THE ROLE OF NINE LEARNER VARIABLES IN PREDICTING
THE ENGLISH PROFICIENCY OF FRENCH CANADIAN
TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Rosalie Banko

A Thesis

in

The Centre for Teaching English

as a Second Language

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master
of Arts in Applied Linguistics at
Concordia University

March 1982

© Rosalie Banko

ABSTRACT

THE ROLE OF NINE LEARNER VARIABLES IN PREDICTING THE ENGLISH PROFICIENCY OF FRENCH CANADIAN TEACHERS OF ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

Rosalie Banko

Relationships between English proficiency and nine predictor variables were investigated in a sample of 67 French-speaking ESL teachers enrolled in a short-term English language immersion program at Louisiana State University. The learner variables were self-ratings of English competency in the four traditional language skills, academic TESL training, age, years of experience in ESL teaching, a speaking task and a writing task. The indices of English proficiency were gathered from the scores of a standardized test of aural comprehension, a standardized test of written comprehension, a paraphrase-recognition test, a cloze test and a dictation test. Correlation and multiple stepwise regression analyses were performed in order to determine which of the predictive measures alone or which combination of these measures could be used to present an accurate picture of second language proficiency. In terms of both statistical significance and meaningfulness, only the speaking task emerged as an important predictive measure.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people have contributed in different ways to this study and their efforts are greatly appreciated.

First of all, I would like to thank my director Professor Bruce Barkman and my readers Professors John A. Upshur and Joe Darwin Palmer for the encouragement, insights and helpful criticism which they so generously offered throughout this project.

Professor Kyle Perkins of Southern Illinois University graciously assisted in setting up this study and patiently explained the complexities of multiple regression.

Professor Stephen Cooper of Louisiana State University has my heartfelt thanks for his cooperation during the 1978 Summer Institute for Quebec Teachers.

I am most grateful to the participants of the immersion program for submitting to the testing procedures which enabled me to collect the corpus of my research data.

I extend my deepest appreciation to Catherine Faure who so efficiently and patiently edited and typed this thesis.

And finally, I want to thank the members of my graduate study group, Jeff Barlow, Frank Bonkowski and Valerie Mollard for their stimulating comments and their readiness to provide a helping hand.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

A serious problem within Quebec's educational system is the inadequate English proficiency of French Canadian teachers of English as a second language (ESL). Given the far-reaching pedagogical and political implications, few studies have as yet touched upon it. However, the situation was indirectly acknowledged by the Quebec Ministry of Education (MEQ) in the early 1970's when it included English language instruction as part of a program designed to improve the teaching of English as a second language (TESL). This program was called the "plan de développement de l'enseignement des langues" and it allotted approximately 20 million dollars for TESL. More recently, certain reports published by the MEQ (White, Daigle, Dozois, Langlois, Pelletier & Cusson, 1976; Georgeault & Danan, 1977) specified the inadequate English proficiency of non-native teachers as one of the major problems facing the profession in Quebec today. In addition, university professors, particularly those involved in teaching training have begun to voice their concern (Acheson, d'Anglejan,

de Bagheera & Tucker, 1978; Sheen, 1978; Frith, 1978).

Therefore, in an effort to remedy the above-mentioned situation and "to ensure the instruction in English as a second language to pupils whose language of instruction is French" (Bill No. 22, 1974, Title III, Chapter V, Section 44), the Ministry made various programs for the training and retraining of ESL teachers available on a province-wide basis. Among these is a four-week English language immersion program which has been held each summer since 1975 at Louisiana State University (LSU) in Baton Rouge. It is sponsored by the MEQ in collaboration with the Quebec Ministry of Intergovernmental Affairs, the Louisiana State Department of Education and the Council for the Development of French in Louisiana. All non-native ESL teachers working at the elementary and secondary levels of instruction are eligible. They must, however, hold a Quebec teaching permit, be assured of a teaching position in ESL for the following academic year and be recommended by their respective school boards. Once these basic requirements are met, a candidate's level of English proficiency becomes the decisive factor in both the selection and placement processes of the LSU immersion program.

Statement of the Problem

The task of determining a candidate's proficiency level is an arduous one. The difficulty lies in finding appropriate and adequate measures of overall language proficiency. Dieterich, Freeman and Crandall (1979) examined 39 different tests of English language proficiency or dominance which had been developed in the 10 years previous to their study. After having analyzed the item content, instructions and scoring procedures of these tests, they concluded that while these instruments might separate those examinees with native-like ability from those with little or no ability, they are less likely to identify those whose language competency lies somewhere between the two extremes. The finer yet necessary distinctions are often blurred or even obliterated by test items or tasks which do not measure what they purport to measure. The researchers also noted that, in many instances, the skills tested were unrepresentative of overall language proficiency. In other words, numerous so-called proficiency tests are at best imperfect and suspect measures of language competency. For the purposes of this study, therefore, proficiency is strictly defined as the results of the five proficiency criterion variables described in Chapter III of this paper.

As stated above, a candidate's level of English proficiency is the deciding factor in the selection and placement procedures of the immersion program held at LSU. Selection here is defined as the screening of applicants for acceptance or non-acceptance into the program and placement (following Clark, 1972) as the grouping of participants into one of four qualitatively different ESL instructional courses.

The task of the selection committee is to determine which applicants are most in need of ESL training. Because the financial and temporal constraints imposed by the MEQ allow neither for interviews with prospective participants nor for the administration of a proficiency test prior to departure for Louisiana, the committee must base its decisions upon information garnered from the application forms submitted by the candidates (see Appendix A for a copy of the application form used in 1978). This information includes the following surrogate measures of English proficiency: (1) self-ratings of English competency in the four basic language skills; (2) academic TESL training; (3) age and (4) years of experience in ESL teaching. As Clark (1972, p. 9) so aptly puts it: "... student-affecting decisions must be made regardless of the amount or quality of information available to aid in this task".

The task of the placement committee is to group the participants at the proper levels of ESL instruction. For that purpose, a standardized proficiency test is administered upon their arrival at LSU. In addition, the following measures are considered in the placement activities:
(1) self-ratings of English competency; (2) academic TESL training; (3) a speaking task and (4) a writing task. These measures can be viewed as integrative in the sense that they require "... an examinee to use more than one of the four traditionally recognized skills and/or one or more of the traditionally recognized components of grammar ..." (Oller, 1979, p. 38) as well as pragmatic insofar as they "... require attention to meaning in temporally constrained sequences of linguistic elements ..." (Oller, 1979, p. 39).

It is important, therefore, within the context of the LSU immersion program, to be able to predict the English language proficiency not only of applicants but also of participants. In order to do so, nine different measures are used. Since these nine measures play an important part in both the selection and placement processes, it makes sense to ask whether or not they are, statistically speaking, efficient predictors of English language proficiency. What is the relationship between

these measures and language proficiency? Do these same measures account for a significant portion of the variance of any of the indices of language proficiency? Is the variance accounted for by the statistically significant measures meaningful as well, in the sense that these measures could be used alone to predict proficiency?

Research Question and Hypothesis

This thesis investigates the role of nine learner variables in predicting the English proficiency of French Canadian teachers of English as a second language. More specifically, the research question is: what are the best predictors of English language proficiency of the participants in the LSU immersion program? The predictor or independent variables are: (1) self-rating of listening skill; (2) self-rating of speaking skill; (3) self-rating of reading skill; (4) self-rating of writing skill; (5) academic TESL training; (6) age; (7) years of experience in ESL teaching; (8) a speaking task and (9) a writing task. The English language proficiency data (the dependent variables) were elicited by means of the following instruments which were administered at the beginning of the immersion program: (1) a standardized proficiency test of

aural comprehension; (2) a standardized proficiency test of written comprehension; (3) a paraphrase-recognition test (P-R); (4) a cloze test and (5) a dictation test.

My research hypothesis is that academic TESL training and years of experience will be the best predictors of English language proficiency. It seems reasonable to assume that the more exposure a second language learner has to the target language, the more proficient s/he becomes. If this is so, then the amount of time spent studying the target language or preparing to teach it, as well as the amount of time spent teaching the language itself, should influence language competency. The TESL and/or ESL classroom provides an opportunity for exposure to and use of English for non-native ESL teachers, especially in the province of Quebec, where government policies have made French not only the official but the working language as well.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Self-Ratings of English Proficiency

To date, eight correlational studies have been con-
ducted to investigate a possible relationship between
self-reports of language proficiency and actual proficiency
measures. Of these, three (Chihara & Oller, 1978; Murakami,
1980; Oller, Baca & Vigil, 1977) deal with English compe-
tency while the remaining five (Gardner & Lambert, 1972)
are concerned with French competency. With the exception
of Murakami who recorded a .69 ($p < .05$) correlation be-
tween an ESL dictation and a self-report of speaking ability,
the results reveal consistently low or negative correlations
between the self-ratings and the proficiency measures.

These results should be treated with circumspection
because valid and reliable self-reports are frequently
unobtainable. On the one hand, subjects may rate their
language ability lower than it really is. This sometimes
occurs when they realize that their self-reports can some-
how affect their future. For example, by 1978 -- the
fourth year of the LSU immersion program -- certain candi-

dates had correctly surmised that they would be refused

admittance if they rated their English proficiency too

high. Instead, they often gave themselves a lower rating

and, consequently, several bilinguals or near-bilinguals

enjoyed a month's holiday in Louisiana.

On the other hand, subjects can succumb to self-

flattery and rate their language ability higher than it

really is. Gardner, Smythe and Brunet (1977) asked

English-speaking high school students to rate their French

proficiency at five separate intervals during an intensive

French language program. The data were then analysed in

a two-factor analysis of variance (level of proficiency

and time of testing). The results showed significant

effects for all five time periods in all skill areas

except reading. They indicated that while these subjects

were capable of recognizing their differing degrees of

proficiency, their judgements were less accurate at the

beginning of the program than at the end. The researchers

suggested that "the self-ratings are particularly instruc-

tive ... because they indicate how students tend to have

a glorified perception of their own skills before such

programs begin which is quickly modified by their initial

experience" (p. 260).

