learning (ibid. : 294):

Memorization and recitation have deep roots in Chinese ideas about education, ... In ancient Chinese schools, the memorizing and reciting of texts by students was considered one of the best ways of attaining a real mastery of anything ... This traditional way of teaching and learning still has a prevailing influence on primary and secondary education in China nowadays. Therefore, it is quite natural to find its traces in modern English teaching at college.

The results from Huang and Van Naerssen's survey were significant in that they found no correlation between memorisation and oral proficiency; hence, the present study concentrated on functional practice and communicative learning strategies as they were seen as the most significant factors for the higher proficiency of some L2 learners. The Huang
and Van Naerssen study, however, only involved 60 students. When the present study was in its planning stage, 125 subjects were mentioned as a minimum number for significant statistical accuracy (University of Cape Town, Department of Mathematics, 1996). Unfortunately this figure then became fixed in my mind as the magic number necessary for an accurate result. Why this was unfortunate, will be elaborated on later and in the conclusion.

In 1967, John Carroll did a large study of 3000 US foreign language majors and was able to demonstrate the beneficial effects of natural language exposure for L2 acquisition. Oller & Richard-Amato (1983: 40) report: "With careful planning, natural language exposure can also be made available within a foreign language environment. When it is, language learning results improve noticeably ... teaching other subjects in English improves student English ... immersion programmes provide a natural environment." In another large study, Bialystok (1981: 33) "discovered in a survey of Toronto teenagers that functional practice for Grade 12's improved performance but that formal practice did not".

A more recent large-scale study involved 374 L2 learners at the University of Puerto Rico. Green and Oxford (1995: 261) state:

Like previous researchers, we found greater use of learning strategies among more successful learners and higher levels of strategy use by women than by men. Our analysis, however, revealed more complex patterns of use than have appeared in previous studies. With both proficiency level and gender, only some items showed significant variation, and significant variation by proficiency level did not invariably mean more frequent strategy use by the more successful students, emphasized active, naturalistic practice and were used in combination with a variety of what we term bedrock strategies, which were used frequently or moderately frequently by learners at all levels.

The strategies tested for in the Puerto Rican survey were the active, naturalistic use of English. They were similar to the communicative strategies tested for in the current survey for this study. They included strategies such as that the learner:

- Looks for people to talk to in English.
- Starts conversations in English.
- Practices English with other students.
- Asks questions in English.
- Watches TV or movies in English.
- Sees many ways to use English.
- Tries to develop cultural understanding.
- Tries to talk to native English speakers (ibid.: 285).
A strong correlation was found between proficiency level and the use of the above strategies. It was only in the so-called communicative (and reading) strategy use that this strong correlation was found. The results in this Puerto Rico survey are particularly relevant because of the size of the sample and the similarity of the questions to those in the current survey. The main drawback was that the group studied was homogenous and at a tertiary level, like the group in Southern China.

One African (Adegbija 1990) study used open-ended surveys, interviews, and observations to measure strategy use by 35 tertiary English students. The most frequently used strategies were reading extensively, mixing with fluent speakers of English, listening to English on radio and TV along with debates and meetings.

Ethnicity and culture seems to play a part in the choice of language learning strategies. Bedell and Oxford (1996) mention how ethnicity and culture influence strategy choice. Strategies can be taught but if they are opposed an L2 learner's own culture they are doomed to failure.

4 Results from Survey

The relevant questions for communicative strategies are all in part two of the survey. (See Appendix A.) The majority of the questions originally came from the Huang and Van Naerssen survey in Southern China which were very similar to the questions used in the Puerto Rican study. In some cases the wording of the questions has been simplified. The communicative questions were mixed in with other questions in an attempt to avoid having the students giving the answer that they may have perceived the teacher/researcher wanted.

For the survey as a whole, there were 131 valid observations. Of these observations, thirteen were from so-called fluent students who scored greater than 40/50 on the cloze test. I knew personally half of the fluent students and can confirm that they were fluent in oral English. The mean score for the cloze test was 27.26, the standard deviation being 10.54. Originally 30/50 or above was the grade for fluency. However, the two weakest Paraguayan students whom I taught in Asuncion in 1995 scored very close to the average score for the cloze. This was of concern as I knew these students well and they could not have been classified as fluent in oral English (in 1995), yet in this test they were very close to being considered fluent, so I did not think 30/50 a high enough cut-off point for fluency. If 30/50 had been
the cut-off point 57 students would have been considered fluent and 74 not fluent. The questions in Part two of the survey were given the value of:

1. often = one
2. sometimes = two
3. rarely = three
4. never = four

Possible scores are between 25 and 100, which is the sum of the answers to Part two (the "lower" the value, the better). The questions were for both communicative and reading strategies. Fourteen were designated communicative and nine reading strategies. In total there were fourteen communicative questions in part two of the survey: questions numbered 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 23.

4.1 Questions and Frequencies

The following are the questions considered for the communicative section of the survey. All the items have the same four points: often/sometimes/rarely/never structure. As it is difficult to judge 'sometimes' and 'rarely', 'often' has been taken as the as the main percentage of interest, and occasionally 'sometimes' has been added if considered significant. The raw data is included in Appendix B.

Q2:2 asked: 'Do you speak English with other students or teachers after class?'. Almost a third or 28.8% said they did this 'often'. This would also be an activity you would need to do often if you were to gain any benefit from it. It is perhaps significant that I considered a third of my Paraguayan class fluent, precisely because they were the ones doing all the talking. Q2:4 asked: 'How often do you listen to the radio, tape or songs in English in order to improve your pronunciation?'. Nearly half (47%) of all students stated 'often'. This is an important activity students can undertake in their own time to improve their listening skills. It is of particular use where little English is spoken outside the school but it is a strategy that requires motivation. Though Q2:4 has an introverted bias, it complements Q 2:2 which considers a more extroverted activity. Q2:5 follows on from Q2:4: 'How often do you stop a tape and listen to it again while you are playing it?'. 'Often' was given as an answer by 34.8%. Replaying a tape is a useful activity to help improve an L2 learner's listening skills but it requires a little motivation: unfortunately only a third were taking the trouble to use it.
Q2:6 asked: 'How often do you look for chances to speak English to other people?'. This was a vital question, one at the very heart of what communicative strategies are all about. It would be expected that the more fluent the student, the more likely he or she would answer 'often'. Again a third (32.6%) of respondents answered 'often'. However, in the Paraguayan sample where my experience suggested a third of students in each class were obviously fluent, there appeared to be no correlation between high cloze score and answering 'often' to question 6. The two most fluent students from my segundo curso class answered 'rarely' and 'sometimes' to this question. Even in quinto curso where five students scored over 40/50 on the cloze test, no one answered 'often'. This is clearly a reflection of the limited opportunities to speak English outside of the school in Paraguay. African students were able to answer 'often' because in Botswana and South Africa in particular there are many opportunities to speak English outside the schools. A fifth (15.9% +5.3%) of all students answered 'rarely' or 'never' to this question, which was a particularly large group of students.

To the following question, nearly a half (49.2%) of students answered 'often'. Q2:7 'When your teacher asks questions in class, do you try and answer them inside your head?' This shows that many students are at least rehearsing in their heads what they may say in English if asked. Their responses can then be compared to those of the L2 learner who actually speaks, which is good communicative practice.

Q2:9 asked 'Do you find yourself correcting other student's English when they make an error?'. 26.5% answered 'often'. Students are communicating in English even if correction is not seen as good by the experts. They also possess a knowledge about the language that enables them to identify and correct errors.

To Q2:10 'How often do you speak English to yourself, either silently or aloud?', almost half (45.5%) answered 'often'. This response implies that the student is beginning to think in English. As an L2 learner becomes more fluent in the L2, he or she is more likely to begin thinking or speaking to himself or herself in English.

In reply to Q2:11 'How often do you listen to radio programmes or songs in English in order to improve your listening comprehension?' 'often' was answered by 42.4%. As this is a simple strategy available to all, it is surprising is that so few answered 'often'.
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The next strategy is more relevant in a country where the English teacher is often the only fluent model of the L2 being learnt by the students. In response to Q2:12 'Do you repeat words or phrases after your teacher or another speaker of English has spoken them?', two thirds (66%) answered 'often' or 'sometimes' but a third answered 'rarely' or 'never'. This is a strategy I have observed being used quite frequently by both Asian and African students. It is used to help get the pronunciation correct. The African students use it much more effectively, many being highly skilled mimics. As a strategy it perhaps helps to show some flaws in the survey. The survey itself was designed for Chinese L2 learners of English. Frequent use of this strategy would perhaps have helped to predict proficiency and fluency among Chinese L2 learners of English. However, African L2 learners would most likely use this strategy less frequently and accomplish better results.

To Q2:14 'How often do you look for chances outside of your school work, to attend lectures, talks or sermons given by English speakers?', 12.9% answered 'often'. Only two students (36/50, 38/50) from segundo curso and none from the other Paraguayan class answered 'often'. So 15 of the 17 students that ticked the 'often' response were African. Owing to circumstances, this strategy would have been more readily available to African rather than Paraguayan students.

The following question is also complicated by the fact that the Africans would have had more opportunity to talk to other English speakers in their vicinity. A Paraguayan student would have had to go to much greater lengths to do that. Q2:15 asked: 'Do you look for English speakers in your town so you can practice speaking your English with them?' Only 12.9% (all African) recorded 'often' as a response and it is relevant to note no Paraguayan answered 'often'. The majority responded with 'never'. Even the most fluent student from segundo curso answered 'rarely' and she wrote rather mysteriously in the margin of her survey. "I have them at home". Perhaps more importantly 40.9% answered 'never'. This is one of the best strategies for improving oral English yet only a tiny minority of students used it frequently.

Q2:16 is closely related to question 12 yet here 36.4% answered 'often'. 'When you listen to your teachers or other speakers of English, do you listen to the way they speak and try to copy them?'
In response to Q2:17 'How often do you watch films or TV programmes in English?'. Almost 70% answered 'often' and nearly 20%, 'sometimes'. This was also a strategy available to all and it is encouraging to see so many making use of it.

For Q2:23 'Do you look up new words you have heard in the dictionary?', 40.2% answered 'often'. When this figure is added to 'sometimes', it makes nearly 70%, so the vast majority of students were making some use of the dictionary, perhaps a reflection of the fact that the teacher or the dictionary were often the only sources of knowledge about words or vocabulary. The purpose of the question was to see if the student was interested in learning new vocabulary. In an L1 English-speaking country almost any native speaker of English could have been of assistance.

Initially when 30/50 was taken as the cut off point for fluency, the cloze scores were compared with a combination of reading and communicative questions, referred to as Value (the overall mean was Value = 49.92). Then a correlation was done; the correlation coefficient between VALUE and CLOZE was -0.219 implying that the better the CLOZE score, the better the VALUE score (as expected). This correlation is, however, not statistically significant (p-value is 0.804). If p-value < 0.05, then the correlation is significant.

T-tests were also done. These tests examine whether mean values differ significantly for two groups. There were 74 non-fluent students and the mean for this group was 50.1486. In the fluent group there were 57 students and the mean for this group was 49.6140. The fluent students had a slightly better mean score (when 30/50 was the cut off point).

A t-test was then done, to test the equality of the means, with the following result:

\[ t\text{-value} = 0.33 \quad 2\text{-tailed significance} = 0.742, \ NOT < 0.05. \]

There is thus no significant difference between the two groups on the value variable.

The main results for this chapter were obtained from examining the answers to the fourteen communicative questions. There were 131 valid observations (completed surveys). Of these 118 were not fluent and 13 were fluent. The scores for the communicative questions should have been minimum 14, maximum 58. If a student did not answer every question, the
survey was still included in the study. The first results are for the means of the reading and communicative strategies. The following Table contains the means (maximum and minimum) and standard deviations.

**Table 1: Means/Minimums and Maximums for Reading / Cloze and Communicative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>N Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>READ</td>
<td>18.02</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>31.00</td>
<td>131.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLOZE</td>
<td>27.26</td>
<td>10.54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td>27.98</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2: Means for Communicative Strategies for fluent and non-fluent students [fluent=greater than 40/50]**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SE of Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not fl</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>27.8051</td>
<td>5.849</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29.6154</td>
<td>5.910</td>
<td>1.639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is the most important result for the chapter on communicative strategies because it contradicts expectations. The non-fluent students had a mean score that was significantly lower. (Lower is better, as it means greater use of communicative strategies.) In the T-test for equality of means, P = .843, so the results were not statistically significant.

5. **Conclusion**

In the results there is a small difference between the non-fluent mean (27.8051) and the fluent (29.6154). This is, however, not the difference that was expected. If the results had been the same as those of other surveys, the mean for the fluent students should have been lower than that for the non-fluent students. The results, even though they were not as expected, were not statistically significant. The results for this section were the most unexpected. The questions were largely the same as those given in the other surveys, where it was shown that use of communicative strategies was an indication of a higher proficiency. The problem then might not lie in the survey. The most likely cause of this unexpected result was the smallness of the sample that lead to what was, in effect, a statistically insignificant result.
The L2 learners in the study, even when they were in English medium schools, were learning English in a non English-speaking environment. The students at St. Gregory's, Natal, would have experienced the greatest exposure to communicative situations in which they could practise English. But even at this school where a large percentage of students were not L1 Zulu speakers, Zulu was the *lingua franca* used by the students among themselves. Savignon (1983) mentions that the presence of role models and opportunities to listen to your L2 are extremely important, yet students in this study were usually deprived of both.

