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In Paris they just simply opened their eyes and stared when we spoke to them in French! We never did succeed in making those idiots understand their own language.

- Mark Twain, The Innocents Abroad

IJFLT: A free on-line, peer-reviewed quarterly journal dedicated to communicating research, articles and helpful information regarding language acquisition to support teachers as they endeavor to create fluent, multilingual students.
The Interdependence Hypothesis states that the development of academic language proficiency in one language contributes to a common underlying proficiency that can be accessed as other languages are subsequently acquired (Cummins, 1984, 2000).

Empirical evidence for the Interdependence Hypothesis comes from case histories showing that children who learn to read well in the first language typically do well in reading in their second language, as well as studies showing positive correlations between scores on reading tests in the first and second language when the child has had a chance to develop reading ability in both languages (Cummins, 1979; Krashen, 2003).

Additional support comes from studies of bilingual education: Children in bilingual programs that include the development of literacy in the primary language consistently outperform comparisons in all-English programs on tests of English reading (Krashen and McField, 2006).

A gap in the research is a lack of studies showing lagged correlations, that is, demonstrating that earlier reading ability in the first language is associated with subsequent reading ability in the second language. This has been shown for word knowledge (August, Calderon and Carlo, 2001), but until now it has not been shown for reading comprehension.

The goal of this study was to determine if reading ability in the first language (Spanish), tested in grade 2, is associated with reading ability in the second language (English), tested four years later in grade 6.

The subjects were 109 children, all English learners, enrolled in bilingual programs (both one-way and two-way programs) in the El Paso area. Nearly all (104 out of 109) of the subjects were classified as low SES, qualifying either for free or reduced cost meals.

Subjects were tested in Spanish on the Aprenda in grade 2 in 2004 and in English on the SAT 10 in grade 6 in 2008 (intermediate level). According to the publisher, the Aprenda is modeled after the SAT 10. Combined Normal Curve Equivalent scores on the reading comprehension and vocabulary subtests were used for this analysis. The same 109 students took both tests.

The mean score on the Aprenda was 71 (sd = 13.2) and for the SAT 10 it was 44 (17.6).

Results
The correlation between grade 2 Spanish and grade 6 English reading scores was positive and statistically significant ($r = .52; p < .0001$). Those who read better in early grades in Spanish read better in English later on in grade 6.

Discussion
This result provides a clear confirmation of the Interdependence Hypothesis, a demonstration that earlier performance in reading in the first language is related to subsequent performance in reading in the second language. The results are especially interesting as the first language test was administered in grade 2, after children have had a fair chance of developing first language reading competence, and the second language test was administered in grade 6, a time when the school curriculum demands high levels of academic English competence.

It is reasonable to hypothesize that children who read more in their first language, in addition to mastering the mechanical aspects of reading, learn more about the world, and develop greater background knowledge in school subjects. This makes the English they hear and read more comprehensible, resulting in greater academic English development.
The empirical evidence supporting the practice of developing literacy in the first language now includes longitudinal research, and the underlying theoretical basis for “transfer” is reasonable. In fact, the majority of educators and non-educators interviewed in a series of studies agree that it is easier to develop literacy in a second language if one is already literate in the first language (Shin, 2000; Shin and Krashen, 1996; Shin, Anton, and Krashen, 1999; Young and Tran, 1999; Lao, 2003; Ramos, 2003).

Those who have been opposed to bilingual education in the United States have claimed, without empirical support, that it slows down the acquisition of English and the development of English literacy. The clear demonstration that early reading ability in the first language predicts subsequent reading ability in English is strong evidence in support of bilingual programs that promote first language literacy. There is now no reason to object to developing literacy in the primary language.

Acknowledgements: We thank Jim Crawford and Jim Cummins for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.
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The “IRAQ” of SSR: What We Need to Know

Ken Smith
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“The best way to improve your knowledge of a foreign language is to go and live among its speakers. The next best way is read extensively in it.”
- Christine Nuttal (1996)

Research strongly supports the assertion that self-selected reading for pleasure, with no or very little accountability, is the major source of our reading ability, our ability to write with acceptable style and accuracy, much of our spelling ability, our vocabulary knowledge beyond the basics, and our ability to use and understand complex grammatical structures (Krashen, 2004).

The “IRAQ” of SSR – What We Need to Know

What follows are components teachers, schools, and programs might want to consider if they are interested in implementing SSR in their classrooms. Each letter in the acronym IRAQ stands for two elements hypothesized to be needed for SSR to succeed.

I – INTEREST and INDEPENDENCE

Teachers who see the value in what stories, novels and books offer that 2-3 page articles can’t are those that get SSR started. However, if such an idea is to have staying power, there must be interest from not only the eager classroom teacher but also from policy makers including department heads, curriculum committees, and other school administrators. In an EFL context this requires a teacher, department or school to think outside the traditional reading class design which tends to focus on an intensive skill-building approach to reading instruction.

R – READABILITY, REGULARITY

Readability: There are numerous readability scales available to check the “readability” of a text (e.g. Flesch-Kincaid, Fry, Dale-Chall, SMOG, Lexile Framework). It has been argued, however, that children’s own experiences with texts do a better job than any formula (Krashen, 2001).

Vocabulary research suggests that a minimum 95% of vocabulary words found in any text must be known in order to comprehend that text (Laufer, 1989). This may be one reason graded readers, books written especially for EFL students, have become more available.

Regularity: SSR should not be seen as secondary, optional, or supplementary, but as foundational to a curriculum. Schools should thus be committed to regular periods of SSR. EFL SSR research concerning duration appears to favor regular intervals of SSR as opposed to massed reading (Lee and Hsu, 2009). In other words, if a class meets three times per week for one hour each meeting, it may be best to have students read silently for twenty minutes each meeting as opposed to choosing one meeting where students would read for the full hour.

A – ACCESS, ACCOUNTABILITY

Access: Greater access to books has been shown to be effective for a wide range of first and second language learners both affectively and cognitively. (Krashen, 2004).

Poverty has a crippling effect on educational achievement, including reading achievement, but there is one way, often overlooked but effective in tackling that problem: strong libraries and access to books in those libraries. In an EFL context, it has been reported that the size of the school library was the most important factor in determining English reading scores among children in the Fiji Islands (Elley and Mangubhai, 1984). In an international study examining reading achievement involving both the economically advantaged (rich) and the economically depressed (poor) in thirty-two countries, Elley (1992) found that
the quality of the school libraries within a country was a strong predictor of a country’s reading rank. In other words, poor countries who invest in good libraries can make up the reading achievement gap between the rich and poor. For effects that greater access to books during SSR had on college EFL students in Taiwan, see Lee and Hsu (2009).