Academic TESL Training

Researchers have been investigating the effects of formal study on second or foreign language proficiency for more than a decade, but the findings of these investigations have thus far proved inconclusive. Krashen, Jones, Zelinski and Usprich (1978) correlated years of formal study with the scores on the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, a 15-minute composition and a cloze test. The cloze test was scored by both the exact-word and the appropriate-word methods. From the results which are shown in Table 1, the authors concluded that English proficiency is significantly and importantly related to years of formal English study. This study supports the findings of a previous study by Krashen (1976) in which he found a positive relationship (.42, $p < .001$) between academic TESL background and the scores on the Second Language Oral Production English (SLOPE) Test.

Chihara and Oller (1978) examined the relationship between attitudes and language proficiency of 123 Japanese adults taking classes in beginner, intermediate and advanced English as a foreign language (EFL) in Japan. Among the predictor variables was the number of years the subjects had spent in formal EFL study. The proficiency

Table 1

English Proficiency and Years of Formal
Study of English

Tests[a]	Correlation with Reported Years of Formal English Study	
	r	p (one-tailed)
Michigan	.50	$p < .001$
Composition[b]	− .34	$p < .005$
Cloze (exact)	.47	$p < .001$
Cloze (approximate)	.45	$p < .001$

Note. From Krashen, Jones, Zelinski and Usprich,. 1978,
p. 259.

[a] $\underline{n} = 116$ for each group.

[b] The lower the composition scores, the fewer the errors.

variables included a cloze test which was scored by the
exact-word method and a three-part EFL test. As Table 2
shows, the correlations obtained were of similar magnitude
to those reported by Krashen et al. (1978) and Krashen
(1976). In contrast to these two studies, it is interest-
ing to note that Chihara and Oller concluded that the "time
spent in formal EFL study correlated significantly (but not
very strongly).with all of the proficiency variables" (p. 62).

Table 2

Intercorrelations between a Cloze Test, the Subparts
of an EFL Proficiency Test and Years of EFL Study

Measures[a]	Years of EFL Study
Cloze	.45
EFL Test	
Grammar	.45
Vocabulary	.48
Listening Comprehension	.46

Note. From Chihara and Oller, 1978, p. 61.

Note. $p < .001$.

[a] $n = 123$ for each group.

Saegert, Scott, Perkins and Tucker (1974) conducted

two separate investigations in Egypt and Lebanon. In the

Egyptian sample, the researchers obtained proficiency data

from 114 Arabic-speaking university freshmen by means of the

Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency; in the

Lebanese sample, the English Entrance Examination was

administered to 71 Arabic-speaking students who were en-

rolled in an intermediate EFL course because they were not

proficient enough to follow the regular university program.

A multivariate linear regression analysis of the data revealed significant overall correlation coefficients for both groups, i.e., .212 and .259 ($p < .05$) respectively. Nonetheless, the researchers considered that the amount of variance accounted for in the proficiency scores was small. They admitted that no data had been gathered on either the quality of instruction or the number of hours spent in formal study per week.. Even so, they concluded that "... proficiency cannot be assessed purely on the ... number of years of EFL training" (p. 103).

Carroll (1967) assessed the foreign language competency of 2,782 American college seniors studying French, German, Italian, Russian and Spanish in 203 American institutions. Tested at the time of graduation, the subjects were students who had no special language training other than the regular course of study and who had not lived abroad for any prolonged period of time. The proficiency data were obtained from the various subtests of the MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Test for Teachers and Advanced Students. The proficiency ratings of the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) of the United States Department of State served as the "common basis for comparing skills and for comparing languages" (p. 134). The scores of the listening and speaking subtest scores were equated with the

FSI "S" (speaking) ratings and the reading and writing
subtest scores with the FSI "R" (reading) ratings. As a
result of the statistical analysis of the data, Carroll
found that "the median graduate with a foreign language
major can speak and comprehend the language only at about
an FSI rating of '2+', that is, somewhere between a limited
working proficiency' and a 'minimum professional profi-
ciency'" (p. 134). However, he also noted that these
findings should be viewed with caution because of a possible
bias resulting from the voluntary participation of both
institutions and students in the investigation as well as
from the equating procedures used in the analysis.

Other studies have also investigated the effects of
formal TESL/TEFL training on second or foreign language
proficiency, but the results have so far been discouraging.
Upshur (1968) examined the effects of formal language
instruction on the proficiency scores of university students
who participated in a seven-week orientation program in
American law. The subjects were placed into one of three
different groups: (1) those receiving no additional EFL
instruction; (2) those receiving one additional hour daily
and (3) those receiving two additional hours daily. The
proficiency data were gathered by means of the Michigan Test
of English Language Proficiency (Form B revised) which was

administered both at the beginning and at the end of the experiment. An analysis of covariance in which the influence of initial language was partialed out, revealed "no significant effects attributable to amount of language instruction" (p. 113). Upshur concluded that "foreign language courses may at this time be less effective means for producing language learning (at least for some learners) than the use of the language in other activities" (p. 124). Because of the small sample size i.e., 10 subjects in each group, this conclusion must be treated with caution.

More recent studies (Clarke, 1980; Monshi-Tousi, Hosseine-Fatemi & Oller, 1980; Oller, Baca & Vigil, 1977; Oller, Hudson & Liu, 1977; Oller, Perkins & Murakami, 1980; Patkowski, 1980) have likewise found no indications that formal language study significantly and meaningfully affects language competency. The researchers performed different statistical analyses, viz., correlation, multiple regression, multiple stepwise regression, two-way analysis of variance and gathered proficiency data from various sources, viz., cloze tests, dictation tests, grammar tests, the Modern Language Aptitude Test and interviews. Nevertheless, the results were the same. In fact,

the strongest relationship recorded, .22 ($p < .05$)
(Patkowski, 1980) accounted for only 4.84% of the variance
in the syntactic proficiency ratings.

Age

Age has frequently been cited as one of the variables
which greatly influence language learning. Penfield and
Roberts (1959) hold that cortical lateralization of the
left hemisphere of the brain is complete at puberty. This,
they argue, is the reason why adults experience difficulty
in learning a second or foreign language. Lenneberg (1967)
also believes that this aspect of neurological maturation
is complete at puberty and supports his beliefs with find-
ings from aphasia and mental retardation. However, his
critical period hypothesis is addressed specifically to the
question of first language acquisition. With regard to
second or foreign language learning, he states that "... a
person can learn to communicate at the age of forty ..."
because "... the cerebral organization for language learn-
ing as such has taken place during childhood, and since
natural languages tend to resemble one another in many
fundamental aspects, the matrix for language skills is
present" (p. 176).

The subjects in the present study range in age from 25 to 58 and few studies have been conducted to examine the differences in attainment in second language learning between children and adults. In addition, many of these studies are concerned primarily with accent (Neufeld, 1980; Oyama, 1976).

Snow and Hoefnagel-Höhle (1978) examined the relationship between the age and rate of attainment of 69 native English speakers living in Holland. The subjects were 49 children and 20 adults who had been studying Dutch over a one-year period. The proficiency criteria data were the scores on a battery of tests which measured pronunciation, auditory discrimination, morphology, vocabulary, sentence repetition and translation. A one-way analysis of variance showed that while the adults surpassed the younger children in the acquisition of morphology and syntax, their rate of attainment was inferior to that obtained by the teen-agers. When interpreting their findings, the researchers suggested that perhaps teenagers are better second language learners than adults or children. Another possible explanation was that the teenagers might have frequently found themselves in situations in which Dutch was necessary whereas the adults in the study had encountered few such situations.

Patkowski (1980) investigated the effect of age on the syntactic proficiency of 67 non-native adult immigrants to the United States. The subjects, mostly professionals, had been in residence for at least five years; some had spent as long as 61 years in the country. The proficiency data were the averaged grades given by two raters of written transcripts of a tape-recorded oral interview which was similar to the FSI proficiency interview test. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient between the age of arrival in the United States and the syntactic rating showed a strong negative relationship ($r = - .74$, $p < .001$). A second-order partial correlation coefficient ($r = - .72$, $p < .001$) indicated no significant change in the relationship when the effects of informal exposure and formal instruction were removed. The researcher concluded that "these results ... appeared to strongly support the hypothesis of an age-related limitation on the ability to acquire full command of a second language" (p. 461).

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

In 1975, the first year of the program, there were some 400 applicants. By 1978, however, this number had dwindled to approximately 130. Because of this, all eligible applicants were selected; in fact, only 94 of the available slots were filled. Those applicants not accepted, were refused for one or more of the following reasons: (1) they were native speakers of English; (2) they were bilingual; (3) they did not hold a Quebec teaching permit; (4) they were not going to teach ESL the following year; (5) they were substitute teachers or (6) they were not recommended by their respective school boards because they were considered disciplinary problems. Consequently, those applicants who were selected are representative of the kind of ESL teacher for whom the program was intended.

The subjects in the present study are 67 of the 94 participants in the LSU immersion program held from July 3, 1978 to August 1, 1978. They were chosen because they had

complete dossiers in terms of the independent and dependent. variable data. Native speakers of French, they taught ESL in various areas throughout Quebec: 23 (34%) at the elementary level of instruction and 44 (66%) at the second-ary level.' Twenty-seven (40%) of the subjects were male and 40 (60%) were female. The average age was 37.57 years with a range of 25 to 58 and a standard deviation of 8.83.

The subjects averaged 5.78 years of experience in the ESL classroom. This experience ranged from 0 to 20 years with a standard deviation of 4.17 (Some subjects were to begin teaching ESL for the first time in September, 1978). When this study was conducted, the amount of time allotted to the teaching of ESL in the province depended, to a large extent, upon the level of instruction and the discretion of the individual school boards. Georgeault and Danan (1977) found that for all grades at the secondary level, the amount of time was relatively uniform, ranging from 200-250 minutes per week in all school boards. However, they noted a much greater disparity at the elementary level as Table 3, summarized from their report, illustrates.