All L2 learners in this study were secondary students, whereas the students who took part in the South China, Texan and Puerto Rican studies were studying in tertiary institutions. As a result I believe the motivational levels of the students in my survey would not have been as high as those of the tertiary L2 students. The Chinese students were full-time tertiary students of the English language and would have been highly motivated to make communicative learning situations for themselves outside of the classroom. It was also their choice to study English as an L2. The secondary students however, were often in English medium schools because their parents had put them there. They were not studying English voluntarily as the tertiary students were.

The environment in which the secondary students were studying also would have contributed to a lack of communicative opportunities in which to practise their L2. Many of the students in the study would have used English in the classroom only. The reason why very little difference could be found between the fluent and non-fluent L2 learners in the use of communicative strategies could be as simple as the lack of a significant number of communicative opportunities.

In Francistown there was a Kalanga teacher who taught English through the medium of Tswana, Ndebele, Kalanga and, on rare occasions, English. So many of the L2 learners in the study would not have had communicative experiences in the classroom, let alone outside the classroom. If the opportunity to practise your L2 is non-existent, it makes no difference whether or not you achieved 45/50 or 25/50 on your cloze test. This could account for the fact that the two other strategies tested were used more by the fluent L2 learners. Both other strategies were easier to accomplish in a non English-speaking environment. The finding of communicative situations outside school in Paraguay and Botswana would have been very difficult, if not impossible.
It is important to note here that tape recorders were not used regularly in any of these schools. When I arrived at Colegio San Andres (July 1995) the College had just purchased new English textbooks for all the secondary levels. Students used a communicative text that required a tape recorder to teach it, yet the school did not have a single tape recorder. This in effect meant the communicative parts of the various chapters were not being taught because you could not do so without a tape recorder. Eventually I obtained one and was able to use the text as it was designed to be used.

The only other area where there could have been a problem was in the use of the cloze as a means of testing proficiency. Extensive pre-testing of the cloze and checks of its results against teacher expectations in at least two schools seem, to discount this as a real problem. Given time, financial and distance constraints the written cloze was the most efficient and fairest means of testing for proficiency. If there had been time and resources, it may have been a good idea to include an oral cloze based on a passage from the book and a dictation in the proficiency test. This would have helped ensure that the most fluent students also had good listening skills that would enable them to participate in communicative strategies.

One key variable was that the three other major studies involved tertiary not secondary students. However, it is unlikely that physical age is a problem as many of the secondary students, particularly those from Africa, were the same age as tertiary students in other countries. It is important to note there is a natural attrition rate when students move from secondary to tertiary education; not everyone gets a tertiary education. The South China, Texan and Puerto Rican studies would have been dealing with more successful L2 students.

In the total survey there were only thirteen fluent students out of a total of 131. This was simply too small a sample and this was the most serious flaw in the whole study. One way this problem could have been solved would have been to have a sample of at least 1000, which would probably have given a better result. It is easy to say this in retrospect, but, a sample of 1000 would have been difficult and too expensive for the researcher to gather. Another option would have been to concentrate on senior secondary students only, possibly final-year students. Students in the study were sampled at random from throughout the secondary schools surveyed, sampling taking place at a variety of ages and levels. If final-year students had been sampled to the exclusion of others, this might have resulted in getting a better sample.
L2 learners can use different strategies at different proficiency levels. At St Gregory's, first-year secondary students were sampled along with those from the penultimate year, so there were beginning, intermediate and advanced students all in the same sample. Oxford and Green (1995:292) note that: "People at different levels of proficiency are likely to use different kinds of strategies, partly because they are dealing with various kinds of materials and situations". This was certainly the case with the subjects in this study. Chamot (1987:78) supports this and writes: "Differences in individual strategy use were also found between beginning and intermediate level ESL students. Metacognitive strategies favoured by intermediate level students were primarily self-management, advance preparation, and self monitoring strategies, whereas beginning level students relied heavily on metacognitive strategies such as selective attention and delayed production". These factors all add unnecessary variables to the sample particularly for communicative strategies.

It is important to note that the result did not in fact, contradict the other studies; it was only inconclusive and this should be the main conclusion. There is not enough evidence to come to even a tentative different conclusion. There is perhaps a slight implication that in a foreign secondary setting the reasons for L2 learner variability in proficiency might be influenced more greatly by strategies other than communicative ones.
CHAPTER FOUR

READING

1 Introduction

Reading is the third and last strategy that was investigated in this study. Initially reading did not figure as a strategy as the emphasis was on oral communicative strategies and acculturation. It was only as this study developed that I was forced to acknowledge how important reading is as a communicative learning strategy and a source of knowledge about culture in societies where English is not widely spoken. The emphasis in this study is on extensive rather than intensive reading. Palmer (1917:137) first proposed a distinction between intensive and extensive reading: "Intensive reading is related to further progress in language learning under the teacher’s guidance. Extensive reading develops at the student’s own pace according to individual ability".

When it comes to teaching an L2, different theories espouse different goals. Stern (1992:80) argues that when teaching goals have been formulated they have usually been expressed – at any rate from about the 1960s – as the acquisition or development of proficiency ('competence' or 'communication skills') rather than as the acquisition of explicit knowledge or conceptual skills. Indeed, it has often been said that the goal of language teaching should not be explicit knowledge ... In the 1960s this skepticism about knowledge was expressed in the slogan of the audio-lingual method, 'Teach the language not about the language'.

In audio-lingual methodology, reading is not initially an important strategy for L2 learners. Proponents of audio-lingualism posited a progression rather than an integration of skills in the order listening, speaking, reading and writing. This primacy of the aural-oral modes has fallen into disrepute and the communicative approach advocates the integration of all four skills from the beginning in formal instruction.

Language Institutes in Santiago de Chile and Spain have been known to advertise their services as instructors in the English Language with the proviso "no reading and writing necessary". This policy is no doubt a reference to the fact that many L2 learners may only want to be able to communicate orally in English. This is a very real desire for many learners
of L2s throughout the world, that can lead to students trying to learn English by a variety of means, some of them dubious. One method being used by L2 students to learn English in Santiago de Chile in 1991 was listening to tapes in English that were meant to instruct you in English while you slept. There are also other options to consider. Stern (ibid. : 34) states: "Print versus non-print, authentic versus contrived material, the role of technology, particularly computer assisted learning and so on. Clearly it is no longer merely a question of 'What's your textbook?'".

Throughout history the majority of people who have learnt an L2 would have done so without instruction. A large number of those L2 learners would have also learnt to speak and understand oral communication only, not to read or write their L2. Many L2 learners, then, are seeking only Basic Interpersonal Communication Skills (BICS). This was largely what I was seeking initially while learning Spanish as an L2 in Paraguay. In these circumstances, reading and writing do not figure prominently, the emphasis being on developing oral-aural skills in the L2. Baetens-Beardsmore (1986:35) maintains that "BICS refers more to language use which reflects manifestations such as oral fluency, accent, and certain aspects of sociological competence". BICS can occur where there are contextual supports and props for language delivery. In face-to-face contexts, for example, there are non-verbal supports to help negotiate meaning (Baker 1996:152).

However, oral-aural competence was not the motivation of the majority of L2 learners in this study. English was used as medium of instruction in all the countries except Chile. The majority of students in this study were seeking Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP). CALP refers mainly to the ability to cope with the demands of the education system where literacy skills are required. CALP occurs in the context-reduced academic situation. Cummins (1979) argues that CALP is cross-lingual and that, once its features have been learnt, they are applicable in any language context thus an older L2 learner can transfer skills from his or her L1 to assist with literacy activities in the L2. Baker (1996:152) is critical of the terms BICS and CALP, suggesting they can become imprecise, value laden, simplified and misused. However, L2 students learn English for different reasons and the terms BICS and CALP help make a distinction between those L2 students using English as a medium of instruction and those studying it because it is a useful international language if they were to travel.
The majority of so-called successful students from South Africa, Botswana and Paraguay might eventually study at English-speaking universities, the Paraguayans studying in the USA, the Batswana in the UK. If the L2 is being used as a medium of instruction, more developed reading and writing skills are required.

In all the different countries and cultures in which I have worked, my most fluent L2 students were voracious readers. This is not mere coincidence, as the wealth of research into reading shows (Krashen 1996, Oller & Amato 1983, Smith 1971 & 1973, Clay 1972, Steinberg 1993). Reading is clearly beneficial for L1 speakers of English and the benefits are similar for L2 students: an increase in reading fluency and in vocabulary.

If I reflect on my own L2 teaching and learning experience, in Paraguay I was much more fluent orally in my L2 than my class was, but I could not read and write in my L2 (Spanish) at the same advanced level as my class could in English. My students were reading and studying the book Little House on the Prairie, the original edition in English. At that time I could not have read a similar book in Spanish but I could certainly have discussed it in my L2. I have since begun to study Spanish literature at university level and I would expect my L1 literacy to transfer to the L2 academic environment.

L1 learners are usually orally fluent in their first language before they begin to learn to read. This is often not the case with L2 learners, particularly with L2 learners in non English-speaking countries. Rivers (1968:267) writes:

> The reading process is made more difficult for the reader of a new language when the reading material contains many items not yet encountered in their oral form. Familiarity with language items in their oral form facilitates early foreign-language reading which then becomes a rapid recognition process that leaves more mental energy available for the complex and demanding task of comprehension of sequential meaning.

Outside the L2 learner classroom, reading might be the only exposure a student gets to his or her L2. As has been already stated in other chapters, the L2 learners in this study had little exposure to English outside the classroom. If reading is a strategy used by an L2 student, it should be a predictor of greater success in language learning. This is because readers would be getting greater exposure to their L2 than non-readers. It is unfortunate that, despite research (Elley & Mungabhai 1983; Davis 1995) showing the benefits of reading to L2 students, extensive reading programmes have not been adopted as readily as
they might have been. Books are expensive and it is not always possible to fund book floods in the less affluent parts of the world.

2 Reading Theory
Contemporary theories of reading have a psycholinguistic or cognitive basis. In other words, once initial sound- graphic decoding skills are in place, we read for meaning. How well we succeed depends on a number of factors including reading experience, knowledge of ideas and culture in the text as well as life experience.

Communicative language teaching has taken two main directions: one non-analytic and experiential, based on the Canadian immersion experience; the other analytic or 'formal'. Stern (1992:13) states that the latter "is based largely on linguistic and sociolinguistic considerations. It reflects the European work on needs analysis, speech act theory, and discourse analysis, and more generally the growth of Sociolinguistics and related disciplines". Communicative language teaching methods were used in all the schools in this survey. Steinberg (1993:239) suggests that the merits of teaching methods depend on the goals, presumably whether oral proficiency is required or whether reading and writing are the primary goals. He states: "Communicative language teaching has avoided the narrowness and dogmatism of the method concept and covers a wider range of components. Many of its advocates are seeking a synthesis with aspects of earlier methodologies" (ibid.).

Teachers should not limit themselves to one method or approach to language teaching. In certain circumstances it may be important to focus on one thing such as reading or even acculturation. Savignon (1983:25) comments that "L2 learning, like L1 learning, begins with the needs and interests of the learner ... The basic unit of practice should always be a text or chunk of discourse. Production should begin with the conveyance of meaning". Reading as a process is a complex issue and it is sometimes difficult to define. Grabe (1991:378) notes: "a description of reading has to account for the notions that fluent reading is rapid, purposeful, interactive, comprehending, flexible, and gradually developing".

2.1 General Psycholinguistic Background to Reading Theory
Clay (1982:1) writes that reading theories compete for support rather than lead us to clear explanations and predictions. On the one hand the traditional, older view sees reading as an exact process
with an emphasis on letters and words, while on the other hand, a more recent set of theories sees reading as an inexact process, a search for meaning during which we sample only enough visual information to be satisfied that we have received the message of the text. ... One describes reading as a direct perception process and the other describes it as an hypothesis-and-confirmation process.

For some theorists reading is simply a matter of decoding the graphics into sound and extracting the meaning from the sound. Often very poor L1 readers will sound out a text aloud as they read, much to the annoyance of others. Some readers do read like this but not the good ones. Smith (1971) criticizes this meaning from sound theory. He argues that fluent readers do not convert written words into sounds before they can comprehend writing: "that in fact it is generally impossible for them to do so – fluent reading is accomplished too fast for the translation into sound to occur, and the prior comprehension of meaning is a prerequisite for sounding out many sentences" (ibid. : 44).

Research into the functioning of the brain using brain scan imaging has helped throw further light on the subject of reading theory. Steinberg (1993:183) mentions that, when the brain is scanned during reading, it "shows that the latter part of the reading process, where Wernicke's area is said to be activated, does not occur in many instances thereby indicating that the auditory aspect of the theory is in radical need of modification. In other words, one can directly recover the meaning of written words without having to access their sound".

However, reading is not just a visual process. Two kinds of information are involved. Firstly there is the visual kind. This refers to what is in front of the eye; in other words, the words on the page. Secondly there is the non-visual one. This is what is behind the eye: in the mind, in other words. This second process involves what we already know about reading, about language and about the world in general (Smith 1973:6). The more the reader knows 'behind the eyeball', the less visual information is required to identify a letter, a word, or a meaning from a text.

The fluent L1 reader is looking ahead in the text, to the next word group or even further. Goodman (1967:126) calls fluent reading a "psycholinguistic guessing game, which requires skill in selecting the fewest, most productive cues necessary to produce guesses which are right the first time". Oral language skill is important but it does not ensure reading success; what does, among other things, is the ability to anticipate. It is more difficult for L2 learners
working with foreign language texts to look ahead and guess, unless the material they are looking at is very familiar. Rivers (1968:273) writes: "It cannot be overemphasized that familiarity with the context and the semantic area which is basic to the reading material is essential in early practice if students are to develop habits of fluent direct reading".

