THE WRITER

BRIGHAM YOUNG UNIVERSITY — HAWAII
Volume 24, Number 3 • Laie, Hawaii • July 1991

TESL Reporter
BYUH Box 1830
Laie, Hawaii 96762-1294
USA

ISSN 0886-0661

A quarterly publication of the Language, Literature, and Communications Division of Brigham Young University—Hawaii

Subscriptions are available on a complimentary basis to individuals and institutions involved in the teaching of English as a second/foreign language. Requests for new subscriptions and change of address notification for continuing subscriptions should be sent to the circulation manager.

Manuscripts relevant to teaching English as a second/foreign language, bilingual education, intercultural education and communication, and teacher preparation in these areas are welcomed and should be submitted (in duplicate) to the editor. Manuscripts dealing with classroom aspects of teaching are especially encouraged.

Manuscripts should be typed and double spaced throughout, generally not exceeding ten pages. Each manuscript should be accompanied by a cover sheet with the title; author's name, position, and address; and a short (less than 50 words) bio-data statement. Identifying information should not appear elsewhere in the manuscript in order to insure an impartial review.

It is expected that manuscripts submitted to the *TESL Reporter* are neither previously published nor being considered for publication elsewhere.

Reviews of recent textbooks, resource materials, tests, and non-print materials (films, tapes, or computer software) are also invited. Potential reviewers who indicate a particular area of interest to the review editor will be contacted concerning recent titles in that area.

Advertising information is available from the business manager.

Abstracts of articles published in the *TESL Reporter* appear in *Language and Language Behavior Abstracts*.

The opinions and statements expressed by contributors are their own and do not necessarily reflect the views of the editors or of Brigham Young University—Hawaii.

Integrating Reading and Writing in an Elementary Course

Aimee Meditz, Ohio University

Integrating language skills meaningfully and productively is a common challenge in pre-college intensive ESL programs. While a balance in listening and speaking skills in a single course may occur effortlessly, a reading/composition course may be much more difficult to balance. Furthermore, the mere balancing of skills is not enough. Tierney, Leys, Birnbaum, and Doughtery are among the many who have explored the fact that integrating reading and writing is not only valuable but essential (Petersen 1986). Too often, writing is added as a parallel activity related only in topic to a reading passage. A more effective method, however, would be to integrate writing with the skill of reading in a way that maximally exploits reading strategies to develop writing skills and vice versa. This paper will discuss how reading and writing can be integrated in an elementary ESL course in a university intensive English program.

Background

The processes and activities discussed here were designed and used in an elementary reading/composition course in a ten-week intermediate ESL program. They were intended to provide meaningful writing instruction and practice to nine adult foreign students (1 Japanese, 1 Chinese, 2 Taiwanese, and 5 Korean), all of whom possessed minimal skills in reading and writing in English. They were placed at the elementary level on the basis of placement testing which included a composition test. The average score of their compositions was equivalent to the 1-2 range on the Test of Written English (Educational Testing Service 1990). According to the TWE scoring guidelines, this range is characterized by a weakness or inability to organize and develop a coherent response to a question and to exercise correct usage (Jacobs et al. 1981).

The prime objective of the reading/comprehension course was to develop effective reading skills and strategies and introduce basic paragraph structure and development. The core textbooks established in the curriculum, *Academic Challenges in Reading* (Abdulaziz and Stover 1989) and *The Ability to Risk: Reading Skills for Beginning Students of ESL* (Noone 1986), focused almost exclusively on reading. As there was no writing textbook, integration of writing instruction and practice was left to the discretion of the teacher.

Rationale

Written English is characterized by certain forms and patterns, and successful readers are attuned to those conventions. In teaching reading to L2 learners, teachers must cultivate students' awareness of signals and patterns which help infer meaning and relationships among ideas, and anticipate forthcoming ideas (Dubin and Bycina 1991). A student trained in these strategies, then, will be attuned to the written conventions of English. Such knowledge is necessary for the L2 learner to write more readable discourse. Flower

and Hayes (1980) agree that good writers have a functional knowledge of reader-based prose which allows a wider variety of options in expressing ideas. Also, Eschholz (1980) believes that examining what readers use when they read and exploiting these elements in helping the readers of one's own text are as important as studying the habits of good writers.

Signals and Patterns in Reading

Early in an elementary reading/writing course, students begin to practice using lexical and punctuation signals to determine meaning or, when that is too challenging, the relationship among ideas in a text. For example, lexical signals such as "for example" and "such as" are targeted as cues of example. The colon is introduced as a signal of list, and nouns set off by commas are signals of alternative names, or appositives.