Ways to Provide Access:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source for Books</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Libraries</td>
<td>Individual libraries or bookshelves located within each classroom that would contain a range of books chosen to suit the language level and interests of the students in that class. (Hill, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Libraries</td>
<td>A Central Library is a central location where books are checked out and then students can bring those books to read either in class or at home. When we think of Central Libraries we should think of going to a building that stores books to be checked out. (Hill, 1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Centers</td>
<td>A separate learning area where students may go for further assistance in learning to read. Books are typically displayed and desks or other sitting areas are made available. Sometimes books may be checked out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handcrafted Books</td>
<td>Books that are written by more proficient students for less proficient students to read. For Handcrafted Books in a FL context see Dupuy and McQuillan, 1997.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accountability: In McCracken (1971), guidelines were set for SSR. In these guidelines there is to be no accountability for what students read, no check to determine whether the student has understood or will be held responsible for what they read during these periods of SSR.

Pilgreen (2000) addresses issues of accountability by stating, “The key to non-accountability is to omit any activity that gives students the message that they are responsible for completing a task, comprehending a particular portion of their reading, or showing they have made improvement in some way. As habitual readers are well aware, the very knowledge that they have to do something with reading other than what they choose to do takes away from the magic. It keeps them from experiencing the enjoyment of just relaxing with a good book, which is the goal of an effective SSR program.”

In a popular EFL context of “free” reading, many extensive reading programs do indeed hold students accountable, by giving quizzes, asking students to write short reports on what they’ve read, or supplement reading with reading related activities (Bamford and Day, 2004). There is no evidence that these extra activities help, and some evidence that they do not (Mason, 2004; K. Smith, 2006).
**Q- QUANTITY, QUALITY**

**Quantity:** Access to a greater number of books for SSR positively influences scores in terms of reading and writing. (Krashen, 2004; Lee and Hsu, 2009).

How much must students read to show gains in language development? Some have suggested (D. Hill, cited in Day and Bamford, 1998) one book per week, but this is potentially problematic. The simplest graded readers are sixteen pages in length whereas advanced graded readers are often close to one hundred pages long. It might be wiser to suggest a range of pages, perhaps seventy-five to one hundred pages per week, as a goal regardless of the proficiency of the student rather than providing a specific number of books to be read.

**Quality:** Should students be reading “classics” or can they read what some might label “junk”? Ujiie and Krashen (2005) have presented evidence showing that lighter reading has value: light reading, including comics, teen romances, and magazines, promote literacy and language development. In addition, there is compelling evidence that lighter reading can serve as a conduit to heavier reading, providing both the linguistic competence, background knowledge, and interest that makes more demanding reading comprehensible.

In EFL contexts, currently the primary source of reading material in the form of books is graded readers. While the quantity of graded readers has increased in the marketplace, this leaves the consumer with questions as to which graded readers to choose. David Hill from Edinburgh Project on Extensive Reading (EPER), who some claim has read more graded readers than anyone, maintains a database assigning a scale of 1 - 5 where 1 is the worst and 5 the best, on the quality of graded readers examining features such as clarity of the plot, support of the illustrations, appearance of the printed page, and interest of the story itself (Day and Bamford, 1998).

**Conclusion**

I = Interest, Independence  
R = Readability, Regularity  
A = Access, Accountability  
Q = Quantity, Quality

The factors presented here are, of course, hypotheses, but they are well-supported by research and experience. Of course, the experiences of teachers who attempt to apply them will add to our knowledge of what the elements are of an effective in-school reading program.

The bottom line is that when readers have access to more books at home, at school, or at the public library, they read more (Krashen, 2004) and those who read more achieve more. If only a small portion of the money that is repeatedly being spent on improving technology would be spent on improving libraries by stacking them with interesting, readable, accessible, quality materials for students, it would do much to improve the language abilities of our EFL learners.
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Studies done in Japan over the last twenty years have consistently demonstrated that stories combined with self-selected reading are extremely effective in promoting second language acquisition, far more effective than traditional approaches.

The focus of much of this research has been on efficiency, that is, whether comprehensible-input based methods produce greater gains per unit of time invested compared to traditional approaches. This research direction was stimulated by scholars who conceded that comprehensible-input can result in language development, but who feared that it may not be efficient. They recommended supplementing comprehensible input with traditional methodology, claiming that it would allow students to reach certain goals more quickly (Swain, 1985; Long & Robinson, 1998).

I present here a brief review of this research.

Mason (2004) investigated whether adding supplementary writing to an extensive reading program would increase its effectiveness. Three groups of college EFL students participated in an extensive reading program for three semesters. One group wrote summaries of what they read in Japanese, their first language. A second group wrote summaries in English, and a third group wrote summaries in English that were corrected. The three groups made similar gains, but their efficiency was very different, with the Japanese summary group making far better gains per hour devoted to English.

For example, on the TOEIC Reading Comprehension test, the Japanese Summary Group gained 33.67 points over three semesters, a result of 150 hours of reading. This means they gained about .22 points for each hour dedicated to English. The English summary group put in more time with English, because they wrote their summaries in English, a total of about 300 hours. They gained 34.17 points on the TOEIC Reading test, a gain of only .13 points per hour. Similarly, the English writing plus corrected gained 40.5 points and dedicated 300 hours to English, a gain of about .14 points per hour. Note that the correction group gained the most, but they were far less efficient than the Japanese summary group. Similar results were found for performance on a cloze test and for written grammatical accuracy.

Mason and Krashen (2004) compared vocabulary growth for first year college students in Japan in EFL through hearing a story with a combination of a story and supplementary activities designed to focus students specifically on learning the new words in the story.

The “story-only” group spent only 15 minutes hearing a story. The “story-plus-study” group spent nearly the entire class hour (85 minutes) hearing the story and doing supplementary activities. Calculations of words learned per minute revealed that the story-only group learned words more efficiently, about .25 words per hour on a delayed post-test, compared to .16 words per hour for the story-plus-study group.

In Mason (2006), students who had completed classes in which they were involved in free voluntary reading of graded readers were encouraged to continue reading on their own in preparation for the Test of English as a Foreign Language (ITPTOEFL).
Each of the readers read different books, according to their own taste.

The average gain per student was 3.5 points per week, which is about the same as gains students make in TOEFL preparation courses. These results are consistent with other studies showing that those who read more do better on the TOEFL (Gradman and Hanania, 1991; Constantino, Lee, Cho and Krashen, 1997).

The subjects in this study were well-educated, experienced language students, were highly motivated, and volunteered to engage in the reading program. It is thus inappropriate to generalize these results to all language students. The results of this study confirm, however, that it is possible to improve in a second language from input/reading alone. The results also suggest that at least some students can prepare quite well for the TOEFL in their own country.