Smith (1971) maintains a distinction needs to be made between learning to read and fluent reading. A new reader has to acquire many special skills that will later be of very little use – or automatic and internalised – when he or she is fluent. Smith (ibid. : 3) writes:

The mere fact that a child cannot read very fast puts a heavy burden on memory and attentional systems that are both inexperienced and overloaded with all kinds of instructions and rules. By the time the novice has built up enough speed to take some of the strain off his memory, many of the earlier rules have become unnecessary or overlearned and automatic, and the memory load is reduced in any case.

Smith (ibid. : 7) hypothesises that there are two ways of reading for comprehension:

Mediated comprehension requires the prior identification of words, while immediate comprehension can be accomplished by going directly from the visual features to the meaning. Once again, only the fluent reader can take the immediate shortcut; the beginner must do everything the hard way. The possible extent of immediate comprehension depends, as does immediate word recognition, upon a number of factors including the knowledge a reader has built up during his reading experience of the way words and letters (and therefore distinctive features) occur together in the language.

For example, an experienced reader of English knows that words beginning with the letter t have for their second letters h, r, w or a vowel. The letter q is always followed by the letter u. An L2 learner would have to learn much of this. The letters in Spanish words behave differently from those in English words. Other matters such as word order are also different. However, being able to read in the L1 will assist in learning to read in an L2 because learners have already learnt the more complex psycholinguistic strategies for processing knowledge. Steinberg (1993:255) writes:

Knowledge of the complexity of structure, morphology (word formation) and phonology (sound patterns) in one language cannot help but serve to facilitate acquisition of the other language, for the learner does not have to wonder about how to deal with language as he or she did in first language learning. The second language learner has already dealt with similar language problems in the first language, not only with regard to formal linguistic properties but also with respect to developing psycholinguistic strategies that are used in the process of producing and understanding sentences.
The reading skills learnt when learning to read in an L1 can be transferred to the learning of the L2. If there is a lot of similarity between the languages as with English and Spanish there is a greater advantage for speakers of these languages.

There are regularities in our spoken language that we are not aware of until they are drawn to our attention. Take grammar in an L1 as an example. Humans can and do store and use knowledge that is not always accessible to the consciousness. Smith (1971:9) writes of reading: "the actual marks on a printed page are relatively less important than the knowledge of language that a skilled reader has before he even opens the book".

2.2 Schema Theory

There are a number of important factors that assist fluent reading or rapid comprehension of a text. The role of background knowledge in comprehension is formalised as schema theory, which argues that the interpretation of a chunk of text is assisted by the reader's previously acquired knowledge. Carrell and Eisterhold (1983: 556-7) explain:

This previously acquired knowledge is called the reader's background knowledge, and previously acquired knowledge structures are called schemata (Bartlett 1932, Adams and Collins 1979, Rumelhart 1980). According to schema theory, comprehending a text is an interactive process between the reader's background knowledge and the text. Efficient comprehension requires the ability to relate the textual material to one's own knowledge. Comprehending words, sentences, and entire texts involves more than just relying on one's linguistic knowledge.

There are two means of processing a chunk of text, top-down and bottom-up processing. Bottom-up is text-based processing, top-down is knowledge-based processing. Savignon (1987:146-7) writes:

Thus bottom-up processing occurs when aspects of the input directly suggest or activate a lower-level schema, which in turn suggests or activates a higher-order schema. Bottom-up processing is therefore called data-driven since it is ultimately the input data that generates the suggestion of particular concepts (Rumelhart and Ortony 1977:128). On the other hand, top-down processing occurs as the reader makes general predictions based on higher-order, general schemata and then searches the incoming data for a fit to these partially satisfied, higher-order schemata ... Top-down processing is therefore called conceptually-driven since it is ultimately the general concepts that generate the search of the data (Rumelhart and Ortony 1977).
The most efficient processing of a chunk of text is done by a combination of top-down and bottom-up processing. Top-down processing relies on prediction so if the L2 learner has more life experience and background knowledge he or she will be able to read a text more efficiently. Also if a reader knows something about the topic he or she is reading it will assist in processing. Byrnes (1987:178) maintains:

Knowing what it is that we are about to read significantly limits the processing choices we need to make, thus increasing our efficiency and accuracy at the task before us (Carrell 1984b, 1984c and this volume). ... The greater the store of background knowledge readers can bring to the task, the less dependent they are on purely linguistic information. Conversely, the less knowledge the reader has in regard to the topic, the more the reader must rely on linguistic input for interpretation.

Bottom-up processing relies on decoding the linguistic units of a text and this is where linguistic knowledge becomes important. So L2 learners with a good knowledge of L2 language and some life experience should find reading in an L2 easier. Savignon (1990:147) notes that over-reliance on one form of processing can lead to reading difficulties at second language level.

There are various misconceptions about what reading is. I have often observed Chinese L2 learners of English looking up every word in a text they do not know and writing down the equivalent in Chinese above the English word. This method is not very efficient and relies on overuse of bottom-up processing. There is a strong resistance to predicting and/or inferring the meaning of the word in context. Anderson (1999:74) comments that many of his students also approach a chunk of text from a bottom up perspective. They feel they must understand and pronounce each word to comprehend. Thus, they spend hours looking up definitions in bilingual dictionaries and trying to "translate" the text, only to become frustrated by words that are misinterpreted by the dictionary or literal translations that have no meaning in English. As I introduce strategies to assist students in reading more effectively and utilize more top-down approaches to reading comprehension, I notice a sense of insecurity in the students. Their security blanket has been lost. They are uncertain about their reading and understanding of the text. They have lost the reassurance of the bilingual dictionary that gave them the "real" meaning and not a "guess" as these new strategies do. No matter how much I model or have the students rehearse in class, once they are on their own, they miss the training wheels and revert to more familiar and comfortable habits. They miss the confirmation and sense of correctness they felt as they translated every word and sentence.
Anderson eventually comes up with a solution that involves a combination of bottom-up and top-down processing. Anderson's comments are also perhaps more representative of Chinese/Japanese learners of English than Spanish or African. The Chinese/Japanese students I have taught find it difficult to read anything without a bilingual dictionary or a translator. Most of my African students did not own a bilingual dictionary, let alone have access to a translator. There were also few bilingual dictionaries in the South American schools. The South American students were more inclined to guess or infer the meaning of words they did not know from context. Because of the many cognates between Spanish and English this is often a successful strategy for South American students.

2.3 Bilingualism and the Transfer of Reading Skills

If the L2 is required for CALP, reading will obviously be much more important when learning the L2, particularly reading in relevant subject fields. The Paraguayans, South Africans and Batswana came to learn their L2s by very different approaches but they were at least all communicative approaches.

There is some debate on when the onset of bilingualism should take place, early or late. Baetens-Beardsmore (1986:166) points out that: "arguments in favour or against instruction through the medium of a second, weaker language are still in the debating stage, depending on the type of population being provided for". The Paraguayan and Southern African schools used very different approaches, the former aiming for early bilingualism and the latter for later bilingualism but they did have comparable proficiency levels among their senior students. The situation with South Africa is complex and requires some further explanation. The private education sector is large and growing and in many private schools (and some formerly 'White' state schools) there is a straight-for-English policy, even when English is an L2. In many largely Black schools, it is usual for L2 students to begin learning English in grade one as a subject then from grade five it becomes the medium of instruction. I encountered great variation within all the schools when it came to proficiency levels. This is relevant to reading because it is extremely important that an L2 learner of English is literate in his or her L1 before he or she begins to learn in their L2. South Africa is a complicated case because many African L2 learners are simply not literate in their L1s and this is thought to disadvantage them when it comes to learning an L2. Full bilingualism is thought to give students a cognitive advantage, though if a learner does not attain full bilingualism it could be disadvantageous to their learning potential.
Cummins (1979, 1984) proposed the threshold level hypothesis as one factor, which could account for the differences in attainment between pupils in different circumstances. Basically the hypothesis is that there is a minimum level of linguistic proficiency in the L1 which a child must attain in order to avoid cognitive deficits. If an L2 learner is not fully competent in his or her L1, it is highly likely that he or she will be equally incompetent in the L2. As a result the positive effects of bilingualism will not emerge. Such an L2 learner will then suffer academically in his or her schooling particularly in the areas which are highly dependent on literacy skills. L2 learners with a high threshold level of linguistic competence in the L1 are in a better position to attain a similarly high threshold level in their L2 which would allow them to cope better with the more academic aspects of a curriculum and not be at a disadvantage cognitively. In addition, Cummins's developmental interdependence hypothesis posits that if, the outside environment is capable of maintaining the L1, then intensive exposure to L2 in school leads to rapid bilingual development with no detrimental effects on the L1.

A study in Oller (1991) supports Cummin's threshold level hypothesis. It involved 71 children from bilingual Spanish-English backgrounds in the San Antonio, USA, area. The subjects were school-aged children who had begun school with Spanish as the stronger language. The students' proficiency in both English and Spanish was tested using a cloze procedure. It was the same cloze passage, the English being translated into Spanish to test for proficiency in that language. Oller's (1991:162) conclusions were that "it seems clear that both primary and non-primary language skills are important to performance on achievement tests. An implication of this finding is that Cummin's threshold hypothesis (esp. Cummins, 1984) is worth closer scrutiny than it has received so far".

A clear distinction needs to be made between language majority and language minority students. In Canada with L1 English-speaking students learning in French immersion classes you get what is called additive bilingualism. This is a successful educational model because immersion provides an additive bilingual environment in which students acquire French as L2 without any cost to their L1 language and culture. Genese (1998:243) writes: "Second language immersion programmes were first instituted in Canadian Schools in 1965 to provide English speaking majority children better chances of learning Canada's two official languages ... The innovation of immersion was the use of the target language to teach regular academic subjects during part of the school day". In an additive bilingual situation,
the addition of a second language and culture is unlikely to replace or displace the first language, which is also developed and promoted at school and elsewhere.

The Paraguayan students were in an additive bilingualism situation like the Canadian students and this helps explain why they were moderately successful at learning English. The Paraguayans were majority language students like the English in Ontario yet they were learning in a what is a minority language in Paraguay. The Spanish language and culture were not under threat in anyway. In contrast, minority language students such as Aboriginal Australians or Spanish speakers in the United States are disadvantaged by the fact that their language and culture are under threat outside the classroom. Learning a majority language might undermine their L1 language and culture. Cummins (1986b:20) in the interdependence hypothesis suggests that "to the extent that instruction through a minority language is effective in developing academic proficiency in the minority language, transfer of this proficiency to the majority language will occur given adequate exposure and motivation to learn the language". Cummin's theory suggests that majority language students are empowered or disabled by four major school characteristics.

[1] The extent to which minority language students' home language and culture are incorporated into the school curriculum.

[2] The extent to which minority communities are encouraged to participate in their children's education.

[3] The extent to which education promotes the inner desire for children to become active seekers of knowledge and not just passive receptacles.

[4] The extent to which the assessment of minority language students avoids locating problems in the student and seeks to find the root problem in the social and educational system or curriculum wherever possible (Baker 1996:345-47).

In all the countries of this study, the L2 learners were able to maintain their L1s. This is particularly true for students in Paraguay, Chile and Botswana. In South Africa the situation is a little more complicated. First, the L1 for non-English speakers may only be used for family and immediate community needs. Second, South Africa has many ethnic and linguistic minorities. Third, English is the prestige language in South Africa and tends to dominate the other official languages. Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, for reading and CALP, during the apartheid regime there was a systemic policy of not developing the indigenous languages for academic or business purposes. Literacy was not properly established in the
L1 and this tradition continues, undermining attempts to learn the L2 effectively and often creating semilinguals not particularly proficient in either the L1 or L2 and certainly not able to use either for cognitive academic tasks.

If I reflect on reading theory in the light of my teaching experience, I find many of the theories borne out. I once had a colleague in Darwin, Australia who had an East Timorese student to whom she was simply failing to teach English. The student was of Chinese extraction and spoke an East Timorese Chinese dialect as his L1. His L2 was Portuguese or the East Timorese dialect of that language. The student was a refugee and was not literate in either his L1 or L2. My colleague was beginning to doubt after a year's instruction that she would ever be able to assist her student in becoming fluent and literate in English. This case and Smith's hypothesis highlight how crucial it is, that students become literate in their L1 before they attempt to learn English as an L2. The reading process will be slower in an L2 situation as the L2 learner has less non-visual information.

2.4 Reading as Comprehensible Input

Krashen (1982, 1985, 1994) claims that we acquire language by understanding messages (the Input Hypothesis) in a low-anxiety environment (the Affective Filter Hypothesis), and that comprehensible input results in language acquisition, subconscious tacit competence. According to Krashen, conscious language learning is limited in function and it can only be used when stringent conditions are met; for instance, the language-user must know the rule and must be focused on form. L2 acquisition is seen as an unconscious process, when learners use language as a means of communication. If an L2 learner is learning English in an L1 English-speaking country, there are many opportunities in everyday life when the L2 learner is forced to read in English. For something as simple as grocery shopping, some reading is required. Packets in the supermarket need to be read, so their contents can be ascertained. Later instructions may need to be followed in order to prepare a meal. Oller & Amato (1983:39) claim that "[r]ead for information and entertainment, or film or television viewing are also natural uses of language".

