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Abstract

This thesis comprises a study of English Language teaching methodologies in the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes at The Udmurt State University in Russia. Findings are drawn from a combination of qualitative and quantitative research methods which provide both a longitudinal and cross-sectional perspective.

Existing information gathered for a taxonomic survey and supported by naturalistic observations demonstrates that UdSU has a small corpus of ESP teaching materials with a limited value. Only two teachers have been research active in creating UdSU variants of the Milashevich Method and the Intensive Method. However, both variants contain weaknesses and require further methodological development.

Insights drawn from an analytical investigation into UdSU's four strands of assessment reveal that there is a lack of consistency in the application of and therefore a methodological weakness in the Faculty's assessment criteria. Data gathered from existing material and interviews, show that UdSU requires further development in the area of syllabus design. At present, it continues to work within restricting institutional constraints.

Elicitation techniques involving questionnaires and interviews support the qualitative findings of the taxonomic survey that teaching methodologies are limited in range and low in cognitive value. The teachers' preferred teaching strategies correlate strongly with their students' preferred learning tasks. While the students are positively motivated by contact with Target Language speakers and the general usefulness of the TL, they are less positive about the difficulty of the TL and the learning experiences of the TL classroom.

In the conclusion, I show that UdSU's ESP teaching methodologies are of limited quality. They have served a purpose in the given isolated environment of Central Russia. However, contact with the West has exposed fundamental flaws in the Faculty's approach to ESP teaching. In the foreseeable future, it will continue to experience difficulties in implementing change.
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CHAPTER ONE - INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview of Thesis and Statement of Aims
Since the disintegration of the Communist system in Central and Eastern Europe at the start of the 1990's, the European Union has sought to assist the countries located in those regions in a variety of ways. In higher education, TEMPUS projects (See Appendix 1 for further details about TEMPUS) were established to assist Central and Eastern European universities in updating the staff on Western teaching and assessment methodologies. In addition, the aim was to provide individual subject faculties with personal contact with Western academics in individual subject areas. Financial support was also given for the purpose of staff mobilities to Western higher education establishments and for the purchase of Western teaching resources. In 1994, The Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) along with The University of Helsinki and the Technische Hochschule Darmstadt began a one year preparatory TEMPUS project with The Udmurt State University (UdSU). The goal for the Russian 'partner' university was to seek assistance in the development of the educational process in its proposed Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes (FLSP). The project was completed during the year 1994-95 and of the 96 pre-JEP projects financed in Russia at that stage, it was only one of 20 which received full funding for the three-year follow-up project.

The TEMPUS project, T-JEP-10054-95, had as its aim 'the updating of languages curricula, methodology and materials' in the FLSP at UdSU. The specific objectives of the project were: (1) The restructuring of English and German courses (not French) for non-specialist linguists at The Udmurt State University. This included producing syllabuses for EFL and DAF (Deutsch als Fremdsprache) courses; (2) The training of UdSU staff in communicative approaches to teaching and learning. This involved
improving' the staff's own abilities in the foreign language, updating teaching and learning skills (particularly for those teachers under the age of thirty-five) and showing them how to acquire the ability to devise new teaching materials; (3) The creation of a new Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes at UdSU. This included the establishment of an open learning centre for staff and students.

During this three year period, several crucial issues arose which had not been anticipated before the beginning of the project. First, it became clear to those involved in the project that much of the work which TEMPUS expected to be completed could not in fact be achieved in the manner originally envisaged. TEMPUS had previously been active in Central Europe only. The organisation had drawn up similar criteria and goals for Russia. However it was felt by many involved in T-JEP-10054-95 that TEMPUS had not fully appreciated the realities of the situation on the ground at UdSU. Second, there was a distinct dearth of knowledge about Russian language teaching methodologies on the part of many Western academics involved in the project. This is reflected in the limited range of Western literature on Russian universities outside of Moscow and St. Petersburg. In the case of UdSU, the university is situated in Central Russia, 600 miles from Moscow in the city of Izhevsk which was formerly a closed city. Consequently, knowledge about UdSU in the West was non-existent at the start of the project. The third issue leads directly on from the latter, namely that the starting point for the construction of an understanding between Western academics and their UdSU counterparts was extremely low. This was experienced in many different ways such as an adequate appreciation of the other's educational traditions, the use of different technical terminology and issues relating to the specific nature of EFL teaching at UdSU.
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1.2 Context of the Research and Definition of the Research Question

From the evidence given in section 1.1 above it is clear that there are gaps in the West's knowledge of Russia's EFL teaching and assessment methodologies. This knowledge needs to be updated and the gaps filled. It is the purpose of this research to fill these gaps at least in part. By focusing on one of the so-called 'provincial' universities which represent a clear majority of universities in Russia, it is envisaged that a unique contribution can be made to the West's understanding of how ESP is taught in a Russian context.