In Mason (2007), two groups of Japanese college students in Japan participated in an extensive reading class in which they listened to stories in English told by the teacher and read graded readers at home. One group consisted of English majors who took six other English classes using a form-based approach, and the other consisted of Health Science majors who took no other English classes. The English majors made larger gains, but devoted far more time to English study. As seen in table 1, the Health Science students were much more efficient. Table 1 presents improvements in accuracy as the ratio of error-free phrases to total phrases written. Again, the English majors made better gains, but were less efficient.

Table 1. Percentage of error-free phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>gain</th>
<th>efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Majors</td>
<td>47% (9.8/20.9)</td>
<td>55% (28.2/51.6)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>.06 (8/126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science Majors</td>
<td>35% (6.2/17.6)</td>
<td>40% (13/32.9)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>.28 (5/18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mason, Vanata, Yander, Borsch, & Krashen, (in press), investigated efficiency of vocabulary development in German as a second language. The first experiment of the three showed that hearing a story had a higher acquisition/learning rate than the list method for beginning students of German as a foreign language. The second and third experiments showed that supplementary focus on form activities were not worthwhile for vocabulary acquisition/learning.

The rate of acquisition/learning was .10 words per minute from hearing stories, about six words per hour. In contrast, students learn 2.4 words per hour in traditional classes.

**Concluding remarks**

Comprehensible input-based methods, in the form of hearing stories and self-selected reading, has been validated qualitatively and quantitatively, not only for its efficacy but also its efficiency. In addition, it is very inexpensive: When the school library is well stocked with reading, self-selected reading costs no money. All a teacher needs for storytelling is a thick story-book (such as the Grimm Brothers’ Fairy Tales).
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Developing English Literacy through Science Instruction

Cory Buxton¹, Okhee Lee² & Randall Penfield²
¹University of Georgia,
²University of Miami

Abstract: Bilingual learners participating in a three-year integrated science and literacy program in English improved in both science knowledge and English literacy. There was a clear positive relationship between content and form in students’ written essays about science, indicating that students who had better science knowledge also exhibited better English proficiency in their science writing. The relationship between content and form was stronger on the post test, suggesting that the approach was successful in teaching both science and English. Students with greater English proficiency showed a stronger relationship between content and form, suggesting that the program was more effective for them because the input was more comprehensible.

In this study, we attempted to determine whether bilingual learners (BLs) in science classrooms who learn science content also acquire English language and literacy. If students do acquire English language and literacy while simultaneously learning science content, this would argue for the use of an integrated approach to content and language instruction with BLs. It could also be the case, however, that the relationship between content and language may differ depending on BLs’ English proficiency, suggesting the need for differentiated instructional approaches based on their levels of English proficiency.

This study was part of a larger research and development project with the aim of fostering both science and literacy achievement for BLs in elementary schools in a large urban school district. Specifically, this study examined the relationship between the “form” (i.e., conventions, organization, and style/voice) and “content” (i.e., specific knowledge and understanding of science) of expository science writing among third grade BLs in the beginning and at the end of each year during the three-year implementation of the intervention.

Theoretical Framework
The theoretical base to support the integration of content and language instruction has been emerging in recent years. In science classrooms, many activities and tasks are predicated on students’ reading and writing skills. Literacy also involves viewing and visually representing pictorial and graphic models of ideas and information, abilities that are essential to think and reason scientifically. For BLs to effectively participate in grade-appropriate, content area learning, teachers need to provide cognitively and linguistically rich learning environments. In science classrooms, hands-on, inquiry-based instruction can provide the context for the simultaneous development of science learning and English proficiency. It has been well documented that we acquire language naturally when we understand what people say and what we read (August & Hakuta, 1997; Krashen, 1999). Scientific investigation is well suited for providing this comprehensible input for students when hands-on inquiry is coupled with appropriate linguistic support (Lee, 2005).

The current study is built on our previous research that offers insights into how science curriculum and professional development can improve academic outcomes and narrow achievement gaps in both science and English literacy for BLs (Lee & Buxton, 2008). Missing from the literature, however, is research that addresses the degree to which interventions aimed at promoting science learning and English proficiency simultaneously for BLs indeed achieve this goal.

This study contributes to the literature by addressing the following research questions: (1) What was the relationship between the content and form of science
writing in the beginning and at the end of the school year? and (2) How did the relationship differ among students at different levels of English proficiency?

Method
The research was conducted in a large urban school district in the southeastern U.S. with a student population characterized by a high level of linguistic and cultural diversity. The focus of this study was on third grade students in six treatment schools that continued their participation in the intervention for three years (2004-2007) and provided students’ writing samples. The study involved 683 third graders during the first year, 661 third graders during the second year, and 676 third graders during the third year. Approximately half of the students were Hispanic and the other half were Black, including substantial numbers of Haitians and Caribbean Islanders. The intervention was comprised of (a) curriculum units that included student books, teachers’ guides, science supplies, and trade books on related topics, and (b) professional development that included teacher workshops throughout the school year and classroom observations. As a district-supported, school-wide initiative, all third grade teachers and their students from the six treatment schools participated in the intervention.

A writing sample was used to measure both English proficiency and the ability to explain science concepts in writing. Mirroring the format for the statewide writing assessment, we developed an expository writing prompt on the topic of the water cycle, which was the culminating topic in the third grade curriculum. At the beginning and end of each of the three school years, teachers administered the writing prompt to their students. Two scoring rubrics were developed to assess writing form and content. Data were analyzed using a hierarchical linear modeling approach.

Results
Descriptive statistics for the pretest and posttest for all students and each ESOL subgroup for writing form are presented in Table 1 and for writing content are presented in Table 2.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics for Writing Form Scores (0 to 4 Points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>ESOL levels 1 to 4*</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESOL-exited and non-ESOL</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>ESOL levels 1 to 4</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESOL-exited and non-ESOL</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Writing Content Scores (0 to 4 Points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,020</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>ESOL levels 1 to 4</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESOL-exited and non-ESOL</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>ESOL levels 1 to 4</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESOL-exited and non-ESOL</td>
<td>1,718</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results of the HLM analysis for the association of form and content scores on the pretest indicate that the mean coefficient of form score as a predictor of content score was equal to 0.382, meaning that, on average, every unit increase in the form score was associated with a 0.382 unit increase in content score. This effect was statistically significant \((p < .001)\). The effect of ESOL level on the association between form and content scores at pretest was not significant \((p = .687)\), indicating that the relationship between form and content scores for students in ESOL levels 1 to 4 was comparable to the relationship between form and content scores for ESOL-exited and non-ESOL students on the pretest.