In the 1970s there was a move away from the traditional, controlled language texts to natural language texts. The aim was to reflect natural language and to avoid the problems associated with controlled language texts. Clay (1972:154) writes: "Natural Language Texts try to retain all the qualities and cues of a child's natural language so that the language
processes he has operated for three or more years can guide not only his spoken language but also his reading". In a Natural Language Programme it is the understanding of the message that is given top priority. The Natural Language Programme is a reading programme that involves the use of the above mentioned natural language texts.

There is more than enough evidence to show that reading is evidently very important in L2 acquisition and it qualifies as comprehensible input if carefully chosen to be slightly advanced that the learners' actual linguistic level (input + 1). Reading can best be utilised in L2 learning through a planned reading programme such as the one below, designed by Krashen (1996:17):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: An EFL Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Orientation: Principles of language acquisition and literacy development, presented in the primary language.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Beginning level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comprehensible input-based methodology (Natural Approach, Total Physical Response)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sustained silent reading of simplified texts and very easy authentic texts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Intermediate level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Sheltered popular literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Free voluntary reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. as sustained silent reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. as individualized reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Academic language development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. narrow academic reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. sheltered language and (classical) literature.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the orientation level it is important L2 students are instructed in language acquisition theory (presumably at a basic level, in non-technical terms). The pedagogical approach needs to be justified. Orientation can even be done in the L1 of the students. While this may not be so important for younger L2 students it is often of vital importance with adult students. Chinese students in particular are often very questioning of the pedagogical approach taken by L1 English teachers because it is so radically different from what they are used to in China. Some explanation of language acquisition and of why the L1 English teacher is using a certain approach may influence some of the Chinese L2 learners of English to be more accepting of a different pedagogical approach.
At the beginning level L2 students can be expected to read for pleasure but very simple and/or natural texts should be used. Texts for L1 students would in many cases be too difficult. Students need to experience Natural Approach (Krashen 1983) activities such as games, tasks, hearing stories, jokes, exercises, magic tricks, etc. Clay (1972:20) notes: "The most valuable preschool preparation for school learning is to love books and to know that there is a world of interesting ideas in them. Parents who love to share books with children transmit their feelings, their understanding and their language patterns to their little listeners". So it is very important that learners are literate in their L1s and know what reading is and how pleasurable it can be, in order to facilitate L2 reading.

There is another complication with the transfer effect from L1 to L2 speakers of African or other languages that are non-cognate with English. Steinberg (1993:254) comments:

psycholinguists agree that no one language is easier to learn than any other language, nonetheless not every pair of languages can be expected to be acquired at the same rate. For example, after having learned English, learning French will not be as difficult as learning Japanese. There are differences between English and French syntax but these differences are small in comparison to the monumental differences between the syntax of English and Japanese. Furthermore, there are significant similarities between English and French in terms of vocabulary ... we may conclude that the greater the similarity between two languages in terms of their syntax, vocabulary and sound system, the more rapid the rate of acquisition in the two languages.

This would mean the Spanish L1 students would have a slight advantage over African students in learning to read English as an L2 though this has not yet been proved by research and is still the subject of some debate. The fact that many South African L2 learners of English (particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds) not only speak non-cognate languages as L1s but are not literate in their African L1s puts them at a distinct disadvantage in comparison to the L2 learners from the other countries in this study. What also disadvantages them is the fact that many have illiterate or functionally illiterate parents who do not read to their children or have books in the home. Research done in Fiji by Elley and Mangubhai (1983) helped show this.

At the intermediate level, Krashen (1996) recommends the overlapping components of sheltered popular literature and free voluntary reading, which includes sustained silent reading and individualised reading programmes. The goal at this level is to make students independent so they can begin to learn on their own. Sheltered popular literature classes are
another way L2 learners can use reading as a strategy to improve their L2: "The goal of such a class or module is to introduce the student to a wide range of texts in the second languages, in order to help the student establish a reading habit" (ibid. : 14).

The kind of literature studied can be as diverse as comics, magazines, newspapers and novels. In Europe it is now a major industry to simplify classic English literature for the L2 market. Krashen's (ibid. : 15) suggestion is "that in sheltered popular literature classes all students read the same texts, or groups of students read the same text (and discuss them in "literature circles") and the texts are discussed for their "message" as well as for insight they give into the characteristics and values of the culture that produced them". Sheltered literature classes are subject classes not language classes. It is important that the L1 or more advanced students are excluded from them, otherwise the input level can be too high: that is the vocabulary of the more advanced or L1 students would be too difficult for most of the L2 learners. In sustained silent reading (SSR), L2 learners, according to Krashen (ibid. : 15).

simply read for pleasure for a short time each day, from five to fifteen minutes. There is no accountability, no book reports, no requirements that readers finish the book they start. According to the research, students who do SSR, gain at least as much on standardized tests as those who participate in traditional programmes, and usually do much better if the programme lasts long enough.

SSR is better for intermediate level L2 learners but it can begin earlier. Individualised reading simply refers to a situation in which the L2 students are encouraged by the teacher to read in the areas that interest them. Clay (1972:21) argues: "It is folly to kill interest with over instruction". Teachers may be tempted to make every bit of reading count as a comprehension test or motivation for writing but that temptation needs to be resisted. Anderson (1999:43) writes: "It is my belief that good readers do more extensive reading than intensive reading. But, what makes the reader is that he/she has developed the strategies and skills through intensive reading that are then transferred to extensive reading contexts".

2.5 Reading, Vocabulary Development and CALP
At the advanced or academic level, the need is to acquire academic language. Free voluntary reading will make this task easier but it is not enough on its own. L2 students need to start reading in their subject areas. Medical students would read the Lancet and medical journals,
students of politics, newspapers, news magazines, political journals etc. So the L2 student can quickly learn the vocabulary for the area in which he or she is interested.

It is estimated that there are approximately 2000 words that account for 80% of all words found in an average text (Coady et al. 1993). (This comment refers to the English language.) It would seem sensible that in the early stages of L2 instruction a considerable amount of time should be spent learning this basic vocabulary before reading becomes a possible or valuable exercise in the L2 classroom. Often non-fluent L2 students will say that they know the 'big words' (by which they probably mean content words such as nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs) in the sentence, but do not know the 'little words' (by which they probably mean pronouns, prepositions, articles and conjunctions) In the early stages of L2 learning I often found that it was easier to learn the nouns (which name concrete things) rather than adjectives, prepositions, or various. However verbs and their conjugations remain vitally important if an L2 learner and their comprehension is vital if an L2 learner is to read fluently.

Once students get to an intermediate level and are taking a sheltered popular literature course, a case can be made for teaching them some of the more difficult relevant vocabulary before they read the text concerned. George (1983:22) maintains:

It is a well researched and effective method of teaching reading for comprehension to teach the relevant meanings of some key words in the passage for reading before the reading exercise starts... the point of the method is that words learned consciously in advance facilitate reading comprehension. Conscious learning feeds firstly into comprehension not speech.

Not everyone agrees with this approach. Clay (1972:159) writes: "A child does not need to recognize a word in isolation before he can read it in text. Because he reads the word using meaning and context on several occasions, he can come gradually to attribute a particular identity to that word standing alone". Both George and Clay have a point but I do not agree with Clay. She was writing about child L1 learners and believe it is different for literate teenage or adult L2 learners. For Free Voluntary Reading Clay's (1972) comments perhaps most relevant for L1 learners. No doubt George's (1983) advice is taken into consideration when books that are largely for the L2 reader contain glossaries. It is now possible to buy simplified or abbreviated texts of most of the classics of English literature with glossaries containing the more difficult words that L2 learners are unlikely to know. This type of
literature, though common in wealthy Europe, was uncommon in all the countries in which this study was undertaken.

2.6 Teaching Reading

We are concerned in this chapter mainly with extensive reading, but often good reading practice starts in the classroom, particularly for disadvantaged L1 and L2 learners. Teachers have to guide poor readers on what and how to read so that they do not become frustrated and give up this potentially important source of contact with the target language and culture both inside and outside the classroom.

Another matter to consider here is the comprehensibility of texts available to the L2 readers. At what level should L2 readers be attempting to read? Some consideration needs to be given to the suitability of the material in the text. If the subject is something with which the L2 readers are familiar it will greatly assist comprehension. But this is not the only factor, the level of the language is also important as Anderson (1999:117) shows:

The basal reading level is the independent reading level. The reader should be able to read the material without help from the teacher and should show high interest in it. The reader would achieve 90% comprehension when reading basal level material. It is this level of reading material that I suggest teachers use when beginning work on reading rate development. You do not want the materials to be challenging when trying to improve rate. Also, this is the level of material you might consider using when introducing new reading skills or strategies. Keep in mind that you want the learners to have a successful experience practising new reading skills so the text should be rather easy at this initial stage. I would also suggest that this be the level of reading difficulty for extensive reading materials.

The literature available to most L2 students in this study was the same as that available to L1 students. In fact literature of any description was scarce, particularly in Africa. All the African libraries had few books and theft of books was a problem. The books had been there but were stolen as quickly as the schools were able to acquire them. There was obviously a huge untapped demand for reading material that was not being met. This was particularly the case in Botswana as reading was simply not considered important by whoever was responsible for supplying funds for the purchase of reading books.

Anderson (1999:117) also describes another reading level that he calls the 'instructional level'. This would be the level of a text used in the classroom by a teacher for a
comprehension exercise, for example, and relates to Krashen's theory of comprehensible input. The text would be at the more challenging 75% comprehensibility level to allow for more challenging reading. However, if the comprehensibility level drops to 50% you reach what Anderson (ibid.) would describe as frustration: "The frustration level is one that I would think we want to avoid. Betts indicates that reading material at this level is too difficult and frustrates the reader. Comprehension at 50% would indicate frustration level materials".

Betts (1957) has a simple rule for whether a text is too hard for an L2 learner. It is suggested that L2 learners choose the books off the shelf in the library that they want to read, open them at random, then begin to read one page. Each time they come to a word they do not know, they should raise a finger. If they have used up all their fingers before reaching the end of the page, the book is perhaps too difficult for them. A cloze test can also be used to test the readability of any test. Oller (1979: 354) mentions that the first application of cloze procedure was for the measurement of readability levels of texts.

There is a point at which, reading as a strategy touches on acculturation, in that it can assist L2 students to reach that awareness of another reality. Kramsch (1993:131) insists that "foreign language learners have to be exposed to different types of texts, from the most conventional to the most particular, but if they are eventually to find their own voice in the foreign language and culture, literary texts (high literature and/or popular culture) can offer them models of particularity and opportunities for the dialogic negotiation of meaning". Kramsch's arguments concern literary texts and are perhaps more relevant for fluent intermediate or advanced students.

Some L2 learners go through texts and look for words they do not know before even attempting to read. Bilingual dictionary use needs to be discouraged. If any kind of dictionary is being used excessively it could be an indication that the reading passage is too hard for the students. If a dictionary does need to be used, it is best to use a monolingual English dictionary. Dictionary use needs to be appropriate to the context and to the reading purpose; that is, its use needs to be strategic. A reader uses a deliberate strategy to build vocabulary, find meaning, and so on. A reader can decide not to use a dictionary if he or she has limited time and comprehends the gist of the text. Students also need to be encouraged to skip words they do not know, inferring the meanings of words by using the context so
they can read more quickly. In L2 situations, Rivers (1968:273) writes: "Word for word translations must be avoided or students will think this is what reading is about" Students should be encouraged to obtain global understanding and fluent reading styles rather than absolute certainty about every word.

Anderson (1994) has developed a pedagogical framework for the second language reading class that is based on some of the previously discussed theory. Theory and practice are integrated to form the six principles of ACTIVE reading. Anderson (1994:178)

A: Activate prior knowledge
C: Cultivate vocabulary
T: Teach for comprehension
I: Increase
V: Verify reading strategies
E: Evaluate progress

Anderson proceeds from the psycholinguistic viewpoint that the activation of prior knowledge enhances reading skills and comprehension. Pre-reading activities are seen as valuable in eliciting the L2 reader's useful prior knowledge. Pre-reading enhances top-down processing using a number of methods such as: questioning and discussion, giving L2 students something to read with which they are familiar and which is relevant to the topic or showing a picture or a summary sentence in the L1 to represent the main point of the passage.

Vocabulary is seen as important and George (1983) is perhaps more on the right track here than Krashen. There is certainly a case for a teacher pre-teaching difficult vocabulary in a passage for intensive reading or having glossaries in texts that are used by L2 readers for extensive reading. Anderson sees it as valuable for L2 teachers to teach guessing as a strategy and to have class activities that encourage this. Another valuable strategy would be word structure analysis skills that involve the study of prefixes, suffixes, roots and how new vocabulary can be made from these, though this strategy would be more useful for languages cognate with English.
Unfortunately reading in the L2 classroom is usually seen as intensive reading only, in the form of comprehension tests. Teaching readers how to comprehend and monitoring their progress is also important. Teaching L2 readers to summarise will assist here and this is now a common exercise in many communicative classrooms. Comprehension is a vital activity for intensive reading and texts chosen for this level should be challenging. They could be placed in what is known as the instructional level, the 75% comprehensibility level. They can be read by the L2 reader but with the guidance of the teacher.

Anderson suggests there is no single set of processing strategies that significantly contribute to an L2 learner's success. Anderson (1991:468-469) writes: "this seems to indicate that strategic reading is not only a matter of knowing what strategy to use, but also the reader must know how to use a strategy successfully and orchestrate its use with other strategies. It is not sufficient to know about strategies: a reader must also be able to apply them strategically". Finally Anderson recommends effective evaluation (L2 learner performance) of the L2 learners by the teacher and the recording of their progress over time. Anderson's ACTIVE framework provides a valuable framework for understanding L2 reading that can be linked very clearly to the work of earlier theorists.