With regard to academic background, 36 (54%) of the subjects had undergone some form of TESL training. Of

Table 3

Time Allotted to ESL Teaching
at the Elementary Level

| Grade | Minutes per Week | |
	Mean	Range
4	57.5	30-80
5	78.0	30-150
6	83.0	30-150
7[a]	87.0	60-160

Note. From Georgeault and Danan, 1977,
pp. 24-25.

[a]In school boards where this grade
exists.

these, 15 held TESL Certificates from Quebec universities,
five held B.A.'s, one held an M.Ed. in TESL and 15 had
taken a variety of courses, e.g., ESL conversation, compo-
sition, methodology. Nevertheless, 31 (46%) of the subjects
had had no previous ESL or TESL training whatsoever. The
immersion program was their first exposure to ESL training
of any kind. In order to deal with such diverse back-
grounds, the researchers calculated 45 contact hours as
equal to three credits. The subject pool, therefore,

averaged 246.67 contact hours of academic TESL training
with a range of 0 to 1350 and a standard deviation of
374.47. In other words, they averaged 5.47 three-credit
courses or 16.42 credit hours.

The LSU immersion program provides for formal English
language instruction in an English language environment.
This formal instruction consisted of two hours of speech
courses and two hours of English courses presented every
morning by native English-speaking professors. Since the
subjects had been placed at one of four ESL proficiency
levels viz., beginners, low intermediate, high intermediate
or advanced, the content for each course differed accord-
ingly (see Appendix B for a copy of the course descriptions).
To allow for more frequent contact with native English
speakers, the subjects were also required to register for
one of the "short courses" offered by the LSU Department
of Continuing Education such as tennis, photography, ball-
room dancing or karate. In addition, they were encouraged
to participate in the various cultural and sports activ-
ities both on and off campus.

Materials

Independent or predictor variables

1, 2, 3 & 4. Self-ratings of English proficiency. The subjects were asked, in their native language, to rate their English competency in the listening, speaking, reading and writing skills. The following five-point scale was used: (1) excellent; (2) very good; (3) good; (4) weak and (5) nil.

5. Academic TESL training. The academic TESL preparation of the subjects was calculated in terms of contact hours.

6. Age. The subjects' age at the beginning of the immersion program was noted.

7. Years of experience in ESL teaching. The subjects' years of experience in ESL teaching was calculated.

8. Speaking task. Prior to departure for Louisiana, the subjects were requested to prepare a recording assignment and send it to LSU. This assignment was a speaking task which consisted of two parts: reading aloud and answering questions. For the first part, the subjects were required to read aloud a passage in English (see Appendix C for a copy of the passage). The passage can be described

as easy with a readability score of 87 (following Flesch,
1948). It represents a grade-three-level text for native
English speakers (following Fry, 1977). Although the
subjects were permitted to rehearse the passage before
recording it, they were asked to read it as naturally as
possible. The passage took two to three minutes to read.

For the second part, the subjects were required to
answer three questions extemporaneously in English. They
could spend two to three minutes replying to each question
and could use preparatory notes. However, they were asked
not to write out their answers nor to read them. The
three questions were: (1) describe the most interesting
place in Quebec you have visited; (2) briefly summarize
your study and learning of the English language and (3)
what do you do in your leisure time? Explain.

Each recording assignment was graded by two LSU
professors. According to the director of the immersion
program (personal communication), the raters -- all native
speakers of English -- worked intuitively but in light of
the experience acquired from the three preceding LSU
immersion programs involving Quebec ESL teachers. They

did not employ a rating sheet but kept in mind criteria such as those suggested by Harris (1969, p. 84) and were influenced by a variety of items ranging from pronunciation and fluency to vocabulary and structures. They used letter grades to indicate an overall appreciation of the speaking task. The researcher assigned numerical values to the letter grades and then averaged them.

9. Writing task. The subjects were also required to write a paragraph in English and send it to LSU prior to the immersion program. They could choose from one of the following topics: (1) my most pleasant (or most awful) classroom experience; (2) what a teacher (or student) of English most needs and (3) what I expect Louisiana to be like. Each paragraph was graded by two professors from the LSU English Department. The criteria employed were those usually applied to samples written by native speakers. The raters used letter grades to express an overall appreciation of the paragraphs. The researcher assigned numerical values to the letter grades and then averaged them.

Dependent or proficiency criterion variables

1. The Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension. This test, developed and standardized by the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan, presumably assesses

a non-native's comprehension of spoken English in a class-room lecture situation. It contains 90 items in a multiple-choice format. Form Two was used and raw scores were analyzed.

2. The Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency. This test was also developed and standardized by the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan. It presumably measures the English proficiency of a non-native speaker in the areas of grammar, vocabulary and reading comprehension. It contains 100 items in a written multiple-choice format. Form G was used and raw scores were analyzed.

3. Perkins-Yorio Paraphrase-Recognition Test. Developed by K. Perkins and C. Yorio, this test contains 50 items in a written multiple-choice format (see Appendix D for a copy of the test). The subjects read a stimulus sentence, then were asked to choose the correct paraphrase from four possible alternatives. The test included items on passive constructions, word morphology, modals, layered possessives, relative clauses, entailment, presupposition and ambiguous constructions.

4. Cloze test. The written cloze test used in this study (see Appendix E for a copy of the passage) has a reading ease score of 81 (easy) and contains language similar to that found in pulp fiction magazines (following

Flesch, 1948). According to Fry's readability index (1977),
it is a grade-four-level text. A certain amount of un-
mutilated lead was left at the beginning of the 222-word
passage whereafter every eighth word was deleted, producing
a test of 25 items. A longer cloze test might have been
administered but overall testing time was an important
consideration for the researcher.

For reasons of economy, the exact-word scoring method
(Taylor, 1953) was used rather than one involving synonyms
or semantically acceptable words. At the time this study
was undertaken, previous investigations (Irvine, Atai &
Oller, 1974; Oller, Baca & Vigil, 1977; Stubbs & Tucker,
1974) had shown high correlations between the two proce-
dures. More recent research, however, tends to be contra-
dictory. Although Streiff's (1978) findings seem to confirm
the previously-cited studies, Alderson (1979, 1980) seems
to suggest that different scoring methods as well as
different deletion rates can produce different correlations.
In addition, Hinofotis (1980, p. 127) found that "on the
basis of the standard deviations and reliability coeffi-
cients, ... the acceptable-word scoring method provides
more accurate information about ESL proficiency levels".

5. Dictation test. The dictation test (see Appendix F for a copy of the passage) has a reading ease score of 46 (difficult) and contains language similar to that found in academic magazines (following Flesch, 1948). According to Fry's readability graph (1977), it represents a grade-eleven-level text for native speakers of English.

The dictation test was administered as follows. First, the passage was read _in toto_ at normal conversational speed while the subjects listened but did not write. Each sentence was then read twice. Pauses were inserted at natural breaks and punctuation was supplied. Finally, the passage was read again in its entirety so that the subjects might check their work. When scoring the dictation, the researcher counted two points for each correctly sequenced content word and one point for each correctly sequenced function word. The rationale behind this procedure is that content words ordinarily carry more semantic thrust than function words. Punctuation and spelling errors were not counted unless they involved the distortion of word morphology or pronunciation (Johansson, 1973; Whitaker, 1976; Oller, 1979)

as for example in the writing of "mail" for "mall", "you" for "youth", "greasy" for "gressy" "it's" for "its". The maximum possible score for the dictation was 220.

Statistical Procedures

The purpose of this study is to determine the best predictors of the English language proficiency of the participants in the LSU immersion program. Proficiency, in this instance, is defined as the results of each of the five proficiency criteria variables; each test will be predicted separately. In order to do so, a multiple regression analysis was performed. This particular technique was chosen because of its ability to select the minimum number of predictor variables which significantly account for the maximum amount of variance of the proficiency criterion variables. In addition, it is well suited to deal with more than one independent variable at a time as well as handle continuous variables i.e., those which express gradations by indicating differences in quantity or degree (Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973). It should be pointed out that all nine independent variables in this investigation can be termed continuous.

A stepwise solution was used since the researcher was primarily concerned with optimal prediction and consequently did not establish an a priori hierarchy for entering the predictor variables into the regression equation. In this instance, as Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973, p. 98) indicate: "the order of entering the variables does not matter". Instead, the criteria for selection of the best predictors was the statistical significance of an independent variable's F-ratio for both entry into and removal from the regression equation, the increment of the variance it accounted for in each of the five dependent variables and finally, the meaningfulness of its contribution (following Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973, pp. 291, 327; Nunnally, 1978, pp. 185-187).

Let us now briefly consider the stepwise solution. In the first step, the predictor variable which has the highest correlation (multiple R) with the dependent variable and which has a significant F-ratio is found. Here, multiple R (which ranges from 0 to 1.00) can be treated as simple r (which ranges from -1.00 through 0 to +1.00) because it is not a cumulative coefficient as are the others. In each succeeding step, the variable accounting for the largest amount of variance (change in R^2) is entered,

always on the condition that it has a significant F-ratio
("F to enter"). This variable is the one that has the
highest partial correlation of all the variables not in
the equation in the preceding step. F-ratios ("F to remove")
are again calculated to determine the significance of each
other variable already in the equation following entry of
the last variable into the equation. If the variable is
not significant, it is removed. "The analysis is terminated
when no variable not in the equation has an 'F to enter'
that exceeds the pre-specified F for entering and no vari-
able in the equation has an 'F to remove' smaller than the
pre-specified F for removal" (Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973,
p. 291).