The results of the HLM analysis for the association of form and content scores on the posttest indicate that the mean coefficient of form score as a predictor of content score was equal to 0.656, meaning that, on average, every unit increase in the form score was associated with a 0.656 unit increase in content score. This effect was statistically significant \((p < .001)\). Unlike at pretest, the effect of ESOL level on the association between form and content scores at posttest was significant \((p = .018)\), indicating that ESOL level did effect the magnitude of the association between form and content scores. This effect was negative, indicating that as the proportion of students in the classroom who were in ESOL levels 1 to 4 increased, the relationship between form and content scores decreased.

**Discussion**

Our first research question examined the relationship between the form and content of science writing at the beginning and at the end of the school year. The results indicate a significant relationship at both pretest and posttest, suggesting that students who had better science knowledge also exhibited better English proficiency in their science writing. Furthermore, a stronger association at posttest than at pretest provides evidence that the intervention over the course of the school year strengthened the association. These results lend support to the argument in favor of using an integrated approach that simultaneously teaches science content and English language and literacy with BLs.

Our second research question examined whether the relationship between writing form and content differed across students at varying levels of English proficiency. At pretest, there was no significant effect of ESOL level on the magnitude of the association between form and content scores. At posttest, however, there was a significant negative effect of ESOL level on the magnitude of the association. Thus, over the course of the school year, students with greater English proficiency learned science content and developed English literacy simultaneously, whereas students with lower English proficiency did not show this simultaneous growth to the same degree. Interventions such as ours, which primarily present science curriculum and instruction in English, might be expected to have limited positive effects for BLs at the beginning and intermediate levels of English proficiency, because the instruction is less comprehensible. BLs who have exited ESOL programs and have higher levels of English proficiency are more likely to benefit from interventions of this kind. Our study supports the claim that BLs can learn grade appropriate subject matter such as science and acquire English language and literacy simultaneously when the content area instruction is comprehensible. More advanced BLs will benefit from well structured subject matter instruction in English, while less advanced BLs are likely to be better served by models that provide comprehensible input in English in other forms, as well as subject matter taught in the primary language.
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ESOL levels 1 (beginner) to 4 (conversationally competent) are used in this state to designate students who should actively receive ESOL services. In most cases, after two years students are exited from ESOL services but continue to be monitored for two additional years.
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I present here a summary of reading research in Korea done by me and my colleagues over the last decade. This research, done with EFL students and teachers in elementary school and EFL college students in Korea, confirmed the power of reading as a means of increasing competence as well as developing interest and confidence in reading.

In the studies included in table 1, subjects were from 3rd graders to 6th graders and children in the reading programs had time to hear stories read aloud by the teacher and engage in free reading. In all cases, children participating in the reading program showed good gains in language, including vocabulary, reading, writing, spelling and listening and also showed positive attitudes, developing greater interest and confidence in reading and writing.

Cho and Seo, 2001: Fifth graders who were read to and who participated in reading theater, choral reading and other supplementary activities made better gains in vocabulary and showed more interest in reading than comparisons who followed a traditional curriculum.

These results were replicated in Cho and Choi (2003) with third graders, who did book-making and shared reading in addition to hearing read-alouds. They did better than comparisons on tests of reading and writing and also showed more interest in reading.

Cho and Hey J. Kim, 2004: Children in EFL classes that included reading interesting stories from the internet gained significantly more in English than comparisons did. These results are remarkable, considering the fact that the study lasted only 14 weeks.

Cho and Hee J. Kim, 2005: EFL elementary school children did classroom activities related to reading newspapers written for EFL students. Nearly all those in the newspaper class voluntarily read the newspapers in their free time at school, and the class made significantly better gains in English than a comparison group.

In Cho, Ahn and Krashen (2005), book reading from one popular series (Clifford the Big Red Dog) was highly effective.

Cho & Choi (2008) showed that the combination of read-alouds and free reading (SSR) was effective in increasing interest in reading as well as English language development.

A consistent result in these studies is that readers were more enthusiastic about English reading than were comparison students in traditional classes, which may be the most important result, because it suggests that the children will continue to read in English.

Table 1: Elementary School EFL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Gr</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Duration (wks)</th>
<th>Gains</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cho &amp; Seo (2001)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Read-alouds + activities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Vocabulary, interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho &amp; Choi (2003)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Read-alouds + activities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>RC, writing, interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho &amp; Hee J. Kim (2005)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Read-aloud + SSR (newspapers)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>RC, interest confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho, Ahn &amp; Krashen (2005)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Read-aloud (Clifford series) + activities</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Vocabulary, RC, interest, confidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cho &amp; Choi (2008)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Read-aloud + Activities, SSR,</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>LC, RC, writing, interest, confidence, lower anxiety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Free reading and EFL teachers

The second group of studies dealt with Korean teachers who had been assigned to teach English. Few of these teachers had been dedicated pleasure readers in English.

In Cho and Krashen (2001), a single positive experience in self-selected reading of children’s books resulted in a profound change in attitudes toward recreational reading. After the experience, nearly all teachers reported that they were interested in using sustained silent reading in their classes, and were interested in reading more in English on their own. The treatment was simply providing the teachers with the opportunity to browse and read storybooks written for young children. The teachers pointed out that they had had no idea that English reading could be so interesting and comprehensible:

Cho and Krashen (2002) reported on the efforts of one participant in the original study (Cho and Krashen, 2001, described just above) who encouraged her own children to do recreational reading in English over a period of one year. This mother’s efforts to encourage her children in read in English as a foreign language were not successful until she allowed the children to select their own reading. Self-selected reading resulted in clear improvements in attitudes toward English reading and also in obvious gains in English competence.

Using reading to make aural (movie) input more comprehensible

Films in English are extremely challenging for those studying English as a foreign language. In a series of studies, an attempt was made to make an English film more comprehensible by asking subjects to read book the film was based on before seeing the film. In all three studies presented here, a comparison was made between how well intermediate students understood movies in English (without subtitles) and how well they understood the same movies a few weeks to two months later, after reading a short novel based on the film. In two studies, subjects served as their own controls (Cho and Kim, 1999, Cho, 2006), and in the third a comparison group was used (Cho, 2007).

In the first study (Cho and Kim, 1999), subjects saw the film Beauty and the Beast, then read a 22 page version of the story aimed at children ages three to five, and then saw the film again. In the second study (Cho, 2006), subjects saw Love Story twice, then read an abridged version of the book, then saw the film again. In the third study (Cho, 2007), the film was Charlotte’s Web (the 1973 version, not the 2006 version), and this time a comparison group also saw the film. Experimental subjects saw the film, read the book, then saw the film, while comparisons saw the film twice.

In all studies, reading the book increased the comprehensibility of the film, but seeing the same film twice did not make it more understandable. Students also showed increased interest in reading. The reactions of the subjects were very encouraging. The following is a typical response to an open-ended question asked after reading the book and seeing the movie, from Cho (2007):

“I couldn’t understand most of the movie before. To my surprise, I understood it much better than before. All my friends in my class said the same thing. It was unbelievable.”