2.7 Conclusion
It should be clear from the above survey of the literature in reading theory that reading could be an important communicative strategy, assist in the acculturation process and facilitate language acquisition. The empirical studies discussed below bear this out. In the light of both the theory and practice discussed, however, Huang and Van Naerssen's survey questions proved inadequate in evaluating reading as an important factor in language acquisition when access to reading material was possibly easier than access to oral interaction with L1 speakers of English. Reading as a strategy was not of prime importance in the Huang and Van Naerssen study which was largely concerned with contrasting communicative with mnemonic strategies.

3 Empirical Research

3.1 Mangubhai and Elley Study (1982)
The largest, and perhaps one of the finest, research projects specifically on the role of reading in the teaching of English as a Second Language is a Fijian study by Mangubhai and
Elley (1982). One reason for their study was that the majority of research on reading has emanated from L1 situations. They were not comfortable with some of the conclusions drawn from this L1 research and felt there was a need for research in a specifically L2 environment. There were important questions to answer, things such as why it is that L2 teaching is so often ineffective. Fiji is a unique environment, which has two large very different ethnic groups with their own L1s, yet English which is an L2 for the vast majority of the population is the language of administration, education and government. The reasons for this are historical as Fiji was formerly a British Colony, though its education system has strong links with New Zealand and Fijian secondary students sit New Zealand external examinations. English is also the language that the indigenous Fijians, Indians and other minorities use to communicate with one another. The main concern for Mungubhai and Elley is the role of reading in ESL. Reading, they state, is often encouraged in L1 environments but its importance and role is played down in an L2 environment. The prevalent methodology in Fiji at the time of the study was largely audio-lingual. It is typical of audio-lingualism to play down the role of reading in the initial stages of language learning. Reading is considered a consolidator in language learning. New words should be learnt orally before they are presented to L2 students in written form. Rivers (1968:41) writes on the audio-lingual method: "The early introduction of the graphic form of the language has been regarded as a potential threat to mastery of the sound system and to the development of a near-native accent ... A time lag has been advocated between the introduction of new material orally and its presentation in graphic form".

The Mungubhai and Elley (1982:153) research project involved assessing the impact of a "flood" of interesting

First, the English reading skills of class 4 and 5 pupils (ages 9 to 11 years) in twelve rural schools were assessed with standardized reading comprehension tests, and schools divided into three groups which were approximately equivalent in terms of reading ability, racial composition, teacher qualifications and size of classes. The three groups each comprised eight classes – Class 4 and 5 from four schools, and all spent the same amount of time on English.

The first group used the New Zealand 'shared book experience'. Each teacher had 250 interesting story books, with a range of difficulty levels. This was largely a teacher-controlled intensive reading scheme. The second group did the 'Sustained Silent Reading Method'. Each class was given 250 books. The students were asked to read them everyday
minutes. The third or control group was given no extra books but continued to follow the SPC/Tate Oral English programme. The following tables show the test results for the two different classes over one school year.

**Table 1. Post-Test Raw Scores for Class 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Shared book</th>
<th>Silent Reading</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Mean S.D.</td>
<td>N Mean S.D.</td>
<td>N Mean S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comp.</td>
<td>71 19.82 6.28</td>
<td>84 20.39 5.40</td>
<td>65 17.17 5.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Structures</td>
<td>71 14.92 6.20</td>
<td>84 14.73 5.33</td>
<td>65 12.05 3.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word Recognition</td>
<td>33 36.45 12.58</td>
<td>42 34.17 13.60</td>
<td>29 31.55 14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Sentences</td>
<td>32 36.45 12.09</td>
<td>37 10.03 5.52</td>
<td>32 9.78 4.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The book supply groups performed significantly better on the comprehension and word structure tests. One-way analyses of variance performed on all post-tests showed significant differences in Reading Comprehension and English Structures (F = 5.98, p < .01) and (F = 6.11, p < .01). Follow-up t-tests showed that the Shared Books and Silent Reading groups both produced significantly better results on both tests (p < .001). The differences between the two Book Flood Groups were not significant. (ibid.: 155).

**Table 2. Post-Test Raw Scores for Class 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Shared Book</th>
<th>Silent Reading</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N Mean S.D.</td>
<td>N Mean S.D.</td>
<td>N Mean S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Comp.</td>
<td>89 17.29 6.39</td>
<td>86 15.50 6.09</td>
<td>87 13.47 5.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Comp.</td>
<td>89 16.40 4.90</td>
<td>85 14.88 5.95</td>
<td>87 12.15 4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Structures</td>
<td>89 6.62 4.02</td>
<td>85 6.66 4.22</td>
<td>87 6.02 4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Composition</td>
<td>89 1.97 1.98</td>
<td>85 1.98 1.92</td>
<td>87 1.71 1.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Book Flood Groups made significantly greater progress over the Control Group. There were significant differences in reading comprehension and listening comprehension (F = 11.85, p < .01 and F = 17.70, p < .01) respectively. (ibid.: 156).

The Mangubhai and Elley study on the role of reading in an ESL environment was a definitive study. It was a comprehensive, scientific and efficient project that clearly showed the benefits of reading, in particular for the comprehension levels of L2 students. The real significance is in its practical implications, as indicated below:

The provision of a rich supply of high-interest story books is a much more feasible policy for improving English learning than any pious pronouncements about the urgent need to raise teacher quality, or improve teachers' English standards, ... The second ingredient is some encouragement to read stories, at regular intervals. While some follow-up activities are desirable, the writers now feel that regular written comprehension exercises after each reading session only serve to reduce the children's incipient love of literature. Without this positive attitude towards books, any improvements produced are likely to be temporary (ibid.: 159).
This last statement by Mangubhai and Elley about accountability and the role of reading in L2 environments confirms Krashen's (1996) views on the topic, already stated in the theory section.

3.2 Other Studies

Colin Davis (1995) has been involved in developing extensive reading programmes in the UK, Singapore and the North West Province in Cameroon. He was mainly responsible for adapting Elley and Mangubhai's 'Book Flood' approach to the Singapore school system. Davis (ibid. : 331) explains:

The Project to Assist Selected Schools in English Skills, which involved forty of the weakest secondary schools in the Singapore School system, ran for five years, from 1985 to 1990. English, it should be noted, is the medium of instruction in Singaporean Secondary Schools. In that time, it succeeded in raising the schools' English Language pass rate at O-level above the national average. Extensive reading was a principal performance indicator of this project, and so successful was it that many schools outside the project adopted the programme, with Ministry assistance.

The programme was very similar to the Fijian one and involved schools purchasing large numbers of readers, both fiction and non-fiction, which were colour-coded on an 8-point scale of difficulty. Each school was then encouraged to introduce uninterrupted sustained silent reading (USSR) as well as a weekly Extensive Reading Period (ERP). Students were pre-tested to assess their reading levels and reading diaries were kept by the students. Teachers were there to give advice and support in each student's reading. Unobtrusive ways were used to determine that the students really were reading the books that they said they were. Many different strategies were used to encourage and support the students in their reading. The fact that this programme so improved reading levels in the 40 weakest Singaporean schools in which it was trialed, was considered proof enough for the programme to be extended to all schools in Singapore. It is important to note how Davis was strongly influenced by the definitive Fijian study, although he notes that, despite the evidence of the importance of ERP and SSR in an L2 learning environment, these programmes have still not been adopted as readily as they might have been.
An interesting Israeli study (Olshtain, Shohamy, Kemp, & Chatov 1990) supports the theory that literacy in the L1 is often crucial to success in learning the L2. This study involved L1 Hebrew students learning English as an L2. The subjects were from a variety of backgrounds but the main comparisons (Israelis of European origin compared with Israelis of North African origin) were between L2 learners from advantaged and disadvantaged backgrounds. The main finding of Olshtain et al. (ibid.: 26) was that, "academic proficiency in one's mother tongue seems to play a very important role in predicting students' success in FLL within a school situation". A number of tests were given to the students in the study (among them a cloze test) in order to determine the students' proficiency levels in their L1s and L2s. Knowledge about the L1 was found to be the most powerful predictor of success in learning the L2. Olshtain et al (ibid.: 38) write:

The strongest predictor, however, across different student populations, is an external measure of one's academic language ability. Within this factor of an academic L1 proficiency, we found that awareness of language usage and register and ability to correct errors in Hebrew, emerged as one of the subtests that made the greatest contribution and differentiated best between disadvantaged and regular students. The same subtest predicted success in EFL.

This study in effect shows how important it is in late bilingualism, in what can be classified as a formal rather than a natural situation, that L2 learners have high levels of academic literacy in their L1 though this does not necessarily hold true for early bilingualism, which often takes place with a completely different type of student in a different social setting.

Interestingly enough Australian Aboriginal students in the Northern Territory, who do not follow the paradigm of first establishing L1 literacy, demonstrate large-scale failure to learn to read and write in English, though the majority learn to speak it because of sophisticated oral communicative courses or exposure to L1 speakers. In the few Aboriginal communities that have bilingual programmes in which students are taught to be literate in their L1s, schools seem to have greater success in making students literate in their L2s (Keefe 1992). This was also my own experience when I taught in an Aboriginal school in Australia in 1998.
4 This Study

4.1 Background

It is thought to be the case that it is much easier to learn an L2 if you are already literate in your L1. Cummins (1980) found that learning in an L2 had little negative effect on upper and middle class children, which is why the Canadian immersion experience has been so successful. Baetens-Beardsmore (1986:172) defines a submersion, as opposed to an immersion, programme as follows:

The home-school language switch leading to a submersion programme is found when the recipients represent a linguistic minority with a low status mother tongue, where motivation is low since there is no element of choice involved, where the second language may represent a threat to the first and where the parents, often of low socioeconomic status, are not involved in their children's bilingual development.

L2 learners do not seem to learn successfully in these situations. Cummins (1981) notes that with language minority students, sociocultural determinants are more responsible for the L2 learners' failure than linguistic factors. However, for children from minority or lower socioeconomic backgrounds, learning in an L2, often led to poor academic achievement and an inadequate command of both the L1 and L2. Cummins' findings only serve to stress how important it is that indigenous languages in South Africa are nurtured and that every African student becomes proficient in his or her African L1 before he or she begins to learn in English as an L2.

South African students of African origin are often instructed first of all in their L1, making the switch to English as a medium of instruction after a few years at primary school, usually in grade five. A significant question here is how long it takes to establish L1 literacy in a school setting especially where the majority of learners have no literacy exposure at home. Many South African students are simply not literate in their L1s, so scaffolding of their L2 on their mother tongue does not take place. A student who has not attained literacy in his or her L1 is forever at a disadvantage to another student who has attained such literacy. There are many reasons for this, both historical and social, but one relevant for this study is South Africa's multilingual and multi-ethnic nature. In large urban centres especially, there are learners from diverse ethnic backgrounds and not everyone is instructed in his or her L1. Socioeconomic status is also a major factor: the vast majority of South Africa's L2 learners
of English from an African ethnic background are from the lower or working classes. As a result they have limited access at home to reading material in English.

In Botswana the switch to English as a medium of instruction takes place later, in the first year of Junior High School. This is the major difference between the Batswana and the South Africans. In the past, only a small percentage of Batswana students would go on to study in English at a secondary school. Recently, however, the numbers of students entering the junior secondary schools have increased. Junior secondary education has also recently been funded by the state, making it more affordable and available for the general population. Less academically able students are now getting a secondary education. There is a transition then from an elitist to a universal secondary education. In Batswana primary schools, students are taught in Setswana, which is the L1 of the majority of learners. English is studied solely as a subject, so the vast majority of Batswana are literate in their L1. It should be noted that there are significant minorities of other linguistic groups in Botswana whose languages are not studied in schools. There were for example five L1 Kalanga-speaking students in this study.

The Paraguayan students in this study spent their eight primary school years in what was effectively an English immersion environment. In the mornings the Paraguayan students were taught a British primary school programme in English by British teachers. In the afternoons they were taught a Paraguayan programme in Spanish by Paraguayan teachers. This was to fulfill Paraguayan legal requirements. Children were largely sent to this school because instruction was in English. The Paraguayan students began school at five years of age. The emphasis at first was on the learning of oral English, as when the children first attended school they were not literate in their L1 or L2. The school's methodology was modelled on successful Canadian total immersion programmes where L1 English-speaking primary children were put into French-speaking classrooms. Stern (1992:12-13) states:

In the immersion class the emphasis is not on language per se. Rather the emphasis is on substantive, non-language content, and on experiencing the language in actual use. There is no sequencing according to grammatical or speech act categories. In this approach, language is almost 'de schooled', as if to say 'Take care of the content and let language take care of itself'... the underlying rationale is to place the language learner in a situation in which the target language is used for 'real' communication, rather than for rehearsal, play, pretence, or simulation.
The primary years of the Paraguayans then were in an immersion environment. At the secondary level this changed and the students had two hours and fifteen minutes of English as a subject per day. Religion as a subject was also taught in English. All other secondary subjects were taught in Spanish.

In effect, English was used as a medium of instruction for most of the students in this study, though some students had been exposed to English for a much longer period of time than others. Most students thus needed to develop Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency (CALP), the exception being the nine Chilean students for whom classroom instruction was in Spanish and English was studied only as a subject.