Statistical significance, however, is not the only
reason for keeping a predictor variable. The researcher
must also decide whether or not the significant variable
is meaningful as well. If the variable is not meaningful
but merely trivial, then the researcher may discard it.
This decision rests upon the researcher in accordance with
the objectives of the study in question. For the purposes
of this study, a meaningful predictor variable is one which
contributes more than 10% of additional variance to the
explanation of a proficiency criterion measure.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The research question addressed in Chapter I of this thesis is: what are the best overall predictors of the English language proficiency of the participants in the LSU immersion program? In order to answer this question, the relationship between the predictor variables and second language competency must be examined not only in terms of their statistical significance but also in terms of their meaning and importance. Can any of the independent measures alone or any combination of these measures be used to predict a relatively accurate picture of language proficiency?

Summary Statistics

The means and standard deviations were calculated for the proficiency criteria data. Since the maximum scores were different for each test, it was necessary to convert them into standard form i.e., to find Z scores which, while providing a linear transformation, leave the shape of the score distribution unchanged (Nunnally, p. 121). Reliabil-

ity estimates were also obtained by applying the Kuder-Richardson formula 21 (Ary, Jacobs & Razavich, 1979). The results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4

Summary Statistics for Proficiency Tests

Test	No.[a]	Mean	SD	K-R 21
MTAC	90	65.72	12.97	.90
MTELP	100	61.40	15.43	.91
P-R	50	39.96	8.17	.90
Cloze	25	15.09	4.09	.67
Dictation	220	163.94	35.88	.97

Note. MTAC (Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension).
MTELP (Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency).
P-R (Paraphrase-Recognition Test).

Note. $n = 67$ for each test.

[a]Maximum score for each test.

[b]The K-R 21 formula assumes item independence and, consequently, the reliability estimate for the dictation is being overestimated.

As the standard deviations indicate, the scores on all the tests reveal good variability. Reliability estimates are high with the exception of the cloze test. Its modest reliability coefficient suggests that the test was perhaps unsuitable to the subjects' levels of proficiency or insufficient in length. Although the passage can be considered easy (following Flesch, 1948) and represents a grade-four-level text for native speakers (following Fry, 1977), the mean score is 15.09 (60.36%). In addition, it would appear that the subjects' wide range of academic TESL training (0 - 1350 hours) had an effect upon the distribution of scores.

Correlation Coefficients

Proficiency criterion variables. In order to specify the degree of relationship among the proficiency tests themselves, Pearson product-moment correlations were calculated among all dependent variables. As Table 5 illustrates, these coefficients indicate that the five test instruments measure, to a large extent, similar language skills. The relationships between the cloze test and the other measures were the weakest recorded, a probable result of the low reliability of the cloze test itself.

Table 5

Intercorrelations: Proficiency Criterion Variables

Test	MTAC	MTELP	P-R	Cloze	Dictation
MTAC		.8054	.8178	.6631	.7884
MTELP			.8237	.7203	.8107
P-R				.7209	.8677
Cloze					.7534
Dictation					

Note. MTAC (Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension).
MTELP (Michigan Test of English Language
Proficiency).
P-R (Paraphrase-Recognition Test).

Note. $p < .05$ for all correlations.

Note. n = 67 for each correlation.

Predictor variables. Table 6 indicates the degree
of relationship which exists among the predictor, or in-
dependent, variables. In general, the results reveal
consistently low or insignificant correlations with the
exceptions of .7402 (speaking and writing tasks) and .6928
(self-ratings of listening and speaking abilities). Two
modest correlations are also recorded: .5319 (self-ratings
of listening and reading abilities) and .5228 (self-rating
of reading ability and speaking task). This is a fortuitous

Table 6

Intercorrelations: Predictor Variables

Variables	Age	S-R L	S-R S	S-R R	S-R W	EXP	TT	ST	WT
Age		.0956	-.1101	.0788	-.1322	.3525	.1177	.0142	-.0345
S-R L			.6928	.5319	.3388	-.1689	-.3108	.4716	.2535
S-R S				.3806	.2243	-.2611	-.1647	.4886	.3521
S-R R					.6163	-.1801	-.3071	.5228	.3986
S-R W						-.4223	-.1877	.3691	.4959
EXP							.1660	-.2166	-.2419
TT								-.2470	-.3831
ST									.7402
WT									

Note. S-R L (Self-rating of listening ability); S-R S (Self-rating of speaking ability); S-R R (self-rating of reading ability); S-R W (Self-rating of writing ability); EXP (Years of ESL teaching experience); TT (Academic TESL training); ST (Speaking task); WT (Writing task).

Note. For $r \geq .24$; $p < .05$.

Note. $n = 67$ for each correlation.

result because it becomes difficult to account for the variance in the dependent variables in an unambiguous manner when the independent variables are substantially intercorrelated (Darlington, 1968; Goldberger, 1964; Kerlinger & Pedhazur, 1973).

Predictor and proficiency criterion variables. Table 7 reveals the degree of relationship between the predictor and the proficiency variables. The rating scale for the self-reports ranged from one (excellent) to five (nil): the grades assigned to the speaking and writing tasks ranged from two (A) to 11 (D). In other words, the lower the numerical rating, the higher the self-evaluation and the grades on the speaking and writing tasks. These scoring procedures resulted in negative correlations in spite of the fact that the relationships of the self-ratings, the speaking task and the writing task with the proficiency variables were positive. Therefore, in order to avoid any misinterpretation of Table 7, the signs for these correlations have been reflected in order to show the actual positive relationships. In general, the correlation coefficients show low or insignificant relationships between the independent and dependent variables. Six (13%) of the

Table 7

Intercorrelations: Predictor and
Proficiency Criterion Variables

Predictor Variables	MTAC	MTELP	P-R	Cloze	Dictation
Age	.0644	.1271	.0067	.0086	.0634
S-R L*	.3727	.3248	.3668	.3358	.3992
S-R S*	.3790	.2879	.3201	.2816	.3472
S-R R*	.3613	.5497	.4730	.4324	.4730
S-R W*	.2170	.3593	.2911	.2563	.3244
EXP	.1749	.2262	.2311	.1610	.2811
TT	.3101	.3893	.2702	.2392	.3511
ST*	.7402	.7308	.7286	.6235	.6896
WT*	.5849	.6295	.5252	.4483	.6035

Note. S-R L (Self-rating of listening ability).
S-R S (Self-rating of speaking ability).
S-R R (Self-rating of reading ability).
S-R W (Self-rating of writing ability).
EXP (Years of ESL teaching experience).
TT (Academic TESL training).
ST (Speaking task).
WT (Writing task).
MTAC (Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension).
MTELP (Michigan Test of English Language
Proficiency).
P-R (Paraphrase-Recognition Test).

Note. For $r > .24$; $p < .05$.

Note. $n = 67$ for each correlation.

* Negative signs reflected.

45 coefficients indicate modest relationships. The self-report of reading ability accounted for 30% of the variance in the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency. Thirty-eight per cent of the variance in the scores of the cloze test was explained by the speaking task. The writing task accounted for 40% of the variance in the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, 36% in the dictation test, 34% in the Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension and 28% in the paraphrase-recognition test.

Four (9%) of the coefficients reveal stronger relationships. The speaking task alone explained 55% of the variance in the Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension, 53% in the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, 53% in the paraphrase-recognition test and 48% in the dictation test.

Regression Analyses

Separate multiple stepwise regression analyses were carried out for each of the criterion measures. As stated in Chapter III of this study, this type of operation allows for a close examination of the relationship between a dependent, or criterion, variable, and a set of independent,

or predictor, variables. At this point, it is important
to mention certain principles underlying multiple correla-
tions. As explained by Nunnally (1978): (1) a strong
relationship between an independent and dependent variable
tends to result in a high R; (2) R will not be less than
the highest correlation obtained between the dependent
variable and any one of the independent variables; (3) low
correlations among the independent variables themselves
will produce a larger R; (4) R reveals estimates which
zero-order correlations are often incapable of and (5) the
number of predictor variables does not greatly increase R.
Bearing these principles in mind, let us now examine the
results of the regression analyses.

Table 8 shows that three independent variables i.e.,
the speaking task, the writing task and the self-report
of writing ability are significant predictors of the
Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension. Of these, however,
only the speaking task contributes meaningful variance
(55%).

Table 8

Multiple Stepwise Regression of the Michigan Test of
Aural Comprehension and the Predictor Variables

Predictor Variables	Step	Multiple R	RSQ	Increase RSQ	F Value to enter	df
ST	1	.7402	.5478	.5478	78.7568	1, 65
WT	2	.7725	.5967	.0489	7.7568	2, 64
S-R W	3	.7881	.6210	.0243	4.0425	3, 63

Note.   ST (Speaking task).
        WT (Writing task).
        S-R W (Self-rating of writing ability).
        RSQ = R square

Note.   All F values are significant at $p < .05$ level.

With regard to the Michigan Test of English Language
Proficiency, Table 9 reveals that seven of the nine inde-
pendent variables are significant predictors. Taken to-
gether they explain 70% of the variance in the criterion
measure, although the speaking task alone accounts for 53%
of the total variance.

The data in Table 10 indicate that only the speaking
task and the writing task emerge as significant predictors
of the paraphrase-recognition test. As was the case for the

Table 9

Multiple Stepwise Regression of the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency and the Predictor Variables

Predictor Variables	Step	Multiple R	RSQ	Increase RSQ	F Value to Enter	df
ST	1	.7308	.5340	.5340	74.4968	1, 65
WT	2	.7826	.6125	.0784	12.9494	2, 64
S-R R	3	.7956	.6329	.0204	3.5095	3, 63
Age	4	.8074	.6518	.0189	3.3733	4, 62
S-R S	5	.8226	.6766	.0248	4.6758	5, 61
TT	6	.8332	.6942	.0176	3.4469	6, 60
S-R W	7	.8373	.7011	.0069	1.3596	7, 59

Note. ST (Speaking task).
WT (Writing task).
S-R R (Self-rating of reading ability).
S-R S (Self-rating of speaking ability).
TT (Academic TESL Training).
S-R W (Self-rating of writing ability).

Note. All F values are significant at $p < .05$ level.

Note. RSQ = R square.

Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension, the amount of variance explained by the speaking task (53%) is meaningful whereas that contributed by the writing task is too small to be so considered.