There is another key reason why it is important that research into UdSU is required in the West which is the most important of all for EU taxpayers. The European Training Foundation runs the TEMPUS projects in Russia using EU their money. Each project costs around £500,000 over the three year cycle. Over the last ten years several hundred projects have been completed or are nearing completion. To those Westerners working on the ground at UdSU, it was clear that TEMPUS had not fully understood the true nature of the situation at UdSU prior to establishing the goals of the project. The aim of this research is to fill in this gap in the EU's knowledge of past and current teaching and learning realities at UdSU. As a direct consequence of the research, TEMPUS can benefit from it and modify its aims accordingly in future JEP projects in areas outside Moscow and St. Petersburg and similarly in other former Soviet republics.

This research has been carried out completely independently of TEMPUS and the work with which I was involved in the TEMPUS T-JEP-10054-95 project. Objectivity has been retained throughout by avoiding the area in which I was involved, namely the production of the First Year General English Syllabus. The conclusions drawn are based on solid theoretical approaches to research as discussed in the overview of Russian and Western methodology in Chapter Three. The investigation involves an examination of specific
teaching methodologies with particular reference to English and where appropriate to German. Specifically, this research is an analytical and evaluative study of teaching issues with the aim of clarifying to what extent there is quality in the EFL teaching methodologies used at the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes at UdSU. In Chapter Three, this incorporates an analysis and evaluation of the evolution of the methodological theories and practices at UdSU. Chapter Five analyses the taxonomic overview of all UdSU publications over the last twenty years. In Chapter Six, UdSU's approach to assessment and its response to the TEMPUS-inspired syllabus design methodology are evaluated. Chapter Seven investigates the current perceptions of teachers and students and also the students' attitude towards language learning.

In order to contextualise the situation at UdSU, references are made to Moscow State University, Novisibirsk State Technical University in Russia and the University of West Bohemia in the Czech Republic. Where most appropriate, comparisons and contrasts are drawn with these universities on specific relevant aspects. The choice of Moscow State University allows for comparison with what is generally accepted to be the best university in Russia. It too has been involved over the same period in a TEMPUS project for languages. Novisibirsk State Technical University is located further away from Moscow and in that respect it provides a point of comparison with UdSU as a provincial university. The third choice of the University of West Bohemia (UWB) has been selected with care for several reasons. First, it benefited from a three year TEMPUS project from 1992-1994 during the first wave of European Union funding in the former Warsaw Pact states. In that respect it is several years further down the path post-TEMPUS than UdSU, thus allowing for the learning of lessons for the future. Second, Czech is a member of the Slavonic languages and native speakers experience similar problems when learning English to those experienced by Russians.
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1.3 Objectives
Within the goal of clarifying to what extent there is quality in the EFL teaching methodologies used at the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes at UdSU, a number of objectives will be realised. These are to:

(1) Establish a clear empirical background to the situation at UdSU. This is essential if a proper understanding of the remaining objectives of this research are to be fulfilled. The empirical background incorporates an appreciation of the geographical, historical, political, economic and social dimensions of life in the city and state in which UdSU is located. In addition, key background details are required also about both the teachers and students of the FLSP in order to ascertain their past and present situations.

(2a) Identify the exact nature of the Eastern European and specifically Russian language learning methodologies which are in current use in the FLSP at UdSU.
(2b) Characterise the nature of any developments of these specific methodologies carried out by teachers within the FLSP and evaluate the effectiveness of any changes made.