The Paraguayan students were the only students tested in this study I also taught myself. Colegio San Andres had a Sustained Silent Reading Programme and twenty minutes a day in all secondary classes was spent on SSR. There was also a Krashen-style (1996) sheltered literature programme. Each level studied a particular text from English literature. The second level class did *Little House on the Prairie* by Laura Ingles Wilder. Sustained Silent Reading was not done in any of the other schools.

I introduced SSR to my Batswana classes. The Head of Department was very critical of this as she thought the students would only use this time for sleeping and that they should be doing something useful from the text book. In effect we only ever did silent reading when we had a double period and therefore enough time. The Batswana school also had a library with very few books. All the African schools, except St. Gregory's, had very few books in their libraries mainly owing to lack of funds and constant pilfering. There was clearly a great demand for reading material in English that was not being met. The Paraguayans had a well-stocked library but many of the books were old and perhaps inappropriate. The most popular books that were read by students during SSR were not available in the school library, and had to be bought at great expense elsewhere; for example, Mills and Boon Romances.

4.2 Statistical Analysis of Responses

The questions that were concerned with reading were in Part Two of the survey. The questions were taken directly from the South China survey, nine in total and in retrospect
that was probably too few. They were questions 1, 3, 8, 13, 18, reverse 20, 23, 24, 25. The questions were scored in the same way as the communicative questions: the lower the value, the better the score.

The options were:


4.3 Relevant 'READING' questions and frequencies.

Q2:1 asked: 'How often do you read newspapers, magazines, books, brochures or pamphlets in school?'. Only 38.6% of the respondents claimed that such reading material was used frequently in class although only .8% said that it was never used. Such a statistic is strange in a school setting as it implies a reliance on textbooks or literary texts for reading material to the exclusion of contemporary texts that would be of interest to learners and would give them some idea of contemporary culture. Libraries in all the schools in the survey were either not well resourced or were inappropriately resourced. No school contained a daily newspaper in English available for students to read, nor did they have current magazines and periodicals. This question has a counterpart in 2:8 which asked: 'How often do you read newspapers, magazines, books, comics or pamphlets in English outside of school?' Here the response was that 45.5% read such material often. Obviously the L2 learners had the desire and motivation to read such material but it was left to their own initiative to find such reading material. Perhaps the schools were failing to meet these needs. Six of the seven fluent (above 40/50 in cloze) Paraguayan students answered 'often' to question 8 as did many of the Paraguayans who scored in the high thirties. This was not the case with the Africans. The Paraguayans were all from extremely wealthy backgrounds and the students' parents were able to buy expensive imported magazines in English. Segundo curso had to do 20 minutes of sustained silent reading at the beginning of every lesson. I allowed the students to read anything in English. Some read paperback novels but many brought new glossy magazines to class. The Paraguayans also had the best-resourced library of all the schools in the survey. This raises the question of the resourcing of schools and the background of the students. The Paraguayans, owing to their wealth, simply had better access to reading materials and this is perhaps reflected in the fact that the majority of fluent students were Paraguayan.
Q2:3 asked: 'How often do you read aloud, so you can improve your pronunciation?' This was not a good reading question; a psycholinguist would not have asked this question as it focuses on the connection between the sound and the graphic representation. Smith (1971) was critical of this 'meaning from sound' theory of reading and it has been noted that it is often not fluent readers that make use of this strategy. Only 26.5% claimed to read aloud 'often'. The problem here is these students would most likely not be the fluent ones so it skews the survey. It also brings up the issue of Chinese educational practice again. This reading aloud strategy is something very Chinese and it is a strategy likely to be employed by good Chinese L2 learners of English. The fluent students had a range of responses to this question which supports this argument.

Q2:13 asked: 'Do you memorise stories or other reading materials from your textbook or English bible?' This question was included because it was in the original survey. This is also an unsatisfactory question as it is not one that would be asked by someone interested in reading as a communicative practice. It was included because it was in the original survey. This is because the question relates to the graphic presentation of words and because memorisation is not a reading purpose. Memorisation is a strategy favoured by Chinese L2 learners of English. The Huang and Van Naerssen (1987) survey had a section where they tested memorization strategies specifically. This type of strategy usage was found to not correlate with proficiency but it seems as if the Chinese bias in favour of this strategy has found its way into other sections of the survey. A proficient Chinese, may use this strategy but this is not necessarily the case with other cultural groups where memorisation is not seen as being so important. For younger children this strategy could even prevent or replace the proper development of reading. In junior classes where parents read books to young children, the child can memorise the text and then recite the information later in class, leading the teacher to believe the child can read. This is a strategy I have often observed in an L2 situation in the Aboriginal-Australian classroom.

Q2:18 'How often do you think in English, while working or studying in English?' is only incidentally related to reading as it could relate to any situation while studying in English: 57.6% answered 'often'. This is a marker of a fluent L2 learner but the fluent students had a variety of responses and many non-fluent students also answered 'often'. A related question Q2:20 asked: 'How often do you think of what you want to say first in your home language and then translate it into English?' This question was scored in reverse as the more
fluent L2 learners would be expected not to do this. Only 15.2% of students answered 'never'. Only one of the fluent Paraguayan students answered 'never' so the other nineteen L2 learners who answered 'never' were all African with a variety of proficiencies. The other fluent Paraguayan students did at least answer 'rarely'.

Q2.23 asked 'Do you look up new words you have heard in the dictionary?'. Looking up words one hears in the dictionary is only incidentally related to reading as one reads the dictionary to look up the meaning of the word. In the type of extensive reading advocated in the theory and practice section of this chapter, fluent reading encourages students to make inferences about words they do not know and read selectively rather than continually interrupting reading with references to the dictionary. A fairly high percentage (42.2%) of the students said they 'often' look up words they hear, only 7% said they 'never' do so. This question once again reflects the Chinese educational/cultural bias of the original survey. A so-called good Chinese L2 learner of English would be expected to use the dictionary a lot. Chinese culture has tremendous respect for anything written down and it is extremely difficult to wean Chinese students from the dictionary, even when they no longer need it. Chinese students do not like to guess; they like to be 100% sure they have the right answer so they use a dictionary, even though this is not considered to be good education practice in regards to fluent reading. Paraguayan students were not addicted to the dictionary to the same extent as the Chinese and a less fluent student would usually ask a more fluent student (or the teacher) orally about the meaning of a word if there was something he wanted to know. While this strategy was often used by the Africans, Chinese students rarely did so. As I have already stated, dictionary use should be a planned strategy not the only resort on every occasion. The use can be both a good and a bad thing. The use of a monolingual English dictionary is perhaps more beneficial than the use of a bilingual dictionary. The question was included largely because dictionary use by the L2 learners in the survey would have largely have been of monolingual English dictionaries. Very few of the L1 learners in the survey had access to bilingual dictionaries. This would not have been the case with Chinese learners of English.

For Q2.24 'Do you write down new words you have learnt in a vocabulary book?', a 19.7% said that they did this 'often' and none were fluent Paraguayan students. Though this is an activity Chinese students might be expected to do independently, with the students in the survey it would have been more of a teacher-directed activity. Writing words that one hears
into a vocabulary book is not related to reading skill, though this is another strategy Chinese L2 learners love to use because it is related to their reverence for the written word. It is a strategy a good Chinese learner might use even if it did not correlate with L2 proficiency.

Q2:25 asked 'How often do you use any library, either at school or in the town, to either borrow or read books in English?' is vital as regards extensive, communicative reading. It is perhaps, a poor substitute for a reading diary, as what constitutes frequent use of the library is a relative concept. The other problem is that not all libraries are equal. The most user-friendly library was that at St Gregory's in South Africa. This library was used frequently by students and had a good supply of useful books. The other African libraries were noted for their bareness and small size. It was not always a simple matter to use them. The library at Colegio San Andres had many books but many of them were old and inappropriate. If the library is an attractive place with books that students want to read it is obviously going to attract more use.

There are also cultural and social considerations. Paraguayans were from wealthy backgrounds and lived in large houses. The Paraguayans read outside the classroom but in their homes, not the school library, which was not used a lot. The Paraguayans were more inclined to socialise and interact with others at school (library usage would have been more of an introverted activity), rather than lock themselves away in the library, as would be expected of good Chinese L2 learners. Once again the Chinese cultural bias shows up in the survey questions. The majority of Africans did not come from wealthy backgrounds, so if they wanted to do school work and read in peace, the library would often be the only place available to them.

In the survey only 41.7% answered 'often' to the library question. Though more than a quarter of all students said they used libraries 'rarely' or 'never'. The fluent Paraguayans gave a variety of responses to this question. In segundo curso, the most fluent student answered 'often' but the second most fluent answered 'never', This was the only 'never' for the fluent group, though as already stated, library usage would be more important for African students.
4.4 Table 1: Comparisons of 'READING' Means for fluent and not fluent students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>nos of cases</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>read not fluent</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>18.1780</td>
<td>4.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.5385</td>
<td>4.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean difference = 1.6395
Levene's test for Equality of Variances: F = .249 P = .619

There is no statistical significance in the results but there is a difference in the means between the fluent and non fluent students. The fluent student mean was 16.53 while the non fluent mean was 18.17. The fluent students clearly used more 'reading' strategies than the non-fluent.

Initially when the results were being analysed for Part Two of the survey the 'oral communicative' and 'reading' questions were combined and called 'Value'. This was a mistake as I did not want to analyse these questions together, but it later gained significance because 'Value' approximated more closely with what Huang and Van Naerrsen were originally trying to test as 'communicative strategies'. I was perhaps unwise to try and separate the 'reading' from the 'communicative' questions for analysis before I had a full understanding of reading theory, though the greatest omission was not having enough questions specifically relevant to reading. The level of proficiency at this level was taken as 30/50 on the cloze test. The results appear in the tables below.

4.5 Table 2: Comparisons of 'VALUE' Means for fluent and not fluent students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>variable</th>
<th>nos of cases</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>not fluent</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50.1486</td>
<td>9.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fluent</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49.6140</td>
<td>9.271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean difference = .5346 Levene's test for equality of Variances: F = .026 P = .873
Table 3: Comparisons of 'VALUE' Means for male and female students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>nos of cases</th>
<th>mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51.3214</td>
<td>9.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48.8667</td>
<td>8.630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.996</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean difference = 2.4548 Levene's test for Equality of Variances: F=.521 P=.472

These results were not statistically significant but the interesting thing about them was that there was a difference in the 'Value' for fluent and not fluent students. The fluent students gained a lower and therefore better score for 'Value'. When the sex of the L2 student was taken into consideration, the female students gained a 'Value' score more than two points lower than their male counterparts.

5 Conclusions

The results show the value of reading in L2 situations. The fact that they are not more conclusive or statistically significant is due more to faults in the survey than anything else. Firstly the sample size was too small. Thirteen fluent students were simply not enough to get an accurate result. If this survey were done again, there would need to be a much larger number of L2 students in the fluent group. Another problem was in the questions themselves. There were only nine 'reading' questions and when students were asked if they read anything, the quality or quantity of reading material was not specified. It would have been advantageous to find a way of measuring the amount of extensive reading an L2 learner had done and to factor it into the overall score for reading. It was perhaps a mistake to decide against using a reading diary. However the biggest problem with the reading questions was in basing them directly on the survey done in Southern China. The reading questions were not based on a systematic theoretical understanding of what reading is and the importance of schemata: linguistic, textual, cultural etc. In fact only two of the so-called 'reading' questions actually focus on reading. Initially my major concern was to repeat the oral communicative strategies part of the South China survey in a different setting with L2 learners from different ethnic backgrounds to see if I could emulate the results of Huang and Van Naerssen's (1987) South China study. I was initially only interested in oral strategies. This meant I had to use their survey almost in its original format. The original format
contained largely communicative questions with an oral/aural bias and a few that were actually related to reading itself. However, after I had administered this flawed survey, I read more about reading theory and became increasingly aware of just how important extensive reading was as a learning strategy in societies where opportunities for oral communication in English were limited. Without direct contact with L1 speakers of English, reading is important in the process of acculturation as it is a ways of providing knowledge of English-speaking culture. More recently I have also had experience teaching Asian students, mainly Chinese but also Japanese and Korean. The South China survey had a strong Chinese cultural bias in the questions it asked. Mnemonic strategies are particularly important in China but less so in other parts of the world and Huang and Van Naerssen were particularly concerned with contrasting the efficacy of mnemonic versus communicative strategies. Certain strategies would be used by fluent Chinese students, even though these strategies were probably not the ones responsible for these students being fluent in English. However, if I had written the survey myself, as I was living in Southern Africa at the time, it would have been difficult for me to avoid giving an African bias to the questions. Now I could probably write a balanced survey if I was to use it to test Asian, African and Latin, L2 learners of English. The cloze test itself was probably a better test of the students’ reading levels and as it was, only 13 students proved to be very proficient at reading.

It is now my opinion that the number of questions to poll for communicative reading strategies needs to be increased. If I were to do the survey again, the following questions might be added to in order to give a better result. Firstly there need to be more questions delving into what type of extensive reading the students are doing. In the South China survey it was asked: 'How often do you read newspapers, magazines, books, comics or pamphlets in English outside of school?'. In the new survey this question needs to be broken up to give more weighting to the importance of extensive reading. Q1:A Could read: 'How often do you read novels in English outside of school?' Q2:B 'How often do you read magazines outside of school?' Q3:C 'Do you read a daily newspaper in English?' Q4:D 'Do you ever read any newspapers in English?' Q5:E 'In your community is it possible for you to read any signs, notices, posters or advertisements in English?' Q6:F 'When you buy products or goods that have instructions or other words in English on their packaging, do you read the English words?'. These new questions would give a fairer indication of just how much vital extensive reading each L2 learner does.
Other possible questions in light of what I now know about reading theory could be:

Q7: G 'When you are reading something in English and you do not know the meaning of the word, do you try and infer the meaning of the word?'
Q8: H 'Do you read literature in your native language?'
Q9: I 'When reading stories/texts in English are you able to anticipate what is going to happen in the story/text?'