Students also practice citing specific sentences in the text that prove their answers to comprehension questions. When students answer correctly but cannot cite a specific sentence of proof, they discuss how they are able to answer the question. Thus, the notion of inference is introduced. This leads to identifying idea relationships in a paragraph and, later, to how sentences fit together, each having a function committed to a single purpose. This prompts analyzing paragraph patterns: looking at each sentence of a paragraph and asking, "What is this sentence doing for me?" A single word answer such as "example," "explanation," "definition," or "reason" can be used in listing the sentence functions. The resulting paragraph pattern, then, is a numbered list of functions.

Developing Writing Skills

Once students are practiced in exploiting signals and paragraph patterns in reading and understand that readers of their writing will seek out such supports, the process of incorporating these strategies in the writing process may begin.

A first step is to have each student identify the pattern of a paragraph that he has understood. After the student has numbered the sentences, he asks what each sentence is offering the reader and which signals are helpful in identifying the sentence's function. It is not unusual for a sentence to have two parts or functions. In that case, a two-part label may be given.

Having completed the pattern analysis, the student writes a paragraph following the pattern he has identified. When the teacher reads the paragraph, he should write the pattern he finds in the paragraph. In this way, the student writer receives feedback about what the reader gathered in meaning and can compare it to his (the writer's) intended meaning. This imposition of pattern is not intended to be a prescriptive endeavor, but rather a controlled writing assignment that allows the student to experience the constraints of purpose at the sentence level.

This type of constraint is brought to a more realistic level when the student is asked to address an essay question comparable to those found on university examinations. This activity requires the student to read the question, and identify the essential information needed to answer it. The student lists this in terms of the purpose labels he has been using in paragraph pattern analysis. He, then, tries to design a paragraph pattern with those

essential points and any other explanations or examples he finds necessary, or by now typical, in answering a question.

Feedback for this activity comes in two phases. After the paragraph is written, it would be helpful for the class to see sample paragraphs answering the same question. These can be written by the teacher for class discussion. Discussion should compare the pattern analysis with the information required by the question. Secondly, when a student's paper is returned, the teacher's feedback is in the form of a pattern analysis. In this way, the teacher is providing a visual representation of what he understood to be the ideas and their relationships in the paragraph. Referring back to the essay question, the teacher can easily determine if an essential point is missing. In conferencing with the student, he will be able to show which idea is missing (as far as he understands) and elicit student recognition of where the idea could be included in the paragraph.

There are several advantages to this sort of feedback. It gives students the chance to explain their intended meaning and find out what signal or lack of signal misled the reader. All of the feedback is explicit in showing what students should change in their next draft. An added benefit of this feedback is that while the students learn to revise, they realize that the problem is in expressing the idea, not the idea itself. E.D. Hirsch, Jr. makes this valuable point when he writes, "the logic of writing is not the same as the logic of thought, and the clarity of a piece of writing is not the same as the clarity of its thought" (Hirsch 1977, 88-89).

Additional activities should continue to develop student abilities in anticipating sentence functions in context. In one such activity, students must put sentences of a scrambled paragraph in order. This exercise requires students to apply their understanding of the ideas, the relationship among them, and their sensitivity to signals.

Another related activity would be a sentence-level cloze exercise. Given a paragraph with a few sentences removed, students must determine the type of information that would most likely fill the gap. Early on, these paragraphs should be transparent and heavily signalled so as to be supportive. Later, more challenging ones can serve as the basis for discussion of writer options in developing an idea.

Use in the Writing Process

Applying the signal + pattern method to writing has benefits at each step of the writing process. As a prewriting tool, this method can help generate ideas which are functionally relevant to the topic. For example, given the task of defining "insurance" in a paragraph, students generate the pattern: definition, explanation, example. This is a bit different from a topical outline in that the purpose, not just the topic, of the sentence becomes an explicit objective, helping the writer make conscious choices in weaving the semantic links and relationships from sentence to sentence. Actually, the risk of a student digressing from the paragraph topic is decreased in this method as sentences are generated on the basis of their functional relationship to the topic. If a digression does occur, it can be easily identified and corrected through pattern analysis.

While writing the first draft, students can rely on the pattern if they find it helpful. Others may not work comfortably with the listed pattern. These students can, however, benefit from some self-

questioning during the writing process. When composing a sentence, they may ask what the function of the sentence is or if it contributes strongly to the purpose of the paragraph.

In the editing phase of the writing process, students can write their own patterns, questioning the function of sentences and checking for adequate and coherent signals. After a great deal of experience in having the teacher analyze their paragraphs, students gain a notion of how the system works in expressing both what a reader gets from a paragraph and what a writer intends in the paragraph.

This ability can then be exercised in peer reviewing of the paragraphs. The signal and pattern analysis becomes a tool that students can objectively and constructively use to negotiate meaning through written text. It provides a visual representation of sentence function and semantic relationships. The key objective is to give the student writers something concrete to work on in their next draft, to eliminate the mystery of "Why didn't the teacher/reader understand this?"