Although comprehension improved, the films were still, however, challenging. We have thus taken some steps toward making films more comprehensible, but we have not yet succeeded as much as we would like to.

Summary

Studies done over the last decade have confirmed that self-selected reading and hearing stories work. The results are remarkably consistent, especially when combined with results of studies done in other countries with other researchers (Krashen, 2007). The research has also confirmed that people can get excited about reading even from a brief exposure to comprehensible, interesting reading material, a conclusion similar to Trelease’s idea of a “home run book experience” (Trelease, 2006). Finally, the research has shown that reading can provide valuable background information that makes aural input more comprehensible, and thus more useful for language acquisition.
References


Managing Meaningful Interaction in the Elementary Language Classroom

by Carol Gaab
TPRS Publishing, Inc.

Seasoned presenter, Carol Gaab has been presenting TPRS workshops and in-services for national and international schools and universities since 1996. Carol also presents for the Bureau of Education and Research and is known for presentations that are engaging and practical. In addition to teacher training, Carol has 16 years experience teaching Spanish and has been an ESL teacher for various major league baseball clubs since 1990. Her clients have included the SF Giants, Oakland A’s, CO Rockies, AZ Diamondbacks and Milwaukee Brewers. Carol has written and published TPRS training materials and curricula for elementary through high school students. She also serves as a TPRS consultant/editor for various textbook publishers. For more information about Carol, visit tprstorytelling.com.

If you have ever taught an elementary language class, then you know what a challenge managing ‘group’ discussions can be. An elementary teacher can go from calm class to chaos in 3 seconds, just by asking a harmless question. A simple question, such as “Who likes strawberry ice cream?”, can elicit an explosion of simultaneous responses that grow louder and more intense with each second that ticks by without some type of acknowledgement for students’ meaningful contributions to the discussion. The volume grows louder, and voices become more piercing as each student struggles to heard: “I don’t like strawberry ice cream; I like chocolate!...I LOVE strawberry ice cream!... I’m allergic to strawberrtwies!... After my friend’s birthday party, my sister threw up strawberry ice cream in the car!... One time, my dog ate my ice cream cone!... My mom can’t eat ice cream; she’s lactose intolerant... One simple question (“Who likes strawberry ice cream?”) can leave a teacher teetering on the brink of insanity and wondering why s/he hadn’t just done a coloring activity.

Now, some of you are probably asking, “What’s wrong with coloring activities?” The answer is nothing, as long as you fill the activity with an abundance of contextualized, compelling, comprehensible input, and if you use the activity sparingly, so that you do not deprive students of meaningful interaction in the target language. Teachers can give commands, such as “Color the ball blue. Color the boy’s shirt red.”, but commands do not generally help students develop fluency. They help students develop passive language skills, but why would we settle for simple passive skills when young learners are capable of much more? Young learners can develop active language skills that will lead to real fluency in the target language.

For more information about these and other comprehension-based strategies for all ages, you may want to consider attending the Multi-cultural Language Conference in Ixtapa, Mexico, June 28-July 4, 2010. Visit http://www.tprstorytelling.com, for more information.
So how do teachers provide meaningful interaction in the target language without sacrificing sanity or a positive, productive learning environment? Think about how we engage babies, toddlers and young children in any activity or discussion. The answer is simple: **questions!** More? Do you want more?... Is the ball red or blue?... Which one is the pig? What does the cat say?... What's your favorite color?... What's your favorite TV show?... etc. **Personalized** questions, such as these, provide meaningful interaction/discussion that is age-appropriate and personally relevant, but only manageable with very few children. The key is to make personalized questions manageable and effective for a classroom full of children.

Managing productive classroom discussion in the target language relies on two crucial skills: how we ask questions and how we elicit responses. In terms of how we ask questions, there are several variables that should be controlled: 1) **Questions should always be comprehensible.** Start by asking low-level questions (yes-no and either-or), and use visuals and gestures to help provide meaning and context. 2) **Keep questions concrete.** Young learners do best with questions that are grounded in everyday events, since previous life experiences provide the foundation for new understanding and learning. Young learners tend to be egocentric, and questions that pertain to their lives/life experiences will provide the most meaning. 3) **Questions should be personalized and engaging.** Ask playful and fun questions that appeal to students’ interests. 4) **Ask Questions that have an illusion of open-endedness.** Young learners generally lack both the language skills and the cognitive reasoning skills to answer a truly open-ended question. However, teachers can create the illusion of an open-ended question by offering a limited number of choices. *(ex.: What do you want to eat?– pizza or tacos?/pizza, a taco or a hamburger?)*

Group discussion in the elementary language classroom takes patience and strategic planning. First, teachers need to carefully craft questions that meet the above-mentioned criteria, and then they need to manage how students provide responses. Random, raucous responses will negate the effectiveness of personalized questions, no matter how well they are presented. If teachers strategically provide fun, natural and structured opportunities for all students to respond, young learners will be more apt to pay attention to questions and to the answers that are provided by classmates. Every student needs a viable outlet to provide meaningful, personalized answers that will be noticed and acknowledged.

Let’s face it, listening to twenty-five individual answers gets boring, and it leads to **contrived** questions that lack meaning. This begs the question: **HOW** do we notice and acknowledge all student responses without losing ‘control’ and without compromising engaging, interesting input? The answer is through variety and creativity! The following is a list of tactics for eliciting, managing and acknowledging responses from early language learners:

**Post-it Charts:**
On the board or on butcher paper, create a chart that pertains to students’ likes, interests or life experiences. *(ie: favorite color, favorite ice cream flavors, pets, sports, etc.)* Label three to five columns along the bottom. *(ie: chocolate, vanilla, strawberry, other)* Point to the chocolate column and ask students, “**Who likes chocolate ice cream?**” Students who like chocolate ice cream place their name on the chocolate column. Continue asking about each flavor until all students have placed their name on the chart. Compare and contrast student (dis)likes, asking basic questions interspersed with amusing questions. *(ie: Does Billy like vanilla ice cream or does Jenny like vanilla ice cream? What kind of ice cream does Billy like? Does Billy like vanilla or does Billy like JENNY? Does Tyler like chocolate ice cream? Does Tyler like chocolate or spinach ice cream? What kind of ice cream does Sponge Bob like?)* Other charts could be based on other questions, such as, **What sport do you play?** What’s your favorite color? **Do you have a pet?**-a dog?, a cat?, a fish?, a mouse? Etc.
TPR Responses:
In addition to the basic “Raise your hand if...” or “Stand up if...”, students can also respond to questions with a specific action or gesture. Questions and corresponding gestures might include: Who has brown hair?– Jump twice, if you have brown hair. Who has a red car?– Put your hands on your head, if you have a red car. Who plays piano?– Pretend you are playing the piano. Who is wearing a red shirt?– Stand up, if you are wearing a red shirt. Who is wearing jeans?– Dance ballet, if you are wearing jeans. Who rides the school bus?– Bounce up and down in your seat, if you ride the bus. Who rides bike to school?– Lay on your back and ride bicycle with your feet in the air, if you ride bike to school. Who walks to school?– Walk in place, if you walk to school. Etc.