If these and similar questions had been added to the original survey it would have meant there would have been roughly equal numbers of reading and communicative strategies. This may have given a better balance to the results in light of the fact that extensive reading is likely to be an extremely important learning strategy and source of knowledge about acculturation in communities where very little English is spoken in the natural environment outside the schools.

Despite the paucity of the data, there is a clear indication that the more fluent and female L2 learners read more than the others. This is what would be expected, if a similar more extensive survey were to be done.
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

1 Introduction
This chapter provides a brief summary of the research, its results and its possible weaknesses. The main aim of this survey was to see if more successful/proficient students of English as a second language used certain learning strategies more frequently than less successful students. Student proficiency levels were measured using a cloze test. Three presumed strategies of successful language learners were identified for investigation: acculturation, oral communicative strategies and wide reading. These strategies were tested through a questionnaire and the results correlated with the results of the cloze procedure.

2 Cloze Procedure
The cloze test was chosen because it was a simple, cheap, easy means of administering a test that could rank a group of students according to their levels of proficiency in English. When I was first contemplating the use of a cloze test as a means of gauging student proficiency levels, I experimented with a 50-word cloze on three students whose proficiency levels I knew. The results encouraged me to use a cloze test overall but one that would not give any of the students an advantage. Oller (1979) and Bormuth (1967) also support the use of the cloze test as a means of gauging the language proficiency of L2 learners. When the cloze test was given in the first school (St. Gregory's) to be surveyed, the results were closely monitored. I consulted with the teachers about whom they considered to be their most fluent students. The results of the cloze test and estimates of teachers were in accord and as a result the cloze test was used in all the other schools. It was only at St. Mark's and St. Gregory's in South Africa that I was able to administer the cloze test in person. In Botswana and South America the test was given by former colleagues. The fact that I could not have personal involvement in the administering of all the cloze tests was another reason for choosing this method. All the tests were marked for appropriate word score. At first it was decided that students who scored above 30/50 in the cloze test would be considered fluent while those who obtained less than 30/50 were to be considered non-fluent. However, the Paraguayan students scored well on the cloze test. There was a group of not very fluent students from my segundo curso class that scored above or around 30/50 in the cloze test.
I knew these students very well and did not think they should be included in the group of fluent students. A score of above 30/50 would correspond to an independent reading level, and mean the L2 learners could easily read the text, but I wanted to focus on the most proficient L2 learners. Also, the preliminary results from the survey showed no significant correlation coefficients between students from the fluent and non-fluent groups. The cut-off point for students considered fluent was then raised to 40/50. The raising of the score for the fluency level created a new problem that had not been considered before. Now only 13 students were considered fluent and 118 non-fluent. Once again there was not a significant difference between the correlation coefficients.

3 Statistical Results

3.1 Sample Size
The statisticians at UNISA responsible for analysing the statistics advised me that the major problem in this study was the smallness of the sample. When the means are looked at more closely, there are small differences that warrant comment. I now believe the sample size was an error. The initial size of the sample was based on advice from the Mathematics Department at the University of Cape Town (1996) which advised that the minimum sample size to get an accurate result was 125. Another factor contributing to the sample size was the fact that Huang and Van Naerssen (1987) used only a sample of 60. As the present survey was modelled on this South China study, I thought doubling the sample would ensure an accurate result. There was also a logistical problem that meant in the initial stages 125 samples seemed a reasonable figure. The survey was bulky and expensive to photocopy at eight pages long. There was also the cost of postage and photocopying in countries where the surveying could not be conducted in person.

3.2 Fluent versus non-fluent students
A further problem was that, in the early planning stages, it could not have been anticipated that so few students would later be classified as fluent. If this had been anticipated, a sample size of 1000 might have solved the problem. But owing to the resources of the researcher this was not really a possibility. Maybe subjects for the survey should have been chosen, focussing on the best and worst students in each class. Teachers who have taught a class for a while usually have a fairly good idea of the fluency of their students in the L2. If teachers had been asked to choose the five best and five worse students in their classrooms for
sampling, it would have ensured a greater number of fluent students in the survey. It would have also made for greater contrast between the fluent and non-fluent groups. This study is not about mediocre or average students; it is about what successful students do differently from those that do not succeed. Rather than sample the average student, it might have been better to make comparisons between the two extremes. The present survey consistently chose students at random thus sampling a large number of average students who were obviously doing some things right.

3.3 Survey Questions

The survey collected data that focussed on three main learning strategies. Many of the questions were not original, so there were not many real problems with the questions themselves. Problems arose out of the weighting to give various answers.

4 Acculturation

The hypothesis as regards acculturation was that there would be a correlation between the L2 learners' level of acculturation and their level of English proficiency. A positive attitude to L1 language and culture would be indicative of a higher proficiency level. It was difficult to write questions for this section of the survey. It was even more difficult deciding what weighting to give to each response. Acculturation is also an intangible quality that is very difficult to measure accurately. It is not a static quality and can change dramatically over time. By surveying L2 students for their level of acculturation the best that can be hoped for is a freeze frame snapshot of the L2 learners' acculturation level at a particular moment in time.

The written questions were an attempt to gauge if the L2 learners had positive or negative attitudes towards L1 culture. It was an attempt to discover if there were any fluent students with negative attitudes towards L1 language and culture as this would help disprove the hypothesis. None were found in this survey but then there were only 13 fluent students. There were negative comments but generally by L2 learners with lower cloze scores. The t-tests and correlation coefficients were found not to be significant. This result did not really prove anything either way when the smallness of the sample was taken into consideration. What was significant was that when the individual means for fluent (19.9231) and non-fluent (20.9746) were examined more closely it could be seen that the mean difference was as great as 1.0515. Thus, the lower the score, the more acculturated the individual. This means
that the fluent L2 learners in this survey were marginally more acculturated than their non-fluent counterparts. A difference was expected in the means and that showed up in the results. The results give some support to Schumann's acculturation hypothesis, not enough support perhaps to draw major conclusions, but enough to warrant future investigation.

5 Communicative Learning Strategies

There were 14 communicative strategy questions in Part Two of the survey. The questions were largely taken from the Huang and Van Naerssen survey. They were also similar to the type of questions asked in Green and Oxford's (1995) Puerto Rican survey. Therefore, little fault can be found with the questions as such and the weighting given to the responses. Originally this was seen as the core part of the survey and I made the assumption that it would be very simple to repeat the results from the previous surveys. The present survey involved secondary L2 students from diverse backgrounds. Previous studies involved tertiary students from homogenous backgrounds.

The results from this section of the survey were the most unexpected. The correlation coefficients were insignificant. No real conclusions can be drawn from these results. The surprising factor is the means themselves. The fluent students averaged a mean of 29.6154. The non-fluent students averaged a much better score of 27.8051. This result, in effect, finds that the non-fluent students used more communicative strategies than the fluent group, an unexpected result. The mean difference was 1.8103, so it is difficult to say that there is no difference entirely between the two groups. The mean difference could be exacerbated by the size of the fluent sample so it is difficult to draw any conclusions, but it is important to note that all the students in the study lived in countries where there were not significant opportunities for the practice of communicative learning strategies. The greater proficiency of the more fluent students could then perhaps be accounted for by factors other than oral communicative learning strategies. Reading as a strategy could be much more important than I had previously thought, especially in foreign countries where English is learnt as an L2. Acculturation could also be more a factor as well but it is important to note that acculturation is intimately linked with motivation and opportunity. Owing to the size (thirteen) of the fluent sample, it is difficult to draw any major conclusions, though it has to be considered whether the fact that the subjects involved in the survey were secondary students from heterogeneous backgrounds played a part in the result.
6 Reading Strategies

Nine questions in Part Two of the survey were designed to test for the use of reading as a learning strategy. However, they do not elicit the type of information that a psycholinguistic approach to reading would like to access. Owing to the circumstances of the L2 students involved in the study, reading should have been the most important strategy. A criticism of the survey could be the fact that there were only nine questions that directly or indirectly tested for reading and focussed mainly on the sound- graphic aspects rather than meaning making or reading habits. Once again there was the problem of what weighting to give to answers. Originally an idea of having the students write a reading diary for one to two weeks was considered. If this had been done, it would have been a clear indication of exactly how much reading the students were doing in their L2. This idea was discounted owing to logistical reasons. A reading diary would have been too difficult to collect when the researcher could not always collect the information in person.

The t-tests and correlation coefficients were not statistically significant. However, when the means themselves were looked at closely, there was some difference. The fluent students scored an average of 16.5385, while the non-fluent students averaged 18.1780. Once again, the lower the score, the better. The mean difference here was 1.6395. This is quite a large difference considering the faults in the weighting of the survey. The result supported the hypothesis that reading is an important learning strategy for L2 learners of English. It also supports the findings from the Elley and Munghabhai (1982) study in Fiji. Major conclusions cannot perhaps be drawn but it is a result that shows there is something in the hypothesis that warrants future investigation.

7 Conclusion

The results were inconclusive. There was confirmation, however, that for the subjects involved in the study, reading and acculturation as learning strategies might be of some importance in increasing language proficiency. It would be logical for reading as a strategy to play a major role in the acquisition of English as an L2 in a non English-speaking environment, as has been proved by other studies. Reading as a strategy is something largely accessible to all L2 students both inside and outside the classroom. In light of the fact that extensive reading is still not considered important as a learning strategy by many educators in L2 learning environments, further study in this area is clearly warranted. Anecdotal evidence and the results from isolated studies in Fiji and Singapore seem to indicate that
extensive reading in an L2 environment is extremely important. Further studies among secondary students in different countries from diverse backgrounds are something that might convince educational planners to take extensive reading more seriously.

Acculturation is an intangible quality that can only be tested indirectly. It is intimately linked with motivation and attitude. There is evidence that it can be used successfully as a learning strategy, by some L2 students. As a strategy it probably has more use for L2 learners in L1 countries. However, owing to the way English is now being taught as an L2 throughout the world, it has the potential of becoming an important strategy. Many secondary students now learn English as an L2 at schools in their countries and at some stage in their education they spend time in an L1 English-speaking country. It is during the time of this immersion experience (an experience for increasing numbers of L2 students) that acculturation becomes important as a learning strategy. There is enough evidence to show that L2 learning is often uneven. The Paraguayan students, for example, had extremely well developed reading and writing skills and poorly developed listening and speaking skills in their L2. An immersion experience of between 3-12 months would enable L2 students to catch up in their speaking and listening skills for English as a L2. However it is difficult to say whether acculturation is more a predictor of success in L2 learning than a learning strategy. More tolerant and accepting students are more likely to be able to acculturate than L2 learners who do not have these characteristics. Tolerance, empathy and acceptance are personal characteristics rather than concepts that can be taught. Acculturation is an interesting concept and Schumann's acculturation hypothesis is something that warrants further study in different environments.

The unexpected results for the communicative part of the survey were the major surprise from this study although there is the possibility that these results were due to flaws in the survey. However, as the students involved were secondary and not tertiary as in other studies, it could perhaps be the influence of uneven skills development. For all the students in the study it would have been the speaking and listening skills that would have been the most difficult to develop. This was due to the simple fact that the students lacked opportunity to use oral communicative learning strategies. This type of strategy could be of much more importance when L2 learners learn English in L1 English-speaking countries.
Many of the more fluent students had spent time in L1 English-speaking countries. Several of the students from the fluent category (above 40/50 in cloze test) had actually lived in L1 English-speaking countries. For example, the most fluent Chilean student who scored 33/50 on the cloze test had lived in the United States for one year when a small child.

What this study shows is the necessity of providing opportunity for immersion in L2 culture, access to books for sustained silent reading, and opportunity for real communicative activities if you are effectively to learn English as an L2.
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Appendix A: Survey

Learning Strategies for Oral Communication UNISA 1997

Part 1

Personal information: Please answer the following questions by placing a tick in the correct box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Name:</th>
<th>School:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[1] Sex

- male
- female

[2] Age

- younger than 12
- 13-15
- 16-20
- 21-25
- 26-30
- 31-35
- older than 40

[3] What language(s) do you speak at home?

- Spanish
- Setswana
- Kalanga
- English
- Guarani
- other

[4] How long have you been studying English?

- Less than 1 year
- 1-2 years
- 2-3 years
- 3-4 years
- more than 5 years

[5] How many hours of English class do you have each week?

- fewer than 2 hours
- 2-4 hours
- 5-8 hours
- 9 hours or more
[6] Where do you come from?

City

town

rural area

[7] Nationality

Botswanan

Paraguayan

Chilean

Other

[8] (a) Do you want to visit an English speaking country?

yes

no

(b) If yes, which English speaking country would you most like to visit?

USA

UK

Australia

Canada

New Zealand

[9] Do you like the way the Americans or British do things?

Americans

British

[10] With whom do you prefer to speak English?

native speakers

people from your own country, who speak English

foreigners who speak English as a second language

For the following questions please tick the best answer or write your answer in the space provided.