Something the signal + pattern method does not do, however, is address surface level errors of spelling and punctuation. Students at the beginning level greatly need instruction in such areas; however, their own writing need not be the context for this until later drafts. It is much more important to teach the student how to develop a coherent and cohesive paragraph than it is to correct the surface errors of a paragraph that weakly expresses ideas.

Interestingly, however, one elementary student in the reading/composition course did find the pattern analysis helpful in determining where a sentence should end. In doing a pattern analysis during a conference with the teacher, he read his sentence and found that there were three functions. He felt this was too "heavy" so he separated the two that seemed to work together and put the other one in a sentence on its own. Although there was never a mention of the original punctuation error, by analyzing the sentence functions, the student reassessed his punctuation choices.

Implications in Academic Tasks

The signal + pattern method may also be useful in combining skills to complete other academic tasks. It facilitates sharper reading response strategies. For example, a student learns that he may be able to answer a short comprehension question without actually understanding the information. Given, "The shallops get angry when they don't scrush in the morning" and asked, "What makes shallops angry?", students can infer that "not scrushing in the morning makes shallops angry." This demonstrates how a student can cope with concept relationships when challenged by unfamiliar vocabulary. It is important to get the beginning student to realize that total comprehension of every word is not always realistic and that he needs to use strategies to help him compensate and exploit what he does know.

Secondly, sensitivity to signals and patterns helps in the interactive (top-down and bottom-up) processing of reading as it fosters anticipation and semantic monitoring (Dubin and Bycina, 1991). Thirdly, signals and patterns can provide cues for student note-taking. Lastly, they can also help the student select essential

pieces of information and their relationships for paraphrasing.

Through this signal + pattern approach, what begins as instruction and practice of effective reading strategies can become a greater wealth of strategies applicable to the writing process and study skills. The signal + pattern approach provides one way of integrating reading and writing instruction, and it develops student expertise in establishing and satisfying reader expectations. This approach respects the student's ability to generate ideas and provides strategies for expressing them effectively in English. Through this process, the student also learns that writing and logic are culture specific (Kaplan 1972) and that written English is comprised of many conventions and stylistic patterns perhaps different from his native language.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to two anonymous referees for comments on an earlier draft.

Works Cited

Abdulaziz, H. T., and A. D. Stover. (1989). *Academic challenges in reading*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Dubin, F. and D. Bycina. (1991). Academic reading and the ESL/EFL teacher. In M. Celce-Murcia (Ed.), *Teaching English as a second or foreign language*, 2nd ed., New York: Newbury House.

Educational Testing Service. (1990). *Test of written English*. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service.

Eschholz, P. A. (1980). The prose models approach: Using the products in the process. In T. Donovan (Ed.), and B.W. McClelland (Eds.), *Eight approaches to teaching composition*. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

Flower, L. and J. Hayes. (1980). The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem. *College Composition and Communication*. 31: 21-32.

Hirsch, E. D., Jr. (1977). *The philosophy of composition*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Jacobs, H. L., S. A. Zingraf, D. R. Wormuth, V. F. Hartfiel, and J. B. Hughey. (1981). Testing ESL composition: A practical approach. New York: Newbury House.

Kaplan, R. B. (1972). Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education. In K. Croft (Ed.), *Readings on English as a second language*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers, Inc.

Noone, L. J. (1986). *The ability to risk: Reading skills for beginning students of ESL*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Petersen, B. T. (Ed.). (1986). *Convergences: Transactions in reading and writing*. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

About the Author

Aimee Meditz is pursuing a master's degree in TESOL at Ohio University after having taught six years in Casablanca, Morocco.

Here to Stay in the USA and *Living with Strangers in the USA*

Comparative Review by Blanca Nielson, Brigham Young University

HERE TO STAY IN THE USA: ESL/US STUDIES FOR BEGINNERS. T. Maciel and J. Duffy. Hayward, CA: Alemany Press, 1990. pp. 144. Paper $5.95.

LIVING WITH STRANGERS IN THE USA: COMMUNICATING BEYOND CULTURE. C. Archer. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents, 1991. pp. ix + 156. Paper $12.50.

Both *Here to Stay* and *Living with Strangers* are intended to help students or immigrants to the U.S.A. feel comfortable in their daily activities and associations as they learn English. *Here to Stay* is a textbook for beginning level adults seeking U.S. residency or citizenship. This text stresses understanding and adapting to the American lifestyle without giving up one's own language and culture.

On the other hand, *Living with Strangers* is clearly intended for high school or college students associating with students from other countries on a daily basis. In our multicultural society it is important for both American and foreign students to gain a greater awareness of self and others as a basis for problem solving in the twenty-first century.

Both of these texts may be used in a semester. The workbook-type format of *Here to Stay* is self-explanatory. The large amount of pictures on every page provides a simple structure which the beginning ESL student may use to stimulate conversation in a class. It's broken into eleven units which discuss different situations immigrants or visitors to the U.S. might find themselves in. The authors integrate vocabulary, grammar, reading-writing, listening-speaking, and culture into each unit.