Hands-on Responses
Hands-on responses require students to have one to three visual representations of possible answers. Visuals can take a variety of forms: hand-made popsicle stick puppets, Clip Art images, images or line drawings from curricula, coloring activities, etc., colored yarn, props, toys, etc. Ask a variety of questions that can be answered by simply holding up a visual representation of the answer. Students can verbalize answers as they hold up each item, and the teacher should vocalize each desired answer. What color is your hair? / What color is Billy's hair?– Hold up the appropriate color yarn. Do you live in a house or an apartment?– Hold up appropriate picture. Who lives in a Pineapple under the sea? / Who lives in the White House?– Hold up appropriate character. Etc.

Lottery Responses
Write every student’s name on a popsicle stick, and place the popsicle sticks in a jar. After every third or fourth group question, prep the class for the “Special Question.” Pull a popsicle stick (student’s name) out of the jar and dramatically say, “It’s time for a “Special Question. The Special question is for... student’s name!” Direct the next question to that student, but MAKE SURE you guarantee success when you ask the question. For example, if you ask “Who lives in the White House?”, guarantee success by pointing to a picture of the White House as you ask. Then pause briefly to discern whether or not the student understands the questions and knows the answer. If s/he needs more help (aka: scaffolding), simply follow up with an either-or option: “Does Sponge Bob live in the White House or does Obama (the president) live in the White House?”

Sustaining a positive learning environment is crucial for comprehensibility and for maintaining student engagement and focus, regardless of the age of the learner.
Letter from the Editor: An Endorsement of iFLT: the International Forum on Language Teaching

The birth of the International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching

In 2004, The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching was born during a conversation between Dr. Krashen and myself over a glass of wine. In our first year there was an on-line subscription charge of $25.00. The following year, in response to a concern that IJFLT was prohibitively expensive for some in our international community, it became a free on-line journal. It is dedicated to communicating research, articles and helpful information regarding language acquisition to support teachers as they endeavor to create fluent, multilingual students. Our editorial board expanded, as did our membership, which now exceeds 11,000 subscribers.

An IJFLT Conference?

In the past two years those of us who started the Journal along with many presenters in the TPR Storytelling® community began to brainstorm about the possibility of creating our own conference. After a decade of meeting annually at the National TPRS Conference, state conferences, regional conferences and workshops, our collaboration had manifested in projects, books, new workshops and new teaching ideas. As a result, we began to see that the strength of a conference is as much in the people who attend as in the caliber of the presentations. What we have learned over the years is that we have been most inspired to create, write, brainstorm, envision and implement when we were in one another’s company. The power of the interaction and the networking at conferences inspired us as much or more towards innovation as did the actual content of the conference.

We imagined uniting our international readers under an umbrella of comprehension-based methods, including TPR, TPRS®, Story-asking and Sheltered-Subject Matter Instruction. What if teachers of English as a Foreign Language and as a Second Language, bilingual teachers and second language teachers could come together to share ideas, strategies and research? What if it the conference could welcome both first and second language teachers? What if all people with similar views of language acquisition could interact? The more people who participated in brainstorming sessions, the bigger the ideas became.

We discussed an inexpensive, non-profit conference run by a board of directors, that would be accessible to anyone who wished to attend. What if a conference could be run like a forum or a Farmer’s Market?

The Forum was the public space in the middle of a Roman city that was the center of judicial and business affairs and a place of assembly for the people and gathering place of great social significance.

A Krashen quote from an early discussion: “Let me share my fantasy: A no-dues, wide open organization. The only real expense is the conference. And all we need for a conference is a place to hold it. Charge admission to the conference, that’s all, just enough to pay for the space and presenters, but no big shot expensive keynotes.

We have already made history with the free journal. Maybe we can make history with the new organization.

The other alternative is to have a huge Tupperware party.”

Armed with an idealistic vision of creating a non-profit conference, we began seeking an organization that could provide us with a non-profit umbrella and a location.

COACH: From Fantasy to Reality

COACH Foreign Language Project www.coachflproject.org is a community of professional language teacher leaders founded by Dr. Suzanne Charlton, 1983 California State Teacher of the Year. COACH is committed to improving foreign language teaching and learning. Their collaboration provides teachers with creative, standards-based lessons.
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and classroom resources for a variety of World Languages, and promotes teachers’ professional growth through hands-on workshops, institutes and travel study programs.

The group is based in California and agreed to sponsor the 1st Annual International Forum on Language Teaching, host the conference at Los Alamitos High School and be our local resource in Southern California.

Our first official meetings took place in San Diego in November, 2009 and coincided with the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL). COACH’s booth at ACTFL was surrounded by teachers hungry for ideas, packets, strategies and support from other teachers. COACH is a powerful presence in California and an alliance with COACH was clearly one with great potential. Real teachers helping other teachers is precisely our goal.

**The First Meetings: Honoring Our Roots, Planting New Trees**

At our first meeting, we began to brainstorm the perfect conference. There would be coaching, so that teachers could leave with new skills instead of just new information.

There would be time to meet with colleagues and collaborate on projects. There would be a Fluency Fast pre-conference for language teachers who wanted to improve their own language proficiency as well as those who wanted to learn a new language. There would be sessions for teachers of each language. There would be workshops that were truly hands-on workshops, not lectures.

In addition, we wanted to honor our past and our roots: Dr. James Asher, the inventor of Total Physical

COACH Foreign Language Project's booth at ACTFL was inundated with teachers all day every day.

First iFLT meeting, San Diego, California. Top: Kristy Placido, Contee Seely, Karen Rowan, Carmen Andrews-Sanchez, Jason Fritze, Darcy Pippin Seated: Diana Noonan (Conference Director), Leslie Davison, Dr. Stephen Krashen, Linda Li, Carol Gaab

The COACH Team, 2007

Providing quality professional development for Foreign Language Teachers throughout Southern California.
Response®, Berty Segal, long-time TPR expert, Blaine Ray, the inventor of TPR Storytelling® and Dr. Steven Krashen and Dr. Tracy Terrell, creators of the Natural Approach. So many teachers who owe their methodologies to them say that they use techniques from each one to build strong programs that accelerate the language acquisition process.