(3a) Trace the history of the usage of distinctly Western methodologies in the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes.
(3b) Quantify the extent to which Western methodologies are used by the teachers of the Faculty.
(3c) Deduce the extent to which Western methodologies are suitable for UdSU.
(3d) Evaluate the extent to which Western methodologies will be suitable for use at UdSU as it emerges from its long period of academic isolation from the outside world.
(3e) Recommend suitable future methodologies for language learning at UdSU.
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(4) Evaluate past and current practices in assessment. As the claims made by staff at UdSU cannot always be substantiated this research seeks to distinguish between fact and fiction. The key elements which require evaluation include the entrance examination, the placement test, the end of year oral examination and the final exit oral examination. The research into assessment is completed by an investigation into the practice of awarding marks for oral examinations.

(5a) Review the history of syllabus design and approaches to assessment at the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes at UdSU.

(5b) Assess the impact of Western theories on syllabus design and assessment at UdSU.

(6a) Quantify the extent to which specific teaching strategies are used by teachers within the FLSP at UdSU.

(6b) Determine the individual teacher's perceptions of the methodologies used in the EFL classroom.

(6c) Assess the effectiveness of the teaching.

(6d) Assess the future prospects for the same methodologies at UdSU in the aftermath of the introduction of Western materials and methodologies.

(7a) Produce a profile of the learner population in the FLSP at UdSU.

(7b) Identify their attitudes to language learning and classroom instruction.

(7c) Learn about their perceptions of what occurs during the learning process in the classroom.
1.4 Conclusion to Chapter One

It is inevitable that the areas listed in these objectives overlap each other to differing degrees. However, the order of the objectives reflects the sequence of chapters within this book because it has been possible to avoid duplication by following this sequenced approach to presentation. Consequently, Chapter Two deals with the empirical background of the teaching situation at UdSU and how the teaching at the FLSP is affected by the realities of life in Izhevsk. It is important for readers to have a broad understanding of the realities at UdSU in order to comprehend the qualitative and quantitative findings in later chapters. In Chapter Three, the theoretical background to the research project is presented. First Western FL teaching methodologies are analysed and relevant sections are linked to the Russian context, in particular to UdSU, before focusing on specifically Russian FL learning techniques. The history and development of these methods are traced and the degree to which they have influenced teaching at UdSU is indicated. In addition the extent to which Russian FL methodology has influenced Eastern European FL methodology and vice versa in the form of Suggestopedia and the Intensive Method, its Russian variant including the subsequent UdSU variant are analysed. Chapter Four explains the methodology used to carry out this research. It incorporates qualitative and quantitative aspects, the data collection procedure used and the statistical devices employed to verify the statistical acceptability of the findings. Chapter Five contains an analytic framework of taxonomic findings which are not results of a qualitative or quantitative nature but which contextualise the findings of Chapter Six (qualitative findings) and Chapter Seven (quantitative findings). In the final chapter, Chapter Eight, a conclusion to all the findings is given and the theoretical implications of what has been learnt have been drawn. This includes a revised approach to the way in which the West should seek to assist Russian universities in the development which is necessary in order to raise the quality of all Russian tertiary education establishments to world standards.
CHAPTER TWO - EMPIRICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Udmurt State University

A full understanding of the situation in the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes at the Udmurt State University and consequently the qualitative and quantitative results which are contained in Chapters Six and Seven can only be achieved when all factors affecting UdSU are taken into account. These include geographical location, politics, economics, history, language, society and culture. Their influence can be viewed in the sense of circles (some over-lapping, some concentric) which together combine to cover a central core of influence on life in Udmurtia. To ignore all or even some of these issues would be to overlook key issues which affect the true situation at UdSU. The material in this section is therefore organised in a sequenced manner. The larger picture within Russia as a whole is always presented briefly first, before the emphasis shifts to Udmurtia. Once the general influences have been dealt with, there is a further shift in emphasis to UdSU itself. The final part of this section provides a clear general overview of the University and its structures for those readers who are unfamiliar with the situation at UdSU. For further relevant background on the Russian economy and Russian education system and Udmurt ethnicity consult Appendix 2.