In contrast, *Living with Strangers* is a textbook to improve reading skills and to develop vocabulary. After personal study, students may enjoy discussing what they have read in the classroom, especially if, as suggested, the class includes community involvement projects for practicing cross-cultural skills.

Living with Strangers also has eleven chapters, each focused on a different type of individual and cross-cultural experience. This text is primarily interested in building reading skills and intercultural sensitivity through the use of discussion questions, culture questions, and vocabulary-building exercises.

In short, *Here to Stay in the USA* is an excellent tool for beginning students, while *Living with Strangers in the USA* enhances an already proficient student's language skill and sensitivity through issues of cultural awareness.

Blanca Nielson is a student in TESL at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah.

Writing Tasks: A Way to Improve Student Performance

by Stephen Dunbar, Vancouver School Board

Classroom teachers make decisions, on a daily basis, about the best ways to help students not only learn, but learn how to learn. In addition, they seek to find ways to help students transfer skills not only within a subject area, but across subject areas. In order to assist classroom teachers in these processes, this paper explores what effect a visual, designed to increase students' metacognitive awareness of what is involved in a task, has on their ability to produce a piece of writing that matches the general criteria of a specific writing task and on their ability to express themselves linguistically. Specifically, it examines the task of writing a character sketch.

If a metacognitive awareness of what a task involves is of little significance, there should be no significant difference between writing produced in a task where students are given no specific strategies and in a task where they are given a visual that relates what is required of the task in general to its application in a specific situation, with respect to:

i: the general organization of the writing.
ii: the linguistic quality of the writing.

Literature Review

Several studies (Meyer 1985; Carrell 1985 1990; Carrell et al 1989) in the area of reading have indicated that a heightened awareness of metacognitive factors has a positive impact on students' ability to comprehend textual information. Carrell (1985, 1990) concluded that making students conscious of text organization increased their ability to recall top level as well as low level rhetorical organization of expository text and increased their ability to express relationships amongst the ideas. Carrell (1989) similarly concluded that direct teaching of text organization enhanced ESL readers' ability to comprehend expository text. Research with native English speakers (Meyer 1985) has also shown that knowledge of the schematic structure of text enhances a reader's ability to comprehend text.

However, what metacognitive awareness a learner needs, or what a learner needs to know about learning, in order to perform a task successfully, is not always so easy to determine. Once task components become automatic, it is easy enough to view the product, what the learner hopes to attain, but not so easy to see the process, the components that make up the whole.

One way to approach analysis of task is to use Mohan's (1986) "Knowledge Framework". The Knowledge Framework suggests that all tasks have two aspects: "general, theoretical knowledge and specific, practical knowledge" (p. 40). In addition, all tasks, or situations, include a set of knowledge structures (KS), as shown in Table 1.

In addition, it suggests that each knowledge structure, such as classification, appears across subject areas, both in and out of school. For example,

Background Knowledge		
Classification	Principles	Evaluation
Description	Sequence	Choice

Action Situation (Adapted from Mohan, 1989, p. 104.)

Table 1

classification is as much a part of home economics as it is of physics, and, as students soon realize, not only are they classified into groups, but they also encounter classification in record shops, in sports, and in all other aspects of their lives. Having a knowledge of classification in general, then, can assist a student in learning a new mode of classification since s/he has background knowledge that enables him/her to comprehend this type of relationship.

In addition, knowledge structures can be observed in text, oral or written, and can also be represented visually. The main difference is that text "is defined by its stages or schematic structure" (Mohan 1989, p. 102), while visuals, or semiotic representations of knowledge structures, are "defined on the basis of logicosemantic relations" (p.113). Also, whereas "genres (text structures) account for differences between texts, KS's account for similarities between texts, and between verbal and nonverbal communication" (p. 113).

This is relevant to the present study since the Knowledge Framework is recommended as a way to analyze the general knowledge a task requires as well as a way to develop a visual that links this general knowledge to a specific situation.

Subjects

The subjects for this research project were 16 Grade 8 students in a Modified English class in a Canadian secondary school. The students had previously been identified by their elementary schools as students who were likely to encounter difficulty in secondary school because of their level of language proficiency. The group included males (69%) and females (31%), native speakers (25%) and non-native speakers (75%), Canadian-born (81%) and people born outside of Canada (19%). None of the students had attended an ESL class, but a majority of the students (75%) were non-native speakers, and all of the students had attended Learning Assistance Centres at various times in their elementary schools.

Task Description

A short story, "Ramon", from the prescribed English text, was selected because it was one of the few stories in the text with two equally "main" characters. As such, it provided an opportunity to assign students two writing tasks that were equally challenging. After having read the short story, and after having had a chance to discuss the story as a class, the students were asked to:

a) write a character sketch of the story teller (one main character in the story)

b) write a character sketch of Ramon (another main character in the story).