Table 10

Multiple Stepwise Regression of the Paraphrase-Recognition Test and the Predictor Variables

Predictor Variables	Step	Multiple R	RSQ	Increase RSQ	F Value to Enter	df
Speaking Task	1	.7286	.5308	.5308	73.5468	1, 65
Writing Task	2	.7455	.5557	.0249	3.5821	2, 64

Note. All F values are significant at $p < .05$ level.
Note. RSQ = R square.

With the exception of the speaking task, none of the other predictor variables contributed significantly to the explanation of the criterion cloze measure. As Table 11 illustrates, it explained 39% of the variance in the test instrument.

Table 12 shows that both the speaking task and the writing task are significant predictors of the dictation test and together explain 55% of the variance in the measure. Again however, the variance accounted for by the writing task is too small (8%) to be considered meaningful.

Table 11

Multiple Stepwise Regression of the Cloze Test
and the Predictor Variables

Predictor Variable	Step	Multiple R	RSQ	Increase RSQ	F Value to Enter	df
Speaking Task	1	.6235	.3887	.3887	41.3378	1, 65

Note. All F values are significant at $p < .05$ level.

Note. $RSQ = R^2$

Table 12

Multiple Stepwise Regression of the Dictation
Test and the Predictor Variables

Predictor Variables	Step	Multiple R	RSQ	Increase RSQ	F Value to Enter	df
Speaking Task	1	.6896	.4756	.4756	58.9488	1, 65
Writing Task	2	.7426	.5514	.0759	10.8230	2, 64

Note. All F values are significant at $p < .05$ level.

Note. $RSQ = R^2$

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This thesis investigated the role of nine learner
variables in predicting the English language proficiency
of 67 French-speaking participants in a short-term English
language immersion program held at Louisiana State Univer-
sity in 1978. The sample population were elementary and
secondary ESL teachers possessing a wide range of second
language abilities, academic TESL training and years of
ESL teaching experience. The principal concern of the
investigation was whether the learner variables which
figured prominently in the selection and placement proce-
dures of the immersion program were adequate predictive
measures of second language proficiency i.e., the results
of the five criterion measures used in this study.

As shown in Table 5, a substantial relationship exists
among the test instruments themselves which supposes that,
in general, they measure similar language skills. In addi-
tion, the standard deviations recorded in Table 4 indicate
that these measures effectively discriminated among the pro-

ficiency levels of the subjects. The one possible exception is the cloze test which proved to be the least reliable of all the measures. Low reliability is suggested by Oller (1979) as one of the factors which may produce low correlations.

The research question was specifically concerned with finding the best overall predictor of the English language proficiency of the participants in the LSU immersion program. Since the researcher was interested in both the statistical significance and meaningfulness of the predictor variables, correlation and regression analyses were performed in order to determine which of these measures alone or which combination of these measures could be used to present an adequate view of language competency. The research hypothesis was that academic TESL training and years of ESL teaching experience would be the best indicators because the TESL and/or ESL classroom offers non-native English speakers in a french environment an opportunity for exposure to and use of the target language on a regular basis. The data presented in Chapter IV of this thesis do not support this hypothesis.

Interpretation of the Findings

The speaking task emerged as the best overall pre-
dictor of language proficiency. Alone, it explained the
following percentages of variance in the five dependent
variables: (1) 54.78% in the Michigan Test of Aural Compre-
hension; (2) 53.40% in the Michigan Test of English Lan-
guage Proficiency; (3) 53.08% in the paraphrase-recognition
test; (4) 38.87% in the cloze test and (5) 47.56% in the
dictation test. The simple correlations between this
task and all the proficiency measures range from .6896
to .7402. Since they are substantial, the results are
hardly surprising. As Nunnally (1978) contends, a high R
is to be expected under these circumstances. The speaking
task, therefore, revealed itself to be a significant and
meaningful tool with regard to predicting second language
competency.

The writing task also explained a significant addi-
tional amount of variance in every dependent variable
except the cloze test. The largest amount was 7.84% in
the scores on the Michigan Test of English Language Profi-
ciency. In spite of its statistical significance, the
researcher views it as an unimportant predictor because the
time needed to perform and grade the task is unproportional
to the amount of additional variance it explains.

In a simple correlational analysis, the writing task would have assumed more importance than is warranted. Because of its fairly strong relationship with four of the five dependent measures (Table 7)., the task accounted for 34.21% of the variance in the scores of the Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension, 39.62% in the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, 27.58% in the paraphrase-recognition test and 36.42% in the dictation test. Yet the regression analyses show that its contribution is greatly decreased when it is entered into the equation along with the speaking task. The amount of additional variance explained is reduced to 4.89%, 7.84%, 2.49% and 7.59% respectively.

The simple correlation between the speaking task and the writing task is strong (.7402), but the speaking task correlated more highly with the criterion measures and served more adequately as a predictor. Nevertheless, the marked relationship between the two tasks is a serious problem in respect to the interpretation of the data. As already mentioned, Darlington (1968), Goldberger (1964), Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973) and Nunnally (1978) argue that such substantial relationships render unambiguous explanations of the variance almost impossible. In other

words, in the presence of highly intercorrelated pre-
dictor variables, it is difficult to untangle the inde-
pendent contribution of each predictor to the variance
(Darlington, 1968).

In addition to the speaking and writing tasks, five
other learner variables likewise proved significant. For
the Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension, the self-report
of writing ability accounted for 2.43% of the variance.
For the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency, the
self-report of reading ability, age, the self-report of
speaking ability, TESL training and the self-report of
writing ability were significant predictors, explaining an
additional 2.04%, 1.89%, 2.48%, 1.76% and 0.69% of the
common variance respectively. Despite their statistical
significance, their contribution is trivial because the
amount of additional variance accounted for by each measure
is too small to be meaningful.

The low simple correlations between the self-ratings
and the proficiency measures support the findings of
previous studies (Chihara & Oller, 1978; Gardner & Lambert,
1972; Murakami, 1980; Oller et al., 1977) which showed
little or no relationship between self-evaluations of

of language skills and language proficiency. The one
possible exception is the .5497 simple correlation re-
corded between the self-report of reading ability and
the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency,

Summary

The hypothesis that academic TESL training and years
of ESL teaching experience are adequate predictors of
second language proficiency was not supported by the data
gathered in this study. Formal study emerged as a signif-
icant predictor for only one of the proficiency measures,
the Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency. Explain-
ing 1.76% of the variance in the scores, it can scarcely
be treated as a meaningful measure. In fact, the highest
simple correlation recorded between academic TESL training
and any of the criteria variables was .3893.

These results support previous findings (Carroll, 1967;
Chihara & Oller, 1978; Saegert et al., 1974) which showed
that formal study was significantly but not very impor-
tantly related to second language competency. Nonetheless,
this conclusion must be treated prudently because, as in
the case of Saegart et al., no data was amassed on the

quality of instruction, the number of hours of formal study per week or the time interval between classes. In addition, no information was obtained on whether the TESL courses followed by the subjects were conducted in English or in the subjects' native language.

With regard to years of ESL teaching experience, the highest simple correlation between this predictor and any of the proficiency variables never exceeded .2811. As the results of the regression analyses show, ESL teaching experience was not a significant predictor; indeed, this variable was never entered into the equations because of an insufficient F level.

To this researcher's knowledge, no studies have been conducted which include this particular variable as a predictive measure and, consequently, no comparisons can be made. It can only be suggested that, based on this investigation, years of ESL teaching experience is at best a weak indicator of English proficiency. It should be pointed out, however, that no data was accumulated on whether the subjects actually conducted their ESL courses entirely in English or on the extent to which French was used as the language of instruction.

In sum, the speaking task seems to be the best overall predictor for each of the dependent variables studied in this investigation. Perhaps the research hypothesis was unconfirmed because this task is a robust, global, integrative instrument which taps an underlying general language competence. Simply put, academic TESL training and years of ESL teaching experience do not necessarily entail the integrative use of language as the speaking task appears to do. At any rate, of the nine learner variables used in conjunction with the 1978 LSU immersion program, this task alone served adequately as a predictive measure.

Suggestions for Future Study

The findings of this investigation should be treated prudently, particularly in light of the strong intercorrelation between two of the predictor variables viz., the speaking task and the writing task. The results would have been more conclusive if other methods such as factor or commonality analysis had been used along with regression analysis to try to untangle the effects of the learner variables on the proficiency measures.

Furthermore, the small sample size does not allow
for the generalizability of the findings to different
situations. One of the weaknesses inherent in multiple
regression concerns the reliability of the regression
weights. As Kerlinger and Pedhazur (1973) point out,
regression coefficients tend to fluctuate in the presence
of different samples and to have large margins of standard
error. It would be necessary to replicate the study with
a minumum of 100 different subjects in a different place.
The subjects should also be as representative as possible.
Since R^2 is usually overestimated, a large, representative
sample would help reduce the bias.

REFERENCES

Acheson, P., d'Anglejan, A., de Bagheera, Y., & Tucker, R. English as the second language in Quebec: A teacher profile. McGill Journal of Education, 1978, (13), 189-198.

Alderson, J.C. Native and nonnative speaker performance on cloze tests. Language Learning, 1980, 30(1), 59-76.

Alderson, J.C. The cloze procedure and proficiency in English as a foreign language. TESOL Quarterly, 1979, 13(2), 219-227.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavich, A. Introduction to research in education. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1979.

Carroll, J.B. Foreign language proficiency levels attained by language majors near graduation from college. Foreign Language Annals, 1967, 1(2), 131-151.

Chihara, T., & Oller, J.W. Jr. Attitudes and attained proficiency in EFL: A sociolinguistic study of adult Japanese speakers. Language Learning, 1978, 28(1), 55-68.

Clark, J.L.D. Foreign language testing: Theory and practice. Philadelphia: The Center for Curriculum Development, 1972.

Clarke, S.O. The correlation between aptitude scores and achievement measures in Japanese and German. In Oller & Perkins, 1980.