**New Ideas and Directions**

Our November meeting started with a short introduction by Dr. Krashen on some of his newest ideas. These new ideas and their implications will, of course, be discussed at the International Forum on Language Teaching. The collaborative spirit at iFLT will expand these ideas and energize all of us.

Dr. Krashen continues to broaden our view, expanding our conference planning beyond current comprehension-based methods and into the creation of a conference that is both inclusive and “internationalized”. IJFLT has provided a broad base of research indicating the power of comprehension-based methods in language education, and iFLT will give teachers a place to share their ideas on how best to implement that research.

On behalf of the entire editorial board, thank you for your support of IJFLT over the past 6 years. We enthusiastically recommend that IJFTL subscribers and contributors attend iFLT in Southern California in late July.

*Karen Rowan*  
*Editor, IJFLT*

iFLT will take place 10 minutes from Seal Beach. Hotels on the beach are providing group discounts. Information is on the web site. To find a roommate to split expenses, join the Facebook group iFLT 2010.
RESEARCH PAPER
SUBMISSION GUIDELINES

The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching is a peer-reviewed scholarly journal that advances theory and practice in foreign and second language teaching. IJFLT invites manuscripts on the topic of foreign and second language teaching. Manuscripts can deal with both children and adults in any first language and any target language.

IJFLT seeks manuscripts that deal with both theory and research in foreign and second language teaching that have the potential to speak to practice and practical papers that have the potential to inform theory. In addition, we encourage manuscripts that describe innovations in language teaching that include a theoretical rationale.

IJFLT especially invites short papers (2000 words or fewer). IJFLT believes the profession can be served better by short, succinct papers. Some topics, however, require a longer treatment. Papers will not be refused based on length, but IJFLT encourages authors to submit longer papers only when it is obviously justified.

IJFLT also especially invites replications of previously published studies.

Manuscripts should include the following:

(1) An abstract, not to exceed 150 words.
(2) While an extensive review of the literature is not critical, the manuscript should include a theoretical framework, rationale, and appropriate citations.
(3) Whenever possible, authors of studies that include statistical analyses should include measures of effect sizes as well as statistical significance.
(4) References and tables can be done in any of the following styles: APA, Chicago, or MLA.
(5) Biographical information of approximately 25 words, including name, title, university or affiliation, location, and area of expertise. A photo is requested, but optional.

Submissions should be sent electronically to:
ijflteditor@gmail.com.
Learn Powerful Comprehension-based Strategies
including TPR®, TPRS®, Story-asking™, Strategies for the Elementary Classroom, Proficiency-based Grading and more!

3rd Annual Multi-Cultural Conference
Ixtapa, Mexico
June 27 - July 4, 2010

Instructors:
Jason Fritze, Susan Gross, Carol Gaab,
Kristy Placido, Leslie Davison, Scott Benedict

The #1 rated resort in Ixtapa

IJFLT Subscribers save $75 on registration
Discount expires Feb. 10, 2010. Use coupon code: IJFLT-75

Teacher Conference: $1399  --  Spanish Class: $1349
All-inclusive fee includes:
• 5-day conference (June 28 - July 2, 2010)
• 7-night stay at Club Med-Ixtapa
  (June 27 - July 4, 2010)
• unlimited food and drink
• ground transfers to and from Club Med and Ixt-Zih Airport
• tips
• daily sports & activities, including lessons for each
• nightly cultural entertainment
• private beach
• just a 10-minute walk from the nature preserve, public beach, public fishing boats, open-air market and water taxi.

For more information,
visit
www.tprstorytelling.com
or call
800-877-4738
2010 Summer Language Institute

To register click here.

Experience learning Spanish in a fun, low-stress environment. These engaging, interactive classes will be taught using Total Physical Response (TPR) and Teaching Proficiency through Reading and Storytelling (TPRS), two methods that mimic the way you learned your first language. You will be carefully immersed in the language so that it challenges you without going over your head. Learn Spanish through movement, games, songs, and storytelling, and you will be surprised at how much you can learn in 23 hours of instruction.

COURSE LISTINGS:

**Spanish I with Brian Roberts (ages 16 and up)**

July 19-23, 8:30-1:00, University School of Nashville
August 2-6, 10:00-3:30, O'More College of Design, Franklin, TN

This class is perfect for those who have no Spanish experience at all, and even those who have some Spanish experience but are unsure of their ability.

Brian Roberts is a seasoned TPRS language teacher who has taught at CALA's Summer Language Institute for the past three years. He holds an MA in Teaching Foreign Languages and degrees in Spanish Language and Literature, Philosophy, and Psychology. Participants’ descriptions of Brian’s recent one-week Spanish classes say it all: “The whole week was energizing. Brian's class was interesting, invigorating and entertaining. . . . I learned more this week than I did in 4 semesters. . . . Brian was awesome! . . . I did not feel anxious - I felt comfortable.. . . The most efficient methods of studying a foreign language that I have ever seen.”

**Spanish II with Jason Fritze (ages 16 and up)**

July 19-23, 8:30-1:00, University School of Nashville

You do not have to have taken CALA’s Spanish I course in order to take Spanish II, but it is recommended that you have taken a Spanish I course elsewhere (either one year of high school or one semester of college) before taking it.

Jason Fritze has taught Spanish and French for eight years in public schools, and as a TPRS teacher, was named Teacher of the Year. His classes are one part stand-up comedy and one part drama class. In story after story Jason entertains his students while at the same time bringing a vast knowledge of methods that guarantee successful language acquisition. It's hard to believe you're in a class at all. Jason is a National Board Certified Teacher in World Languages, with teaching experience spanning from elementary to adult. Jason regularly presents at regional and national language conferences and conducts workshops/inservices on TPRS for language teachers throughout the U.S. See his bio at www.comprehensibleinput.com.

The cost for all language classes is $350. An additional $20 materials fee will be due on the first day of class.

For all registrations there is a $25 non-refundable fee included in the listed tuition. Participants may receive a refund of all but this fee if they cancel up to two weeks before the start of their class.
Jason Fritze, On Reading
Free video
1 hour, 16 minutes
www.fluencyfast.com/fritze.cfm

From the 2009 Fluency Fast Teacher Training, Denver, CO:
Jason Fritze has taught Spanish and French for twelve years in public schools, and was named Teacher of the Year. His classes are one part stand-up comedy and one part drama class. Jason is a National Board Certified Teacher in World Languages, with teaching experience spanning from elementary to adult. Jason regularly presents at regional and national language conferences and conducts workshops/inservices on reading and other comprehension-based methods for language teachers throughout the U.S. He currently teaches in Laguna Beach, CA. See his bio at www.comprehensibleinput.com.