All of the students performed Task A and then Task B. They were given a half an hour to do each task. For Task A they were simply given a half an hour to do the writing. They were told they could use this half hour to get organized for the writing as well as do the writing, but were given no specific instructions as to how to organize themselves. For Task B the half hour was divided as follows: during the first part, the students were reminded of what they had been asked to include in previous character sketches they had written; they were then shown a visual organizer (see Figure 1) that had been used for a previous writing task of the same type; the students were then asked to take a few minutes to make a similar visual of their own about "Ramon" before beginning to do the actual writing. For both writing tasks the students were permitted to refer to the story in their book and to use materials from class discussion.

It is interesting to note that in Task A none of the students chose to spend time organizing their writing and not one of the students was able to actually complete the writing. Several students started writing, abandoned their attempts, started again, looked through their text, and generally fumbled around, using the time quite unproductively. The atmosphere in the class was one of discomfort, with questions about what they should write, what they should include, whether or not they needed an introduction, et cetera.

During Task B, the students had less time to actually write, because time had been taken up with drawing their attention to what a writing of this type should include, and because the students took time to organize information from the story in their visual. In spite of this, each of the 16 students was able to complete the task.

ORGANIZATION SHEET FOR CHARACTER SKETCH

Introduction:
Title:
Plot:
Place:
Time:
Main Character:
Body:

What the character is like:	How the author lets us know:	Reasons why the character is like this:
In the beginning		
In the middle		
At the end		

Conclusion:
Is the Character believable? _____ Why/Why Not?_____

_____

Figure 1

BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE

CLASSIFICATION	PRINCIPLES	EVALUATION
parts of a character sketch	purpose of each part	how a writing is evaluated
components of each part	how the parts are put together	how well their writing matches the criteria

placing bits of information in each part	how to show sequence of events how to show cause/ effect relationships	selecting parts of story to use

DESCRIPTION	SEQUENCE	CHOICE

SPECIFIC SITUATION

Table 2

Task Analysis

Table 2 (above) gives an analysis of the task based on the Knowledge Framework (Mohan, 1986). As the breakdown shows, successful performance of this task requires that students draw on their general, or background, knowledge of writing a character sketch and apply this to a specific situation. Making this type of connection, though it seems an obvious one to make, does not come naturally for all students. As Tripp (1989) says, "skills and generalizations need to be very precisely and directly taught" (p. 6) if students are to make connections between what they know and what they do.

The students that acted as subjects in this research have worked with this model for several months, but, as the results show, are still not at the stage of automatically connecting what they know with what they do in a specific situation, although improvements have been noted in this area over the past few months. Schmidt (1990) comments on the importance of aspects of a task becoming automatic when he says that if a task requires controlled processing it "cannot be carried out concurrently with other demanding tasks". In other words, until several actions required of a given task are at the automatic level, all aspects of a task are apt to suffer.

Evaluating the Writing

Each of the writings was typed and coded so that it would not be possible to know which writings belonged to which students. These were then given to two teachers to mark, using a ten-point scale. Each paper was given a separate mark for 'General Criteria' and 'Linguistic Criteria.' If there was more than a two-point difference in the mark given by the two teachers, the paper was given to a third marker. As it turned out, none of the

papers required a third opinion. Prior to marking the students' work, each marker was given training in the use of the evaluation system.

Results

Table 3 gives the mean scores for both the General Criteria and the Linguistic Criteria for each task:

	Task A	Task B
General Criteria	3.125	5.969
Linguistic Criteria	3.625	5.281

Table 3

A paired samples *t*-test on Task A and Task B comparing the General Criteria, shows a significant difference ($t = 9.02$, DF = 15, p. < .001). Similarly, a paired samples *t*-test on Task A and Task B comparing the means on the Linguistic Criteria, shows a significant difference ($t = 4.8$, DF = 15, p. < .001).

These results suggest that a heightened awareness of the metacognitive aspects of a task have a significant influence on students' ability to generally organize their work as well as on their linguistic performance.

A further interesting result is the correlation between General scores and Linguistics scores. A Pearson Correlation Matrix showed a correlation of .857 on the General Criteria and Linguistic Criteria marks on Task A and a correlation of .855 on the General Criteria and Linguistic Criteria marks on Task B. This indicates that there is a strong correlation between metacognitive awareness of what a task involves and linguistic performance on the task. It also suggests that when students are consciously controlling several aspects of a task, their ability to achieve general organizational objectives of the task and their ability to perform at their optimum linguistic level are both affected.

Discussion

In spite of the fact that this study has limitations in terms of practice effect, the number of subjects involved, the lack of variety of subjects with regard to academic achievement and language proficiency, and that an intact class was used rather than a class formed by random selection, as a pilot study it provides some interesting data.