Darlington, R.B. Multiple regression in psychological research and practice. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 69, 161-182.

Dieterich, T.G., Freeman, C., & Crandall, J. A linguistic analysis of some English proficiency tests. TESOL Quarterly, 1979, 13(4), 535-550.

Flesch, R. A new readability yardstick. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1948, 32(3), 221-233.

Frith, M. ESL in a changing society: A plea for developing "useable competency" during the next decade and beyond. SPEAQ Journal, 1979, 3(1-2), 9-23.

Fry, E. Fry's readability graph: Clarification, validity and extension to level 17. Journal of Reading, December, 1977, 20, 242-252.

Gardner, R.C., & Lambert, W.E. Attitudes and motivation in second language learning. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1972.

Gardner, R.C., Smythe, P.C., & Brunet, G.R. Intensive second language study: Effects on attitudes, motivation and French achievement. Language Learning, 1977, 27(2), 243-261.

Georgeault, P., & Danan, M. Description de la situation de l'enseignement des langues secondes, anglais langue seconde et français langue seconde, telle que perçue par les commissions scolaires. Québec: Ministère de l'Education, 1977.

Goldberger, A.S. Econometric theory. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Harris, D.P. Testing English as a second language. New York: McGraw Hill, 1969.

Hatch, E. (Ed.). Second language acquisition: A book of readings. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1978.

Hinofotis, F.B. Cloze as an alternative method of ESL placement and proficiency testing. In Oller & Perkins, 1980.

Hopkins, M.F. Experimental reading passage, n.d.

Irvine, P., Atai, P., & Oller, J.W. Jr. Cloze, dictation and the test of English as a foreign language. Language Learning, 24(2), 245-252.

Johansson, S. Partial dictation as a test of foreign language proficiency. Swedish-English Contrastive Studies Report Number 3 (Department of English, Lund University, 1973).

Kerlinger, F.N., & Pedhazur, E.J. Multiple regression in behavioral research. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973.

Krashen, S.D. Formal and informal linguistic environments in language acquisition and language learning. TESOL Quarterly, 1976, 10(2), 157-168.

Krashen, S.D., Jones, C.M., Zelinski, S.J., & Usprich, C. How important is instruction? English Language Teaching Journal, 1978, 32(4), 257-261.

Lenneberg, E. Biological foundations of language. New York: Wiley, 1967.

Monshi-Tousi, M., Hosseine-Fatemi, A., & Oller, J.W. Jr. English proficiency and factors in its attainment: A case study of Iranians in the United States. TESOL Quarterly, 1980, 14(3), 365-372.

Murakami, M. Behavioral and attitudinal correlates of progress in ESL by native speakers of Japanese. In Oller & Perkins, 1980.

National Assembly of Quebec. Bill No. 22. Official Language Act. Quebec: Quebec Official Publisher, 1974.

Neufeld, G.G. On the adult's ability to acquire phonology. TESOL Quarterly, 1980, 14(3), 285-298.

Nunnally, J.C. Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). Toronto: McGraw Hill, 1978.

Oller, J.W., Jr. Language tests at school. London: Longman, 1979.

Oller, J.W., Jr., Baca, L., & Vigil, F. Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: A sociolinguistic study of Mexican Americans in the southwest. TESOL Quarterly, 1977, 11(2), 173-183.

Oller, J.W. Jr., Hudson, A.J., & Liu, P.F. Attitudes and attained proficiency in ESL: A sociolinguistic study of native speakers of Chinese in the United States. Language Learning, 1977, 27(1), 1-23.

Oller, J.W. Jr., & Perkins, K. (Eds.). Research in language testing. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1980.

Oller, J.W. Jr., & Perkins, K. (Eds.). Language in education: Testing the tests. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House, 1978.

Oller, J.W. Jr., Perkins, K., & Murakami, M. Seven types of learner variables in relation to ESL learning. In Oller & Perkins, 1980.

Oyama, S. A sensitive period for the acquisition of a non-native phonological system. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 1976, 5, 261-285.

Patkowski, M.S. The sensitive period for the acquisition of syntax in a second language. Language Learning, 1980, 30(2), 449-472.

Penfield, W., & Roberts, L. Speech and brain-mechanisms. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Perkins, K. Experimental cloze test. n.d.

Perkins, K. Experimental dictation test. n.d.

Perkins, K., & Yorio, C. Paraphrase-recognition test. n.d.

Peterson, J., Upshur, J., Palmer, A.S., Spaan, M.V., & Staff. Michigan Test of English Language Proficiency (Form G). Ann Arbor, Mich.: English Language Institute, The University of Michigan, 1968.

Saegert, J., Scott, S., Perkins, J., & Tucker, R. A note on the relationship between English proficiency, years of study and medium of instruction. Language Learning, 1974, 24(1), 99-104.

Sheen, R. ESL in Quebec: An overview of the problems and some suggested solutions. SPEAQ Journal, 1978, 2(1), 5-19.

Snow, C.E., & Hoefnagel-Höhle, M. Age differences in second language acquisition. In Hatch, 1978.

Streiff, V. Relationships among oral and written cloze scores and achievement test scores in a bilingual setting. In Oller & Perkins, 1978.

Stubbs, J.B., & Tucker, G.R. The cloze test as a measure of English proficiency. Modern Language Journal, 1974, 58, 239-242.

Taylor, W.L. Cloze procedure: A new tool for measuring readability. Journalism Quarterly, 1953, 30, 415-433.

Upshur, J. Four experiments on the relation between foreign language teaching and learning. Language Learning, 1968, 18(1-2), 111-124.

Upshur, J., Spaan, M.W., & Thrasher, R. Michigan Test of Aural Comprehension. Ann Arbor, Mich.: English Language Institute, The University of Michigan, 1969.

Whitaker, S.F. What is the status of dictation? Audio Visual Journal, 1976, 14, 87-93.

White, S., Daigle, M., Dozois, G., Langlois, R., Pelletier, L., & Cusson, J. Rapport du comité d'étude de l'enseignement des langues secondes. Québec: Ministère de l'Education, 1976.

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LA DIRECTION GENERALE DU DEVELOPPEMENT PEDAGOGIQUE
SERVICE DE RECHERCHE ET EXPERIMENTATION

Stage en Louisiane
Eté 1978

FICHE D'INSCRIPTION

1. Commission Scolaire: _____

           Adresse: _____

                    _____

2. Nom et prénom du
   candidat   : _____

           Adresse : _____

                    _____

   Numéro de téléphone
         à l'école: _____

     à la résidence: _____

   Etat civil   : _____

   Date de naissance : _____

3. Fonction   : _____

   Niveau d'enseigne-
   ment   : _____

   Dernier brevet d'en-
   seignement obtenu : _____

Nombre d'années
de service   :

	PRIMAIRE	SECONDAIRE
– en général		
– en enseigne- ment de l'an- glais, langue seconde		

Les renseignements suivants permettront un meilleur classe-
ment et une meilleure planification des cours.

4. Avez-vous déjà suivi des cours de perfectionnement en
   vue d'améliorer votre connaissance de la langue anglaise?

   Non   Oui

   Veuillez joindre une copie des relevés de notes ou
   attestations.

   Spéficifer:

INSTITUTION	DIPLOME OU CERTI-FICAT OBTENU	DUREE	ANNEE

5. Avez-vous déjà participé à des expériences d'immersion en langue anglaise? (Exemple: vie dans une famille anglophone, travail dans un milieu anglophone).

Spéficier: _____

_____

_____

6. Comment évaluez-vous votre compétence en langue anglaise?

Compréhension orale   ☐

Expression orale   ☐

Compréhension écrite   ☐

Expression écrite   ☐

Grille d'évaluation: 1.   Excellent
   2.   Très bien
   3.   Bien
   4.   Faible
   5.   Nul

7. Quelles sont les raisons qui vous portent à poser votre candidature?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Date: _____

_____
Signature

Veuillez retourner cette fiche à votre commission scolaire qui la retournera à la Direction générale du Développement pédagogique.

APPENDIX B

1978 LSU IMMERSION PROGRAM
COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

Group A - Advanced

SPEECH 1051

The purpose of this course is to provide a sophisti-
cated understanding of the sound system of the language,
theory of and experience in various kinds of speech per-
formances, and improved facility in discussing abstract,
philosophical subjects.

Class/lectures present all the sounds and symbols of
common American English, stress, kinds of modulation and
offer detailed information of some of the segmental sounds,
especially those that do not occur in French and those
that are similar to but not identical with French seg-
mental sounds. Regular drills in aural discrimination
supplement the lecture. Theory and some limited practice
with stress and intonation are included.

Lectures and class discussions offer some theory
behind the following speech activities: problem-solving

discussions, making speeches and analyzing characters in
literature. During class, the members participate in dis-
cussions, give speeches and make reports.

One requirement for the course is participation in
an extra-class activity such as writing a newspaper, pre-
paring a sight-and-sound show, rehearsing and performing
a short story, or preparing manuals of information. Except
for an initial informational meeting, this work is done
outside of class.

Field trips offer experience in the use of English
and also provide insights into contemporary life in the
area.

ENGLISH 2025

The purpose of this course is to provide a general
introduction to the study and appreciation of fiction.
Special emphasis is placed on the works of Faulkner,
Hemingway, Steinbeck, Anderson, Porter, Welty and Aiken
as well as on English translations of selected short
stories of de Maupassant and Turgenev. In the reading and
analysis of the short stories and the novels, attention
is given to vocabulary, idiom and pronunciation.

1978 LSU IMMERSION PROGRAM
COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

Group B - High Intermediate

SPEECH 1051

The purpose of this course is to provide a sophisti-
cated understanding of the sound system of the language,
theory of and experience in various kinds of speech per-
formances, and improved facility in discussing abstract,
philosophical subjects.

Class lectures present all the sounds and symbols of
common American English, stress kinds of modulation and
offer detailed information on some of the segmental sounds,
especially those that do not occur in French and those
that are similar to but not identical with French segmental
sounds. Regular drills in aural discrimination supplement
the lecture. Theory and some limited practice with stress
and intonation are included.