Jason’s upcoming workshops:
2. Advanced Spanish for non-native Spanish teachers (a class for Spanish teachers to improve their language skills) at the Denver Language Institute, July 12-15, www.fluencyfast.com
3. The 3rd Annual Multi-Cultural Conference, Ixtapa, Mexico, June 27-July 4, 2010
4. The Center for Accelerated Language Acquisition 2010 Summer Language Institute, July 19-23, 2010

His web site is www.comprehensibleinput.com.

Dr. Steve Krashen
Free video

Keynote address to the Fluency Fast Teacher Training program at the Denver Language Institute, July, 2009
www.fluencyfast.com/krashen.cfm

Dr. Krashen will speak at the International Forum on Language Teaching, www.iFLT.org, July, 2010

Las Aventuras de Isabela
by Karen Rowan

Las aventuras de Isabela is the first novel in the Fluency Fast series for true beginners. It uses a vocabulary of only 200 Spanish words to tell a 2,200-word story. It is repetitive and simple and uses many cognates to make the book comprehensible to beginning adults and children. Set in Guanajuato, Mexico.

$5.00 To order go to: http://www.fluencyfast.com/catalog/index2006.htm

The English version of Isabela is available on-line for free to ELA teachers in the US and EFL teachers outside of the US. http://www.fluencyfast.com/isabela/index.cfm
To submit articles for review, send them by attachment to ijflteditor@gmail.com

Found a helpful link or interesting web site that should be shared with other teachers? Have an idea for an article or something that works in your classroom? Want to let teachers know about upcoming state language conferences, workshops or trainings? Send us an email at ijflteditor@gmail.com.

Interested in TPRS®? Check out www.moreprs.net, a new forum created by language teachers.

Fluency Fast Language Classes
Spring & Summer
Class Schedule
www.fluencyfast.com

Find teaching materials, readers, books, CDs at www.tprstorytelling.com

Podcasts in English for English language learners www.eslpod.com

Subscribe to IJFLT
To subscribe to The International Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, a free, on-line quarterly journal, go to:

www.ijflt.com

Winter, 2004
Spring, 2005
Summer, 2005
Fall, 2005
Winter 2006
Fall 2006
Fall 2007
Spring 2008

Do you have an idea for a beginning reader? We need more comprehensible, easy readers that use high frequency vocabulary, lots of repetition and are also steeped in culture. Contact us:
info@fluencyfast.com
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April 8, 9, 10, 2010  
Beginning Spanish  
Taught by Meredith Richmond

Denver summer classes, $230  
July 12-15, 2010  
Beginning Spanish, taught by Karen Rowan

Intermediate Spanish, taught by Carmen Andrews-Sanchez

Advanced Spanish, taught by Jason Fritze

Beginning French, taught by Diana Noonan

Beginning Mandarin, taught by Annick Chen

Beginning Arabic, taught by Merhan Zaina

September 20, 21, 25, 2010  
Beginning Spanish, taught by Karen Rowan

October 4, 5, 9, 2010  
Intermediate Spanish, taught by Karen Rowan

September 27, 28 and October 11, 12, 2010  
Advanced Spanish, taught by Karen Rowan  
Los Alamitos, California - $100 with iFLT registration. $150 alone.

July 24-25, Pre-Conference Workshop with The International Forum on Language Teaching  
INTERMEDIATE Spanish Carmen Andrews-Sanchez 8am-4pm $199.00

ADVANCED Spanish (for non-native Spanish teachers) Greg Stevens 8am-4pm $100.00

BEGINNING French Donna Tatum-Johns 8am-4pm $100.00

BEGINNING Spanish Karen Rowan 8am-4pm $100.00

BEGINNING Mandarin Linda Li 8am-4pm

Webinars (on-line workshops) through Teach For June with Scott Benedict

http://www.teachforjune.com/workshops/registration/

The following are paid webinars. We’re currently offering a discount of 50% for these webinars. Normal pricing is $50/day/person or $200/day/group. The cost of each of these webinars will go up 1 week prior to the event.

Saturday, February 20 and Saturday, February 27  
@ 10a-1p Pacific/1p-4p Eastern: Proficiency-Based Grading--cost: $50/person or $200/group  
Saturday, March 13 and Saturday, March 20  
@ 10a-1p Pacific/1p-4p Eastern: Accurate & Effective Assessment--cost: $50/person or $200/group (this is a great follow-up to our Proficiency-Based Grading workshop!!)

Saturday, March 27  
@ 10a-12n Pacific/1p-3p Eastern: Powerful PQA--cost: $25/person or $100/group  
University graduate-level (may not be used towards degree) credits are offered with every teachforjune workshop through University of the Pacific.

Scott Benedict
Veterans Tribute CTA, Las Vegas, NV
rsbenedict@gmail.com
teachforjune.com
COACH Foreign Language Project, Inc.

is proud to sponsor a conference providing hands-on training and coaching in comprehension-based methods including TPR®, Story-askingcc, and sheltered-subject-matter instruction.

WHEN: July 27-31, 8 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.
WHERE: Los Alamitos (Seal Beach), CA
COST: $295 per person until May 31st (discounts available)
REGISTER: www.iFLT.org

Presenters: Dr. Stephen Krashen • Berty Segal-Cook • Jason Fritze • Carol Gaab • Donna Tatum-Johns
Diana Noonan • Carmen Andrews-Sánchez • Dr. Shelly Thomas • Karen Rowan • Kristy Placido
Leslie Davison • Scott Benedict • Linda Li • Teri Weichert And more!

How do comprehension-based methods which focus on reading and listening lead to oral proficiency and writing fluency? What are the implications of the latest brain research on language acquisition? How are comprehension-based methods used in immersion, content-based instruction and sheltered-subject-matter instruction?

What about grades, formal assessments, classroom management, technology in the comprehension-based classroom?


Through training in multiple strategies for providing comprehensible and compelling comprehensible input, classroom teachers currently using methods like TPR®, Story-askingcc, reading and sheltered-subject-matter instruction will share what they know, coach teachers to improve their own skills in comprehension-based methods and help each other to leave with solid, usable techniques and strategies that they can implement immediately.

Fluency Fast Pre-conference Classes in
- Beginning Mandarin
- Intermediate French
- Beginning Spanish
- Intermediate Spanish
- Advanced Spanish

$120 or $100 with iFLT registration

Saturday, July 24-Sunday, July 25, 2010

The Forum was the public space in the middle of a Roman city that was the center of judicial and business affairs and a place of assembly for the people. A gathering place of great social significance, it was often the scene of diverse activities, including political discussions, meetings, et cetera. A public forum, also called an open forum, is open to all expression that is protected under the First Amendment. Streets, parks, and sidewalks are considered open to public discourse by tradition and are designated as traditional public forums.

We hope you’ll join us for a new vision of what language education can be.