The impact that a graphic organizer had on the students' ability to perform this writing task, linguistically as well as in general organizational terms, suggests that further investigation is warranted. It would be interesting, for example, to determine what impact the use of a visual would have on the writing performance of students who are already considered to be 'successful' writers. The present results indicate that heightening students' metacognitive awareness of what a task involves has significant impact on their linguistic and organizational skills. It is possible that successful, native speaker writers would also benefit from this form of awareness. Having a better understanding of what they are doing and why they are doing it might help these students to become more proficient writers as well.

In addition, it would be worth investigating the effects that a visual organizer, designed to illustrate the general objectives of a task and how the general objectives relate to a specific situation,

would have on other types of writing tasks. The task of writing a character sketch may, in its deep structure, be similar to other types of writing tasks, yet manifest a surface structure that is quite different. Providing students with visual organizers to illustrate these similarities and differences might enable all students to become more proficient and more flexible writers.

Conclusion

The primary advantage of this model is that it offers a way of linking language and content. Rather than focusing on language and then on content, language and content are co-taught. Students are therefore able to progress academically as well as linguistically.

Consequently, teachers who work in an academic setting with students who have limited proficiency in the language of instruction may well benefit from using a task-based model of instruction that emphasizes the importance of background knowledge and graphically illustrates how this knowledge relates to a specific task.

Students also benefit by becoming more proficient at recognizing generalities and by becoming more proficient at applying these generalities to new situations. As a result, they have a better chance of not only learning specific content in a subject and the language used to express this content, but also a better chance of developing a way of learning how to learn.

References

Carrell, P. L. (1985). Facilitating ESL reading by teaching text structure. *TESOL Quarterly*, *19*, 727-749.

Carrell, P. L. (1990). Awareness of text structure: Effects on recall. Paper presented at the TESOL Convention. San Francisco, California: March 1990.

Carrell, P. L.; Pharis, B. G.; & Liberto, J. C. (1989). Metacognitive strategy training for ESL reading. *TESOL Quarterly*, *23*, 647-673.

Meyer, B. J. F. (1985). Prose analysis: Purposes, procedures and problems. In B. Britton and J. Black (eds.) *Understanding expository text*. (pp. 269-285). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mohan, B. A. (1986). *Language and content*. Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley.

Mohan, B. A. (1989). Knowledge structures and academic discourse. *Word*, *40*, 99-115.

Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, *11* (2), 129-158.

Tripp, D. (1989). The idea of meta-curriculum as a common national curriculum. *Curriculum Perspectives*, *9*, 79-88.

About the Author

Stephen Dunbar is a teacher with the Vancouver School Board. He has developed materials to help teachers coordinate the teaching of language and content, and in addition, has had several years of teaching experience overseas.

A Cauldron of Challenges: ESL Students, Tutoring Services, and "College Composition 101"

Emilio Cortez, St. Joseph's University

In this article a description of a tutoring session with a foreign student is followed by a brief discussion and suggestions for facilitating the coordination of curricula between mainstream college English courses and ESL courses at the same college or university.

Meet Maria

Since Maria struggles with many of the same writing-related difficulties so common to ESL students, I have decided to present the salient aspects of a tutoring session with her to provide a representative tutoring scenario with its inherent challenges.

Maria is a thirty two year old ESL student from South America who lives here in the United States and who would like to graduate from a four-year college. Before Maria can enroll in "College Composition 101," she must successfully complete several preparatory ESL courses.

During this particular tutoring session, Maria needed help writing a short essay which was to parallel the format of a sample essay in the ESL text required for her course. Maria was to write about coming home after a long stay in a foreign country and any problems that such a long separation might cause her, her family, or her friends. It was interesting to note that in Maria's case, when she did return home to visit her country of birth, that some of her friends thought that her suitcases were filled with money since "Everyone in the United States is rich."

Maria's difficulty with her assignment was that she really didn't know where to begin. Of course, as an ESL student, her problems were compounded by her limited English proficiency, but what Maria primarily needed were some brainstorming and outlining techniques to overcome her initial hurdle. In other words, her initial difficulty was related more to the organization of her ideas than to the fact that she was not a native English speaker.

After modeling a brainstorming technique, I helped Maria to construct a simple outline which enabled her to formulate her thoughts further. She then began to write her essay. Forty minutes later she finished her essay and expressed her satisfaction with the final product.

I then had Maria explain the process of outlining, and reviewed other salient aspects of our tutoring session. The session concluded and Maria thanked me for my help.

A Prevalent ESL Goal on the College Level

A common goal shared by many college ESL faculties is to prepare ESL students to meet with success in mainstream courses such as "College

Composition 101." But sometimes ESL students can excel in ESL courses, yet their self-confidence can erode quickly in a course such as "College Composition 101" due to the rigor of the course itself in addition to the ESL students' limited English proficiency. Nevertheless, such a situation should not be construed as demeaning the intellectual capabilities of ESL students, the teaching efforts of the ESL faculty, or the teaching efforts of the mainstream English faculty. But what is required to rectify such a situation is the need for more coordination between the mainstream English faculty and the ESL faculty as well as coordination between the mainstream English curriculum and the ESL curriculum.