Lectures and class discussions offer some theory
behind the following speech activities: problem-solving

discussions, making speeches and analyzing characters in literature. During class, the members participate in discussions, give speeches and make reports.

One requirement for the course is participation in an extra-class activity such as writing a newspaper, preparing a sight-and-sound show, rehearsing and performing a short story, or preparing manuals of information. Except for an initial informational meeting, this work is done outside of class.

Field trips offer experience in the use of English and also provide insights into contemporary life in the area.

ENGLISH 2025

English 2025, as designed for high intermediates in the program, focuses on two particular areas of study: short fiction and composition. Nine short stories by representative American writer e.g., Williams, Hemingway, Thurber, Jackson, White and Stuart, are assigned for their portrayal of a wide range of American culture and for the opportunities they afford for increased reading comprehension and practice in literary interpretation.

Students are required to write three short papers
on topics dealing with plot, characterization or style in
the stories. The purpose of these assignments is to en-
courage the student to develop further his skills in clear
and idiomatic written expression and to guide him to a
deeper understanding of the stories. Other class activi-
ties include idiom drills, dramatization of three of the
stories and field trips to points of interest on campus
and in the city.

1978 LSU IMMERSION PROGRAM
COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

Group C - Low Intermediate

SPEECH 1051

Designed to improve listening and speaking abilities,
the course covers theory and practice of pronunciation.
Attention is given to phonetics, stress, intonation and
rhythm through lecture and practice drills. Daily work in
the language laboratory reinforces these skills.

Communicative competence and fluency are developed in
small group sessions led by the instructor who alternates
daily with a graduate assistant. Included are interpersonal
communication exercises, problem-solving discussion, idiom
exchanges, improvised dialogues and role-playing. Indivi-
dual oral presentations are given each week: reports,
demonstrations, informative speeches and oral interpreta-
tion of poetry, prose, or scenes from plays. Students choose
their own topics, to allow flexibility for special interests
and needs.

Weekly field trips after class hours supply cultural insights and additional stimulation for conversation.

ENGLISH 1005

Students in English 1005, a course in composition and grammar review, are held responsible for material covered in three principal areas: vocabulary building and development, reading and listening comprehension and writing skills development and composition. Daily work involved oral drills with idioms as well as exercises in grammar review and usage. Additionally, students read and discuss both content and vocabulary in stories taken from the reader as well as articles from local newspapers. Three out-of-class compositions of approximately 500 words each are required and weekly quizzes covering vocabulary and grammar are given.

1978 LSU IMMERSION PROGRAM
COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

Group D - Beginners

SPEECH 1051

The objectives of this course, especially designed
to meet the needs of native speakers of French, include
improvement of aural comprehension, pronunciation, fluency
and communicative competence in spoken English.

Brief lectures, explanations of theory, demonstrations,
listening and speaking exercises, and drills are used to work
on target phonemes and such aspects of rhythm as stress and
intonation. To develop communicative abilities, students
participate in role plays and dialogue exercises, in struc-
tured discussions and conversations, and in other activities.
Most classwork is done in small groups which are led by the
instructor or a teaching assistant. Daily laboratory work
reinforces material presented in class.

Occasional weekday field trips provide cultural in-
sights as well as opportunities for realistic communication
and subject matter for in-class discussions.

ENGLISH 1004

English 1004 is primarily a course in listening com-
prehension. Its aims are to help the student increase
his listening comprehension, to promote expansion of his
vocabulary and to improve his reading skills. The course
consists of brief reading assignments which prepare the
student for a lecture in class, dictation of key words to
be used in the lecture, repeated delivery of the lecture
while the students use auding prompts (word-for-word scripts
with words which the student must learn to ignore masked),
note-taking and tests on the lectures. In addition to the
training in listening comprehension, the course provides
idiom drills, grammar lessons in basic English usage, and
field trips to places of interest on campus and in the
city.

APPENDIX C

READING PASSAGE

"I wonder why they don't answer," thought Jane as she listened to the ring on the other end of the line. "It's only eight thirty. That steakhouse should be open now."

Just then Marge entered from her room next door. "Who are you calling?" she asked, as Jane hung up the receiver. "I didn't mean to interrupt."

"It's OK," said Jane. "I was just hungry and thought I might go out for a hamburger, but that steakhouse across the street doesn't answer. They shouldn't be closed this early, though. It's only half past eight." She started to dial again but thought better of it. "Maybe we could go to that hot dog stand on the corner. You hungry?"

Marge paused before replying, as if she were not sure whether she were hungry or not. "I guess so. I can finish all my homework afterward. I still have to read about aphasia, cleft palate, and stuttering for that quiz tomorrow. It's pretty interesting, though."

"Yeah, that's a pretty good course, isn't it," said Jane in full agreement. "I enjoyed it last summer. Too many tests, but an interesting course. How long before you'll be ready to go?"

"Just a few more minutes." Marge ducked out the door, leaving Jane to gather up her purse and keys and jacket. She looked quickly in her wallet to be sure she had some money.

"If Bill calls while I'm out, I'll miss him," she mused. "But he'll call back. And he didn't promise to call anyway. Just said he might, which is sort of a mess. I wish he would commit himself to something, either to call or not. This wishy-washy attitude is too much".

She stopped and thought a minute. "Do I have everything? I have my driver's license, money, and keys. That's it."

Marge met her in the hall. "Do you want a hot dog or a sandwich?" she asked. "That place next to Kraft's makes good sandwiches. And they have milk shakes, tea, coffee, and soft drinks."

"I don't care," said Jane. "Which do you want?"

"Anything's fine with me. I guess it's a good thing we're not particular, isn't it."

And the girls walked past the desk and out the back door.

APPENDIX D

DIRECTIONS:

From the suggested answers (a, b, c, d), choose the one which is similar to the given sentence.

1. The athlete got plenty of rest after the race.

   a. The athlete received a lot of money after the race.
   b. Someone gave the athlete an important gift after the race.
   c. The athlete enjoyed plenty of relaxation after the race.
   d. The athlete became very famous after the race.

2. John should have bought the car.

   a. John bought the car.
   b. John didn't buy the car.
   c. John is going to buy the car.
   d. John should buy the car.

3. Tom was told to turn the lights out before closing the lab.

   a. Somebody told Tom to turn the lights out before closing the lab.
   b. Tom decided to turn the lights out before closing the lab.
   c. Turning the lights out before closing the lab was Tom's idea.
   d. Tom had told somebody to turn the lights out before closing the lab.

4. It's important to remember that every foreign student should be registered with the government by January 31 of each year.

   a. It's not necessary for foreign students to ever register with the government.
   b. All foreign students must register with the government at the beginning of each year, and that's important.
   c. Foreign students should remember that registration with the government is not important.
   d. Foreign students may or may not register with the government by January 31 of each year.

5. The famous singer ended her recital with a folk song.

   a. The first song the famous singer performed was a folk song.

   b. The famous singer began her recital with a folk song.

   c. The famous singer started her recital with a folk song.

   d. The famous singer finished her recital with a folk song.

6. The man took my mother's bag and ran away.

   a. The man gave my mother a bag.

   b. My mother gave the man a bag.

   c. My mother and the man ran away.

   d. My mother had a bag and the man took it.

7. Alice has been a secretary for five years.

   a. Alice was a secretary.

   b. Alice used to be a secretary.

   c. Alice is a secretary.

   d. Alice was never a secretary.

8. If they had had more time, Bob and David would have visited more of their friends in Chicago.

   a. Bob and David didn't visit their friends.

   b. Bob and David visited all of their friends.

   c. Bob and David visited some of their friends.

   d. Bob and David don't have any friends in Chicago.

9. The man promised to tell the truth to the committee.

   a. The man said that he would tell no lies to the committee.

   b. The man said he wouldn't talk to the committee.

   c. The man didn't promise to tell what actually happened.

   d. The man didn't promise to talk to the committee.

10. Sam gave John the book his brother bought him several years ago. Who has the book?

   a. John.

   b. Sam.

   c. Sam's brother.

   d. John's brother.

11. The new textbook has been written by one of the teachers at the Institute.

    a. The Institute wrote the new textbook.
    b. No teacher at the Institute has ever written a textbook.
    c. There is a new textbook and a teacher at the Institute wrote it.
    d. Teachers at the Institute have never written textbooks.

12. That Carlos and Juan got 80 on the proficiency test without studying very much surprised the rest of the class.

    a. Nobody was surprised that Carlos and Juan got 80 on the proficiency test because they had studied a lot.
    b. Carlos and Juan were surprised that they got 80 on the proficiency test because they hadn't studied very hard.
    c. Although Carlos and Juan studied very hard, they were surprised that the rest of the class got 80 on the proficiency test.
    d. Everybody in the class was surprised that Carlos and Juan got 80 on the proficiency test because they had not studied very hard.

13. Our visit to the country was very restful because we had been working very hard.

    a. We were never able to relax in the country.
    b. Our visit to the country was bad for our nerves.
    c. We were very relaxed after our visit to the country because we didn't have to work there.
    d. We were very tired in the country because we had to work there.

14. The house near the shore of the lake was destroyed by the storm last night.

    a. The storm destroyed the shore of the lake last night.
    b. The storm destroyed the house near the lake last night.
    c. The lake destroyed the house near the shore last night.
    d. There was a storm last night and it destroyed the shore of the lake.

15. The judge determined that the report contained an obvious untruth.

    a.   The judge showed that the material in the report was clearly correct.
    b.   The judge didn't prove that the report was true.
    c.   The judge showed the error that the report contained.
    d.   Everybody knew that the report was full of lies except the judge.

16. "Had Tom known they were coming, would he have waited for them?", asked Mary.

    a.   Tom knew they were coming.
    b.   Tom didn't know they were coming.
    c.   Mary is asking if Tom knew they were coming.
    d.   Tom is asking if they were coming.