2.1.1 Udmurtia's Geographical Location

Udmurtia is located on the western side of the Ural Region area on the outermost extremity of European Russia (see Appendix 3). Culturally, the Udmurt people live in a unique position on the boundary of the Turkic-Mohammedan world from the East, the Slavonic-Christian world from the West and paganism from the Eurasian far north. Udmurtia experiences an extreme climate with temperatures as low as -30°C in the winter and as high as +30°C in the summer. The total area of the Republic of Udmurtia
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(42,100 km$^2$) is larger than Switzerland and is about equal to the area of Denmark. The land mass of Udmurtia is minuscule when compared to the whole of Russia and represents only 0.24% of the country's total land surface. The population of the Republic stands at 1,622,000 or 1% of the entire population of the Russian Federation. These statistics reveal the dilemma of the citizens of the Udmurt Republic. The size of Udmurtia in Western European terms is significant but is virtually irrelevant inside Russia. The population of Udmurtia is equal in numbers to the population of Northern Ireland. Yet, in relation to the population of the Russian Federation, the 1% figure for Udmurtia is indicative of the minimal relevance which the Republic represents to the whole population.

The Udmurt State University is located in Izhevsk, the capital city of the Republic of Udmurtia with a population of circa 650,000 inhabitants (42% of the entire population of the Republic). In Russian terms this constitutes only a medium-sized city. The city lies approximately 1,200 kilometres east of Moscow, just close enough and also not big enough to be able to act independently of the capital, unlike other cities further away in Siberia, such as Novisibirsk which can exercise a greater degree of autonomy. Izhevsk is geographically isolated not just from Moscow but cut off from other nations. Only one, Kazakhstan, is within a radius of 1,200 kilometres. Travelling a distance of up to 1,200 km from UWB in Pilsen (another TEMPUS beneficiary university under a similar scheme) for example would allow a traveller to reach 26 countries (United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Russia, Poland, Belarus, Ukraine, Switzerland, Austria, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria, Macedonian, Yugoslavia, Croatia, Slovenia, Albania, Italy, France and Spain). The contrast could not be starker. This distance makes physical contact with the West very difficult for people living in Izhevsk, while even radio and television broadcasts are almost impossible to pick up.
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It is not a surprise that transport to Izhevsk is extremely limited. There are no international flights bookable from Western Europe even though it has an airport. There are flights once a month to Istanbul and Abu Dhabi but these must be booked as round-trips originating from Russia. The reality contrasts sharply with regional cities such as Novosibirsk which has several direct flights to the West each week. Internal flights to Moscow and St. Petersburg are very limited in Western terms and airplanes of the Aeroflot splinter airlines may be viewed as suspect for passenger safety. Further to that, passengers in transit from the West in either of these two cities would have to transfer from the cities' international airports to the national ones in order to catch the connection flight.

The predominant passage to Izhevsk chosen by Western European visitors is a flight into Moscow followed by a 20 hour train journey (or a 32 hour journey if travelling from St. Petersburg). By the time a person arrives in Izhevsk therefore, 36 to 48 hours have passed since leaving home. The journey follows the two main lines of the Trans-Siberian Express but once again these run to the north and south of Izhevsk, but not through it. From the north a two hour car journey is required from Glazov or from the south a one hour journey from Agriz. There is one direct train from Moscow and St. Petersburg to Izhevsk but the flight arrival times generally restrict this option unless an overnight stay is organised.

From 1985 to 1991, Izhevsk's name was changed to Ustinov without consultation by the Soviet government in the tradition of renaming a Soviet city following the death of a high ranking official (In the case of Izhevsk, this was Soviet Defence Minister Dmitri F. Ustinov). Up until recently, Izhevsk was a designated 'closed city'. This meant that foreigners had effectively no access to the city. Even Russian citizens were refused entry or had to comply with severe restrictions. As a result, the vast majority of the local
population had no contact with foreigners. At present, Izhevsk remains a designated 'half-closed' city which in practical terms for foreigners means that the acquisition of a visa requires longer than for a visit to an 'open city'. Visas can only be granted under special circumstances with an invitation from a local organisation requiring ratification from the Udmurt Ministry of the Exterior. Tourism is completely unheard of. The Udmurt State government's own figures for 1995 verify this, revealing that the extremely small sum of $31,000 US was spent on tourism by foreigners (Westerners on business) throughout the entire year. On arrival in the city, the foreign visitor must hand over his passport and visa along with a fee of US $5 to the police who retain it for approximately three days before returning it with the required official frank. It is the responsibility of UdSU to ensure that this is done. Failure to do so quickly enough can and does result in official police aggravation for the UdSU staff in charge of foreign guests.