To effectively meet the challenge of coordinating curricula, the integration of mainstream English course topics, skills, and specific concerns should be addressed in preparatory ESL courses. Unfortunately, certain factors impede the facile integration of mainstream English course concerns into the ESL classroom. Consider the impediments that follow:

1. Many ESL texts are often too general in scope and are not sufficiently coordinated with courses such as "College Composition 101."

2. The nature of assigned readings and major focuses in courses such as "College Composition 101" can vary sufficiently from one semester to the next and from teacher to teacher so as to undermine consistent coordination.

3. Hectic schedules and the pervasive autonomy of instructors can thwart meaningful exchanges among faculty.

Mindful of such difficulties and others, I would like to make several suggestions.

Suggestions for the Mainstream English Faculty

1. Make available to ESL faculty current course syllabi for English courses replete with required readings and assignments on an ongoing semester by semester basis. Such syllabi can be placed in a specified place in the English department or college library for easy reference by the ESL faculty.

2. Make specific notations of recurring pedagogic problems encountered with ESL students and share such concerns with the ESL faculty so as to foster meaningful exchanges--teacher to teacher.

3. Extend an open invitation to the ESL faculty to observe your classes.

4. Promote faculty meetings between the English faculty and the ESL faculty which feature an agenda of coordination between the mainstream English curricula and the ESL curricula.

Suggestions for the ESL Faculty

1. Make available to the mainstream English faculty current course syllabi for ESL courses replete with required readings and assignments on an ongoing semester by semester basis. Such syllabi can be placed in a specified place in the English department, ESL department, or college library for easy reference by the mainstream English faculty.

2. Make a concerted effort to emphasize the teaching of skills and curricular concerns that will have the greatest utility for ESL students in mainstream courses.

3. Whenever possible, be mindful of mainstream curricular concerns when selecting texts.

4. Brainstorming and outlining techniques should be stressed—especially when the ESL course is taken as a prerequisite for a course such as "College Composition 101."

5. Extend an open invitation to the mainstream English faculty to observe your classes.

6. Invite the mainstream English faculty to meetings which feature an agenda of coordination between the ESL curricula and the mainstream English curricula.

Suggestions for the Tutoring Services Faculty

1. Identify individual students who serve as tutors who express a real interest in tutoring ESL students and allocate those tutors to specific tables where students are tutored. In this way ESL students will get accustomed to going to the same tutors and to the same place for help.

2. Have bilingual dictionaries and other resources available at the tutoring site for easy reference by ESL students and tutors.

By conscientiously following these suggestions, the mainstream English faculty and the ESL faculty can become more coordinated and effective in meeting the special needs of foreign students. When open lines of communication and sincere efforts for coordination and professional exchange exist among faculty members, challenging educational goals become attainable.

Dr. Emilio Cortez teaches ESOL at the Charles Drew Elementary School in addition to teaching graduate courses at St. Joseph's University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Conference Announcements

The International Reading Association has announced that its Fourteenth World Congress on Reading will be held on the island of Maui, Hawaii, July 13-16, 1992. The Congress theme is "Toward the 21st Century: Change and Challenge." Strands include, among others: children's literature, culture and literacy, literacy in English as a second language, literacy and technology, and adult literacy initiatives. For more information write to: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Road, P.O. Box 8139, Newark, Delaware 19714-8139, USA. Fax 302-731-1057.

The 1992 TESOL Summer Institute will be held in Bratislava, Czechoslovakia. Session 1: July 6-20. Session 2: July 18-31. The Institute is organized this year by the Institute of International Education in conjunction with The Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport of the Slovak Republic, Comenius University, Bratislava, and Hunter College, CUNY. For more information write: James O'Driscoll, Placement and Special Services Division, Institute of International Education, 809 U.N. Plaza, New York, NY 10017-3859.

Qualities of a Good ESL Program Director

(Continued from page 60)

In fact, the director must not just listen but hear and understand the underlying meaning of what is said. Rogerian listening (or repeating what you think you heard) helps in reducing comprehension errors. Deficiency in listening may result in many lost ideas which could have been beneficial to the program. In addition, a director who neither listens nor heeds the messages he or she is given will stir up resentment. Employees may wonder why they should listen to the director if the director doesn't listen to them. If you want to destroy the morale of a program, start by not listening to your employees.

D ***Delegates***. A director should not try to do everything single-handedly. The director's job is to get others to work together as a cooperative group, and part of working as a group involves the dissemination of labor. Martha Pennington (personal communication, 1989) has pointed out that directors who do not delegate may want to be the star, but trying to do everything that needs to be done may result in a shooting star—bright for a moment and then burns out. Let others shine instead; you will reflect their brilliance.