17. Tom met Jane at his best friend's brother's house. Where did Tom meet Jane?

    a.   At Tom's friend's house.
    b.   At Jane's house.
    c.   At the house of a brother of Tom's friend.
    d.   At Tom's brother's house.

18. The mailman carried the bag which contained the letters.

    a.   The mailman had a bag; there were no letters in it.
    b.   The mailman carried the letters in a bag.
    c.   The mailman carried an empty bag.
    d.   The mailman carried the letters in his hand.

19. Tom did his homework and Mary did too.

    a.   Tom did his homework but Mary didn't.
    b.   Tom did not do his homework but Mary didn't.
    c.   Tom did his homework and Mary did hers.
    d.   Tom didn't do his homework and Mary didn't either.

20. "Never will I repeat a thing like that", said Alice to her parents.

    a.   Alice is making a promise to her parents.
    b.   Alice is asking her parents a question.
    c.   Alice's parents are asking her a question.
    d.   Alice's parents are making her a promise.

21. I didn't know that Mac hadn't been killed after all.

 a. Mac was killed but I didn't know it.
 b. Mac wasn't killed and I knew it.
 c. I knew that Mac was dead.
 d. I didn't know that Mac was alive.

22. Visiting relatives can be boring.

 a. Relatives who are visiting are interesting.
 b. Relatives who are visiting are not boring.
 c. To visit relatives is enjoyable.
 d. To visit relatives is not enjoyable.

23. "Could you open the door, please?"

 a. I know that something will happen in the future.
 b. I am asking if you were able to open the door.
 c. I know that something happened in the past.
 d. I am asking you to open the door.

24. Tom said that he doesn't beat his wife anymore.

 a. He admitted that he had beaten his wife in the past.
 b. He said that he had never beaten his wife.
 c. He said that he still beats his wife.
 d. He didn't say that he'd stopped beating his wife.

25. "Barry goes to the movies every night; we seldom do."

 a. Barry seldom goes to the movies.
 b. Barry and we go the movies every night.
 c. Barry and we seldom go the movies.
 d. We do not go to the movies often.

26. My friend's sister lives in Birmingham, which is a suburb of Detroit.

 a. My friend lives in a suburb of Detroit.
 b. I have a sister who lives in Birmingham.
 c. My friend has a sister who lives in Birmingham.
 d. My sister has a friend who lives in Birmingham.

27. The man who won the contest in 1971 married the girl who won the contest in 1972.

 a. The man won the contest in 1972 and then married the girl.
 b. The girl won the contest in 1971 and then married the man.
 c. The man married the girl and she won the contest in 1971.
 d. The man won the contest in 1971, the girl won the contest in 1972, and now they are married.

28. The joke wasn't very funny; yet, the audience laughed unendingly.

    a. There was no end to the audience's laughter.
    b. The audience didn't laugh at the end of the joke, because it wasn't very funny.
    c. The audience stopped laughing when they realized the joke wasn't very funny.
    d. The audience started laughing before the bad joke ended.

29. Paul asked his brother's advice because he couldn't decide which car to buy.

    a. Paul had difficulty deciding which car to buy.
    b. Paul knew which car to buy.
    c. Paul asked his brother to buy the car.
    d. Paul's brother bought a car following his advice.

30. I saw my father's business associate's calling-card lying on the floor.

    a. I saw my father and his business associate lying on the floor.
    b. I saw my father's associate lying on the floor.
    c. I saw my father's calling-card lying on the floor.
    d. I saw my father's associate's card lying on the floor.

31. Tom hadn't intended on staying up so late but his friends didn't leave until midnight.

    a. Tom wanted to stay up until midnight.
    b. Tom wanted to go to bed early.
    c. Tom didn't want to go to bed early.
    d. Tom's friends left early so he went to bed.

32. "Henry must have arrived already."

    a. I conclude that Henry has arrived.
    b. Henry should arrive.
    c. Henry had the obligation to arrive.
    d. It is impossible for Henry to have arrived.

33. The police found Alice and Tom in my father's car.

    a. My father found Alice and Tom in his car.
    b. My father has a car and the police found Alice and Tom in it.
    c. My father found Alice and Tom in a police car.
    d. My father's car was found by the police.

34. Bill is too tired to talk to.

    a. We can't talk to Bill because we are too tired to talk.
    b. Bill can't talk to us because we are tired.
    c. We can't talk to Bill because he is too tired.
    d. We are too tired to talk.

35. The salesman's untruthfulness surprised us.

    a. The salesman was truthful and that didn't surprise us.
    b. The salesman was a liar and that didn't surprise us.
    c. The salesman's instructions were to tell the truth and he did.
    d. We were surprised at the salesman's lies.

36. Jim was said to have been seen leaving the scene of the crime accompanied by a blonde woman.

    a. Somebody said that Jim had seen the blonde woman leaving the scene of the crime.
    b. Jim and a blonde woman said that they had seen someone leaving the scene of the crime.
    c. A blonde woman said that she had seen Jim accompanied by someone leaving the scene of the crime.
    d. Somebody said that they had seen Jim and a blonde woman leaving the scene of the crime.

37. Neither her daughter nor her son was at home when Mrs. Wilson returned. Who was at home?

    a. Mrs. Wilson's son.
    b. Mrs. Wilson's daughter.
    c. No one.
    d. Both son and daughter were there.

38. The rain seemed endless during the spring.

    a. The rain continued to fall on through the spring.
    b. The rain stopped falling soon after the spring began.
    c. There was no rain during the spring because we had an unusually dry season.
    d. It rained only once during the spring.

39. The John Smith who introduced the speaker who received the award is not the same John Smith who received the first award ever given two years ago.

    a. John Smith received the first award two years ago and he introduced the speaker.
    b. John Smith introduced the speaker; the speaker received the first award two years ago.
    c. John Smith introduced the speaker and another John Smith received the first award two years ago.
    d. The speaker introduced John Smith and he had received the award two years ago.

40. Although John hates vegetables, he ate the beans because Mary made them.

    a. John likes beans.
    b. John likes Mary.
    c. John doesn't like Mary.
    d. John likes vegetables, except for beans.

41. We will never take a test again without studying.

    a. We promise never to take a test again without studying.
    b. In the future we will never study for a test.
    c. We are going to take a test but we are not going to study.
    d. We won't take a test again if we have to study.

42. I can't pay my bill for three more weeks.

    a. I'll never be able to pay my bill.
    b. I'll be able to pay my bill in three weeks.
    c. I paid my bill three weeks ago.
    d. I will not pay my bill.

43. His father is said to have been a genius.

    a. A genius said that he had been his father.
    b. His father told people that he was a genius.
    c. People said his father was a genius.
    d. His father said that he had been a genius.

44. You got a C but you can do a lot better.

    a. You can do better than I can do.
    b. You can do better than you actually did.
    c. You can do better than I did.
    d. You can't do any better than you did.

45. Flying airplanes can be dangerous.

    a. Airplanes that are flying can be dangerous.
    b. Airplanes that are flying are safe.
    c. To fly airplanes is safe.
    d. To fly airplanes is not dangerous at all.

46. If I knew the answer I would tell her.

    a. I don't know the answer.
    b. I will know the answer.
    c. I knew the answer.
    d. I have known the answer for a long time.

47. Tom didn't manage to close the door.

    a. The door was open and it is now closed.
    b. The door was open and it still is.
    c. The door was closed and it is now open.
    d. The door was closed and it remained closed.

48. I saw my mother's sister's dog. Who owned the dog?

    a. My aunt.
    b. My mother.
    c. Me.
    s. My sister.

49. That important steps should be taken to solve the
    pollution problems that affect our cities is clear
    to everyone.

    a. Nobody thinks that the pollution problems that
       affect our cities are really serious.
    b. Everybody thinks it is clear that something ought
       to be done to stop pollution in the cities.
    c. The pollution problems that affect our cities
       are not very serious, and everybody thinks that's
       very clear.
    d. Not everyone is sure that there is a pollution
       problem in the cities.

50. The lion's constant restlessness fascinates the crowd.

    a. The lion rests all the time.
    b. The lion never rests.
    c. The lion is never restless.
    d. The crowd enjoys seeing the lion resting.

7

APPENDIX E

NAME: _____ DATE: _____

DIRECTIONS: 1. Read the passage quickly to get a general understanding of the main idea.

2. Write one word in each blank.

3. Check your answers.

Three grains – rice, wheat and corn – are the world's most important food plants. Rice yields more food from each acre than any other grain. In parts of Asia , there is a warm, damp climate where rice can grow the year around. Asia grows more rice than any other part of the world . Everything depends on the rice harvest; when an Asian has no job, he often says that his rice bowl is broken.

Wheat is another important grain. It grows in many parts of the world and covers more land than any other grain. But the big wheat growing regions are in the United States, Canada, Russia and Argentina. Fields of ripe wheat look like gold in the warm summer sunshine. Flour from this wheat is used to make bread.

Corn is an important grain that comes from the Americas. Corn is sometimes called maize. In many

Indian villages of South America, corn is __the__ main food. In these villages, corn planting __and__ harvesting are times of prayer and festival. __In__ the high mountains of Guatemala, Indians carry __their__ seed corn to the church to be __blessed__ before they plant it. And when the __corn__ is ripe and ready to be gathered, __there__ is a festival. The festival is a __time__ for fun. It is a time for __singing__ and dancing.

APPENDIX F

DICTATION TEST

From the Capital, the university lies just six
blocks up State Street. Here you will find the specialty
shops that cater to contemporary tastes and to youth. The
end of State Street just at the foot of the university is
now a mall - eventually traffic will be banned from the
entire street - and on clear summer days students lounge
and study on the grassy slopes at the foot of the hill
that has become the symbol of the school.

The University of Wisconsin arrived on the scene in
1849. Built on the site of a former Indian village on a
steep slope covered with blackberry bushes, it has become
one of the most beautiful campuses in the country. Its
buildings are characterized by Bascom Hall which crowns
the hill and its famous statue of Abrahma Lincoln at its
front.