Living conditions in Izhevsk are typical for most of urban Russia. Traditional and often grotesque Soviet-style impersonal apartment blocks occupy the new sprawling suburbs and have replaced the more eloquent architecture of older buildings in the centre of the city. Roads just outside the centre are of very poor quality. Hot water for the entire city is heated centrally in the Soviet inspired hot water factory which shuts down for a month in the summer, leaving the inhabitants without any hot water. For such a large city, Izhevsk has very few shops. The first four Western-style supermarkets were opened in 1997 to much accolade. Though prices are slightly higher than in more traditional shops, many citizens of Izhevsk are proud of these shops where they can walk around with their own shopping basket and place in it what they wish to buy before paying at the check-out. Many city dwellers have a kitchen garden or 'dacha' where they spend most of their weekends from May through to October. The rural inhabitants often live in what can be described as third world conditions with no running water, often in remote areas. From these backgrounds the University draws its students.
While the above description of economic hardship applies to most Udmurt citizens, it must be pointed out that a small minority of the citizens, known as 'New Russians', have a great deal of money and purchasing power. This group is particularly appealing for the University. By offering special courses which must be paid for in hard currency, UdSU can earn substantial quantities of extra cash. However, there is evidence that academic standards are being compromised when the lack of ability or application in a student can be compensated for by a wealthy family.

2.1.2 The University

Udmurt State University is one of over fifty classical universities in the Russian Federation which receive state funding. UdSU was founded in 1972 in accordance with a resolution of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation. Created from the former Udmurt State Pedagogical Institute (founded 1931), its growth since has been rapid. Initially there were eight faculties (the term 'faculty' is comparable to the Western concept of a 'department'). At present there are nineteen faculties at UdSU. The University's Faculties of Humanics and Pedagogics include History, Russian Linguistics and Literature, Udmurt and Finno-Ugric Philology, Romance and Germanic Philology, Philosophy and Sociology, Psychology and Pedagogics, Economics, Law, Art, Pedagogical Faculty of Physical Culture, Business Administration, Preparatory Courses and Public Relations. The Faculties of Science and Science Engineering include Mathematics, Physics, Biology and Chemistry, Geography, Medical and Biotechnology, Oil and Gas and Physical Training.

According to the State Inspection for Accreditation (May 1997), UdSU has 9,567 students (6,783 full time and 2,784 part-time) and 800 teaching staff. (among them 45 Doctors of Science and 331 Candidates of Science). All these statistics are above the national average for the Russian Federation. It is therefore reasonable to posit the view
that the picture of what is found at UdSU should be representative (if not better) that what can be found elsewhere is Russia. Since 1991 there has been a private sector at the University. Students may have either a free education using an educational voucher but subject to means testing or they may contribute part or all of their fees. The academic year for full-time students at the Udmurt State University is as follows:

First Semester        Sept./Oct. to December (14 weeks)
Second Semester       February to May - (17 weeks)
Summer Session        June - extra classes
Aug. - Sept.          Students work on collective farms (4 weeks)

UdSU offers the following three types of degree:

(1) The Diplom is the first degree which is obtained after five years of study. Russians equate this with the Western M.A. but this assertion is rejected by most Western academics. The view held by most British academics who visit UdSU is that the first three years of the 'basic education' can be compared to the UK's 6th form courses. The next two years which lead to a diploma are approximately the level of HND courses and perhaps at only a few Russian universities would the level of BA be reached.

(2) The Candidate of Science degree (Kandidat Nauk) lasts three years (post Diplom) and is often done on a part-time basis. Students must pass examinations of a special programme, then write, publish and finally defend a thesis of circa 10,000 words. Western academics believe that a Candidate's degree would equate to a Western MA.

(3) The Doctor of Science degree (Doktor Nauk) involves extensive research leading to a doctoral thesis which must be submitted after publication to the Academic Council which has a secret vote. It frequently equates with the rank of professor. Postgraduate study for a doctorate is possible at present in twelve disciplines.
Some criticisms have been made of the present system at the University. The course structure is seen as too inflexible by some with no student choice. Consequently, the University is planning to offer a two tier system of education leading to a BA and then a MA but due to the slow decision-making process, this will take many years before its implementation.