[11] Have you ever travelled outside your home country?

yes

no
[12] What other countries have you visited?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

[13] Have you ever lived in any country other than your home country for more than six months?

yes    no

If you answered yes, what was the country?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

[14] Do you like to speak English with strangers?

yes    no

[15] Do you like to speak English with native speakers of the language.

yes    no

[16] Do you understand what is meant by the term culture without having to read the definition given.

yes    no

If you answered yes, what is your definition of culture?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

[17] Do you know anything about the culture of English speaking people?

yes    no
[18] If you answered yes to question 17 what things do you like most about the culture of English speaking cultures?
(see definition of culture at the front of the questionnaire.)

[19] What things do you like least about the culture of English speaking people?

[20] Do you socialise with people of different cultures and languages?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
<th>no opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[21] Do you socialise with English speaking people?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>don’t want to</th>
<th>no opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[22] If you answered no opportunity to question 21 because you know no English speaking people. Would you socialise with English speaking people if you had the opportunity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[23] Why are you learning English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>business</th>
<th>education purposes</th>
<th>compulsory</th>
<th>Because I want to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[24] Do you think learning English is important?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yes</th>
<th>no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[25] How do you plan to use your English when you leave School?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>never use</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>work</th>
<th>further study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[26] Would you like to go and live in an English speaking country?

[ ] yes  [ ] no

[27] Do you want to learn more about the culture of English speaking people?

[ ] yes  [ ] no

[28] Does anyone else in your immediate family speak English?

[ ] yes  [ ] no

[29] Do you speak English with anyone else in your family?

[ ] yes  [ ] no

[30] Do you worry about offending native speakers of English by making mistakes in your English while talking to them?

[ ] yes  [ ] no  [ ] no opportunity

[31] Would you like to learn more about the cultures of English speaking people so you can avoid giving offence while speaking to native English speakers?

[ ] yes  [ ] no  

[ ] I do not think it is important to learn anything about English speaking culture

[32] Which of the following statements do you believe to be true.

Anglo-American culture is superior.  
My own culture is superior.  
All cultures are equal but different.

[33] Which of the following descriptions of language learners most appeals to you?

A bi-cultural, bi-lingual person. A person who knows and understands English culture and his/her own and is fluent in both English and their native language.

A mono-lingual person who only speaks his/her own native language. This person believes it is not important to learn other languages.

A student that can understand his own culture only and communicate in English adequately for business, technical and educational purposes.
Part 2:

For the following questions tick what you think is the best answer.

[1] How often do you read newspapers, magazines, books, brochures or pamphlets in School?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[2] Do you speak English with other students or teachers after class?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[3] How often do you read aloud, so you can improve your pronunciation?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[4] How often do you listen to the radio, tape or songs in English in order to improve your pronunciation?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[5] How often do you stop a tape and listen to it again while you are playing it?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[6] How often do you look for chances to speak English to other people?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[7] When your teacher asks questions in class, do you try and answer them inside your head?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[8] How often do you read newspapers, magazines, books, comics or pamphlets in English outside of School?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[9] Do you find yourself correcting other student’s English when they make an error?

often  sometimes  rarely  never
[10] How often do you speak English to yourself, either silently or aloud?

often   sometimes   rarely   never

[11] How often do you listen to radio programs or songs in English in order to improve your listening comprehension?

often   sometimes   rarely   never

[12] Do you repeat words or phrases after your teacher or another speaker of English has spoken them?

often   sometimes   rarely   never

[13] Do you memorise stories or other reading materials from your textbook or English bible?

often   sometimes   rarely   never

[14] How often do you look for chances to attend lectures, talks or sermons given by English speakers, which are not part of your school work?

often   sometimes   rarely   never

[15] Do you look for English speakers in your town so you can practice speaking your English with them?

often   sometimes   rarely   never

[16] When you listen to your teachers or other speakers of English, do you listen to the way they speak and try to copy them?

often   sometimes   rarely   never

[17] How often do you watch films or TV programs in English?

often   sometimes   rarely   never

[18] How often do you think in English, while working or studying in English?

often   sometimes   rarely   never

[19] Would your fear of making grammatical mistakes stop you from speaking English to native speakers if you had the opportunity?

often   sometimes   rarely   never
[20] How often do you think of what you want to say first in your home language and then translate it into English?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[21] Are you afraid to speak English because you might make mistakes?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[22] Do you laugh at other people who make mistakes while speaking English?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[23] Do you look up new words you have heard in the dictionary?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[24] Do you write down new words you have learnt in a vocabulary book?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[25] How often do you use any library either at school or in the town to either borrow or read books in English?

often  sometimes  rarely  never

[26] Do you have any comments you would like to make about your experiences learning English?
Appendix B: Tables

[Survey Results: Frequencies and percentages.]

Acculturation Results:

Some, but not all, of the questions in part one of the survey were used to compute a score for culture. The questions used were 8a, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 24, 26, 27, 28, 31, and 20, 21, 29, 30. The “lower” the score indicated in the result, the higher the enculturation level. The following are the frequencies for the various questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total   132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases   131 Missing cases   1

---

Q8b [Which country?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total   132 100.0 100.0

---
Valid cases 130  Missing cases  2

Q9  [Do you like the way the British or Americans do things?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americans</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 130  Missing cases  2

Q10  [With whom do you prefer to speak English?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People from own country</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 130  Missing cases  2

Q11  [Have you ever travelled outside of your own country?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 131  Missing cases  1
Q13  [Have you ever lived in any country other than your home country for more than six months?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Frequency Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 131 Missing cases 1

Q14  [Do you like to speak English with strangers?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Frequency Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>74.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 4

Q15  [Do you like to speak English with native speakers of the language?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Frequency Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 127 Missing cases 5

Q16  [Do you understand what is meant by the term culture without having to read
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the definition given?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Valid Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 126  Missing cases 6

Q17  [Do you know anything about the culture of English-speaking people?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Valid Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 127  Missing cases 5

Q20  [Do you socialise with people of different cultures and languages?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Valid Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>84.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 129  Missing cases 3

Q21  [Do you socialise with English-speaking people?]
1  94  71.2  73.4  73.4  
2  3   2.3   2.3  75.8  
3 31  23.5  24.2 100.0  
4   3.0  Missing  

Total  132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 128 Missing cases 4

Q22  [If you answered no opportunity to question 21 because you know no English speaking people. Would you socialise with English-speaking people if you had the opportunity?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 45 Missing cases 87

Q23  [Why are you learning English?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 130 Missing cases 2

Q24  [Do you think learning English is important?]
### Q25  [How do you plan to use your English when you leave school?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 130  Missing cases 2

### Q26  [Would you like to go and live in an English-speaking country?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIV</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further study</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 127  Missing cases 5

### Q27  [Do you want to learn more about the culture of English-speaking people?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 129  Missing cases 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>11.4</th>
<th>11.5</th>
<th>100.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 131  Missing cases 1

Q28 [Does anyone else in your immediate family speak English?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 128  Missing cases 4

Q29 [Do you speak English with anyone else in your family?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 128  Missing cases 4

Q30 [Do you worry about offending native speakers of English by making mistakes in your English while talking to them?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Valid cases 128  Missing cases 4

Q31  [Would you like to learn more about the cultures of English-speaking people so you can avoid giving offence while speaking to native English speakers?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>77.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>89.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communicative results:

Q2.2  [Do you speak English with other students or teachers after class?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 131  Missing cases 1

Q2.4  [How often do you listen to the radio, tape or songs in English in order to improve your pronunciation?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Never 4 13 9.8 9.9 100.0
   1 .8 Missing
------- ------- -------
Total 132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 131 Missing cases 1

Q2_5 [How often do you stop a tape and listen to it again while you are playing it?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>85.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 129 Missing cases 3

Q2_6 [How often do you look for chances to speak English to other people?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 131 Missing cases 1

Q2_7 [When your teacher asks questions in class, do you try and answer them inside your head?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Cum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 130  Missing cases 2

Q2_9 [Do you find yourself correcting other student’s English when they make an error?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>74.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 130  Missing cases 2

Q2_10 [How often do you speak English to yourself, either silently or aloud?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>79.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 130  Missing cases 2
Q2_11 [How often do you listen to radio programmes or songs in English in order to improve your listening comprehension?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>96.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 130 Missing cases 2

Q2_12 [Do you repeat words or phrases after your teacher or another speaker of English has spoken them?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>86.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 130 Missing cases 2

Q2_14 [How often do you look for chances to attend lectures, talks or sermons given by English speakers, which are not part of your school work?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Valid cases 129  Missing cases  3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 132  Missing cases  2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>84.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 132  Missing cases  4

Q2_17 [How often do you watch films or TV programmes in English?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 129  Missing cases 3

Q2_23 [Do you look up new words you have heard in the dictionary?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 130  Missing cases 2

Reading Results:

Q2_1  [How often do you read newspapers, magazines, books, brochures or pamphlets in School?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>99.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 131  Missing cases 1
### Q2_3 [How often do you read aloud, so you can improve your pronunciation?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>64.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases: 131  Missing cases: 1

### Q2_8 [How often do you read newspapers, magazines, books, comics or pamphlets in English outside of School?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>87.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases: 131  Missing cases: 1

### Q2_13 [Do you memorise stories or other reading materials from your textbook or English bible?]
### Q2_18 [How often do you think in English, while working or studying in English?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 132 100.0 100.0

**Valid cases** 130  **Missing cases** 2

### Q2_20 [How often do you think of what you want to say first in your home language and then translate it into English?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 165

**Valid cases** 165
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>25.8</th>
<th>26.4</th>
<th>84.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3 Missing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 129 Missing cases 3

Q2_23  [Do you look up new words you have heard in the dictionary?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid cases 130 Missing cases 2

Q2_24  [Do you write down new words you have learnt in a vocabulary book?]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cum Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Q2_25  [How often do you use any library either at school or in the town to either borrow or read books in English?]  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Label</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Often</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>72.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>94.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 132 100.0 100.0

Valid cases 130  Missing cases 2
Appendix C: Cloze Test

English Proficiency Test: Cloze Reading Test

from The Lion, the Witch, and the Wardrobe by C.S. Lewis

Name: 

School: 

Put the best word you can think of into the gaps in the story:

And shortly after that they looked into a room which was quite empty except for one big wardrobe: the kind that has a looking-glass in the door. There was nothing else in the room at all except a dead blue-bottle on the window-sill.

"Nothing there!" said Peter, 1 they all trooped out again— all except Lucy. She 2 behind because she thought it would be worth while 3 the door of the wardrobe, even though she felt 4 sure it would be locked. To her surprise it 5 quite easily, and two moth-balls dropped out.

Looking 6 the inside, she saw several coats hanging up—mostly long 7 coats. There was nothing Lucy liked so much as 8 smell and feel of fur. She immediately stepped into the 9 and got in among the coats and rubbed her 10 against them, leaving the door open, of course, because 11 knew that it was very foolish to shut oneself into 12 wardrobe. Soon she went further in and found that 13 was a second row of coats hanging up behind the 14 one. It was almost quite dark in there and she 15 her arms stretched out in front of her so 16 not to bump her face into the back of 17 wardrobe. She took a step further in—then two 18 three steps—always expecting to feel woodwork against the tips 19 her fingers. But she could not feel it.

This 20 be a simply enormous wardrobe!" thought Lucy, going still 21 in and pushing the soft folds of the coats aside 22 make room for her. Then she noticed that there 23 something crunching under her feet. "I wonder is that more mothsball?" she 24 , stooping down to feel it with her hand. But 25 feeling the hard, smooth wood of the floor of 26 wardrobe, she felt something soft and powdery and 27 cold. "This is very queer," she said, and went 28 a step or two further.

Next moment she found that 29 was rubbing against her face and hands was no 30 soft fur but something hard and rough and 31 prickly. "Why it is like branches of trees!" exclaimed 32 And then she saw that there was a light 33 of her: not a few inches away where the 34 of the wardrobe ought to have been, but a 35 way off. Something cold and soft was falling on 36 . A moment later she found she was standing in the 37 of a wood at night-time with snow under her 38 and snowflakes falling through the air.
Lucy felt a 39* frightened, but she felt very inquisitive and excited as 40* . She looked backed over her shoulder and there between the dark 41* trunks, she could still see the open doorway of the 42* and even catch a glimpse of the empty room 43* which she had set out. (She had, of course, 44* the door open, for she knew that it is a 45* silly thing to shut oneself into a wardrobe.) It 46* to be still daylight there. “I can always get back 47* anything goes wrong,” thought Lucy. She began to walk 48* crunch-crunch over the snow and through the wood 49* the other light. In about ten minutes she reached it 50* found it was a lamp-post in the middle a wood and wondering what to do next, she heard a pitter patter of feet coming towards her. And soon after that a very strange person stepped out from among the trees into the light of the lamp-post.

He was only a little taller than Lucy herself and he carried over his head an umbrella, white with snow. From the waist upwards he was like a man, but his legs were shaped like a goat’s (the hair on them was glossy black) and instead of feet he had goat’s hoofs. He also had a tail, but Lucy did not notice this at first because it was neatly caught up over the arm that held the umbrella so as to keep it from trailing in the snow. He had a red woollen muffler round his neck and his skin was rather reddish too. He had a strange but pleasant little face, with a short pointed beard and curly hair, and out of the hair there stuck two horns, one on each side of his forehead. One of his hands, as I have said held the umbrella; in the other arm he carried several brown-paper parcels. What with the parcels and the snow it looked as if he had been doing his Christmas shopping. He was a Faun. And when he saw Lucy he gave such a start of surprise that he dropped all his parcels.

“Goodness gracious me!” exclaimed the Faun.