I ***Inspires***. A good leader needs to inspire the team that he or she leads to meet challenges. Often, working in an inspired manner inspires others. Conversely, working in an *expired* way will have a like effect on the staff and instructors.

R ***Respects***. Directors should respect those who work for them. This includes their opinions, experience, and knowledge. The sum of the parts of the organization are stronger than any one person. A director needs to understand that employees are talented and valuable in some ways which may be complementary to the director's talents and skills. Directors who fail to exploit the talents of their staff or instructors and other members frustrate everyone involved. Lack of respect begets the same, and respect is nearly impossible to regain once it is lost.

E ***Elicits***. A good director elicits ideas and plans from those who work for him or her to help solve problems. Neglect in this area leads to a director who must be responsible for all creativity. As imaginative as he or she may be, one person's capabilities will pale in comparison to the creativity of many minds working collectively.

C ***Cares***. A rather all-encompassing quality, caring entails a real concern for the employees, the program, the students, and the community. Failure to care about any of the above will lead to the director's downfall. This quality of caring is seemingly an obvious prerequisite for any director. However, time or the pressures of the job can lead to apathy. Directors must consistently check their attitudes. Directors who cease to care should consider a new program or even a new occupation.

T ***Transforms***. A negative program may be transformed into a positive program by redirecting negative attitudes into positive ones by consciously working to turn them around. For example, if you know that communication is a problem,

alleviate the situation by initiating informal meetings, rap sessions, or some other method of encouraging real communication in a relaxed atmosphere. Communication is of paramount importance to an ESL program. Lack of communication will cripple the program's potential.

O ***Orders***. Sometimes a director must issue imperatives. If a director has the big picture in mind, sometimes unpopular courses of action must be enacted for the overall good of the program. For some personalities, this may be one of the hardest things to do, yet the ability to give orders when needed is critical for the success of an ESL program director. A director who is unable give orders is ineffectual. Employees will lose respect for a director who is unable to be firm.

R ***Rewards***. A director should reward those who go above and beyond the minimum job description requirement, even if it is for their own reasons! Sacrifice and commitment need to be recognized. Loyalty will be reduced and discontentment exacerbated if rewards are not forthcoming.

Here again, is what a director needs to keep in mind:

E Energize
S Select
L Listen
D Delegate
I Inspire
R Respect
E Elicit
C Care
T Transform
O Order
R Reward

Of course, these are only some of the skills and actions that an ESL program manager must exhibit to maintain an efficient, harmonious organization. Following this format, I am sure it would be a relatively easy matter to extend the acronym to at least as far as A MODERN AND SUCCESSFUL ESL PROGRAM DIRECTOR. A successful director, in fact, implements a long list of active verbs to ensure an active, vital program.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Dr. Martha Pennington at City Polytechnic of Hong Kong for inspiring this piece during her class "Introduction to ESL Program Administration," at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, and for helping to refine it.

About the Author

Gerhardt Gast is an instructor at Hawaii Pacific University in the English Foundations Program. He is currently working on The Computer Revolution, *a text for ESL students on computer assisted writing with Martha Pennington and Steve Singer.*

Conference Announcement

The Regional Language Centre (RELC) has announced its regional seminar for 1992. It will be held at the Centre April 20-23. The theme for the seminar is Language Teacher Education in a Fast-Changing World. For details write to: Seminar Secretariat, SEAMEO Reg. Language Ctr. 30 Orange Grove Rd. Singapore 1025. SINGAPORE

Qualities of a Good Program Director: An Acronymic Approach

Gerhardt Gast, Hawaii Pacific University

Being an ESL Program Director is a multi-faceted task which requires a number of skills. Many of these skills are innate for some directors, but other skills need to be learned. Inexperienced or ineffective directors have fewer or less developed skills. Moreover, the novice or ineffectual program director might have trouble recognizing these skills, let alone remembering or developing them. To help out, I spell out here an acronymic approach to describing these skills. If you find yourself in trouble with the program you are supposedly directing, remember:

E.S.L. D.I.R.E.C.T.O.R.

E ***Energizes***. A program director needs to energize a program by encouraging staff and instructors. The director provides leadership by helping employees to envision the value of the program to the students and to themselves. Reviewing the potential of the program will often energize all involved. Directors who are listless and apathetic will fail to set any example for their subordinates—except a bad one.

S ***Selects***. A good program director selects good employees. When hiring, an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. If a director fails to hire teachers and other employees carefully, he or she will have the unpleasant task of having to let them go later. Even worse, poor hiring decisions can jeopardize the program, and ultimately, the director's own job.

L ***Listens***. Listening to students, instructors, and staff members is essential.

(Continued on page 58)

TESL Reporter
Brigham Young University—Hawaii
Box 1830
Laie, Hawaii 96762-1294

Non-Profit Organization
U.S. Postage
PAID
LAIE, HAWAII
Permit Number One

Address Correction Requested