UdSU possesses six large teaching blocks located within easy walking distance of the centre of Izhevsk (however, a fire in January 1999 caused severe damage to one of the buildings), four halls of residence, a sports centre with two swimming pools, a skiing centre, a preventorium housing 100 people, a health and training centre housing 300 people, botanical gardens, a biological research station, a publishing department, a printing department, the editorial board of a student newspaper, a medical room, three refectories, five snack bars, a nursery school, three museums and a House of Nature. UdSU’s library is housed in two buildings. The larger one is a closed shelf library card-catalogued, with books available on completion of a request slip. The State Inspection for Accreditation (Quality Assessment) of Higher educational Institutions of the Russian Federation (carried out between 12th and 17th May 1997) reported that the stacks contain 633,813 volumes, though in the FL section there are many duplicates and many of the books are old and often of negligible value. The libraries contain a dearth of genuine material for language learning. Often there are multiple copies of a few novels and some technical manuals and other low-value subject-specialised language pamphlets which are borrowed increasingly rarely by staff and students alike.

In its literature, Udmurt State University explains that its mission includes integration into the world academic system. At present, it is working on projects within the international programmes of TEMPUS. It has had links with universities in Austria (Vienna University), China (Fuzhou University), Finland (University of Turku and
University of Helsinki), Germany (Technische Hochschule Darmstadt), Hungary (the Hungarian Academy of Science and Szeged University), Italy (Aldo Moro University), Japan (Nagoya Institute of Technology), South Korea (Keimyung University), Spain (University of Granada), UK (Manchester Metropolitan University), USA (University of Central Florida) and Estonia and Poland (names for these partner universities have not been supplied). The exact nature of these contacts is (in typical UdSU style) rather sketchy. In several cases, the contact represents a single visit by a guest academic. In others (as is the case with Spain and the United States) there has been a small number of student exchanges. Other contacts with foreigners include occasional voluntary teaching offered by American airmen stationed at a United States airbase in Votkinsk, 50 kilometres away. Clearly, the trend shows an ever increasing level of contact with the outside world but the interaction is very limited in Western European terms. The difficulties of travel are the prime factor and in a post-TEMPUS era, much contact with the West has already disappeared.

2.1.3 Organisational Structure
The University is led by Professor Vytaly Zhuravlev, who has the title of Rector. He must stand for re-election every five years. Under his charge are several Deputy Rectors who together with the Deans of the nineteen Faculties and Heads of Departments assist him in making policies as part of the Academic Science Board. The Rector is answerable to the Ministry for General and Professional Education and must ensure that the University implements state policy in higher education as the Ministry supplies (at least in theory) state funding. In 1997, UdSU received 22.3 billion roubles (£22,300,000) from the Ministry and a further 11.5 billion (£11,500,000) from other sources (primarily from the Udmurt State government and TEMPUS) although the rector has very little control of where most of that money goes. He cannot use it where it is most needed. The TEMPUS grants, for example, had to be used exclusively for the English and German sections of
Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes while the Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology went without.

There is no sense of management structure at UdSU as it exists in the West. Meetings can and do take place but decisions are made on a favour-basis through a system of having contacts. Strings are pulled by high-ranking regional government officials for their family members and friends. It is often difficult to find the Rector when pressing issues need to be dealt with and he only really takes decisions when under pressure to do so. TEMPUS partners frequently experienced this scenario. The effect of the above structure is to ensure that new initiatives are slow to be introduced, if at all. There is no real incentive for entrepreneurs and young enthusiasts to be creative or show independence of thought. This creates a stifled environment in which little progress is achieved and morale is low among those excluded from the hierarchical favour system.

2.1.4 Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes

The Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes was founded in 1994. Hitherto it had been an integral part of the Department of Foreign Languages which was controlled primarily by the teachers who taught the students specialising in foreign languages. The chief languages taught are English, German and more recently French. It has a Dean of Faculty whose role is a supervisory one with the ability to hire and fire staff. Below the Dean of Faculty are a Head of English and a Head of German whose jobs include distributing the teaching roles, timetabling and selecting curricula. In theory, there are teachers who lead a section in all subject areas (but in practice this is not the case because some subjects have only one young teacher). Their responsibility includes teaching and material design. They are responsible to the five heads of the sub-divisions (See website www.uni.udm.ru for current details).
2.1.4.1 Aims of the Faculty
Up until the arrival of TEMPUS the Faculty had no tradition of recording its aims or policies in written form. While unwritten rules existed, they were open for interpretation. Contact with the West has led the UdSU authorities to commit the latter to paper. The main aims of the new Faculty were first laid out in a preparatory coursebook for prospective students (Alekseeva, A O and Ivanova, E A, 1996, p. 26.) as follows:

1. To introduce European standards in foreign language learning at Udmurt State University.
2. To achieve and disseminate new foreign language teaching technologies and methodologies in rural and urban schools and institutions of the Republic of Udmurtia.
3. To develop audio-visual teaching materials and software to form the basis of the Faculty.

No official document containing these aims has ever been produced for internal purposes which leads to the assumption that the goals listed above were merely produced for the purposes of TEMPUS because it was required for funding purposes.

2.1.4.2 The FLSP Staff
In the Post-Soviet era there is a more open choice of careers available to the population. Often these are better paid than ESP teaching. Further affliction is caused by the lack of full recognition of ESP teaching as a profession; it does not appear in the official State Committee of Education list of professions trained and prepared by Russian universities and higher education institutions (Ter-Minasova, 1996, p. 13). These two groups of establishments only train pure language and literature graduates in the classical sense or language teachers for secondary level teaching. Evidently, this is an issue which will have to be addressed if Russia wishes to raise the profile of ESP teachers and standardise the level of its ESP teaching. The affect of this reality means that teachers at the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes are not respected by their UdSU colleagues at the
Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philosophy. The latter believe that they have a superior linguistic knowledge and have been resentful of the TEMPUS project going to 'inferiors'.

According to official Udmurt State University figures, there are around 100 English teachers, including specialists in lexicology, grammar, history of English and teaching methodology. They are based both in the Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology and the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes. 46 teachers work in the FLSP English Section and a further 19 in the German Section. It is unclear exactly how teachers arrived at their positions during the Soviet era but general points can be noted. During that period, the older teachers would have found their jobs very prestigious and comfortable with little work to do. Evidently, connections with the Communist Party played an advantageous role, especially for those further up the ranks. (Some of the older teachers still address their students as 'comrades'). This legacy of favours still exists in the form of nepotism.

2.1.4.2.1 Staff Qualifications

All but one of the teachers working at the Faculty are graduates of the UdSU Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology. This results in a comfortable system which everybody knows well but which simultaneously proves a stifling and rigid environment with a complete lack of outside influence. Izhevsk's isolated geographical location, bad reputation (even in Russia) for being an ugly city and its 'closed city' status have aggravated the situation yet further, as there is little incentive for teachers from elsewhere in Russia to move to Izhevsk. Conversely, the reason why so many UdSU teachers choose to stay in Izhevsk is due to family ties or even the lack of good academic credentials to find another academic job elsewhere, normally in Moscow or St. Petersburg. Since 1997, four young teachers have left the Faculty to do further study in
St. Petersburg and have no intention of returning. Such individuals are a great loss to the Faculty because their departure is evidence of why the standard of the Faculty's teaching is not improving. Another young teacher from the German section used her TEMPUS mobility in Germany to help find an au pair job three years ago and has never returned.

The route to a degree for future teachers in the FLSP at UdSU is clearly defined. The Ministry of Higher and Specialised Education's criteria for universities state that students must have between 4,000-5,000 hours of study (lectures and tutorials) in 20 subjects. UdSU fulfils these criteria. Table 1 below gives a summary of a teacher's five year degree in terms of the number of hours spent on both the compulsory and optional subject elements of the course. The compulsory element represents 89% of the total time dedicated to study while the optional element fills the remaining 11%. The typical Russian tradition of doing more work in smaller groups rather than in lecture format is evident with 44% of the students' time taken up with tutorials as opposed to only 20% of time given to lectures. Interestingly, 36% of the time is given over to private study, which is a growth area in the UK system.

Table 1
Table Showing the Distribution of Classes and Private Study Which Future UdSU Teachers Must Complete During their Degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lectures</th>
<th>Tutorials</th>
<th>Private Study</th>
<th>Total Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compulsory</td>
<td>1276 (16%)</td>
<td>3233 (40%)</td>
<td>2640 (33%)</td>
<td>7149 (89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optional</td>
<td>352 (4%)</td>
<td>270 (4%)</td>
<td>260 (3%)</td>
<td>882 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Hours</td>
<td>1628 (20%)</td>
<td>3503 (44%)</td>
<td>2900 (36%)</td>
<td>8031 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The compulsory subjects studied during the period can be divided into the following sections with the following amount of course time spent studying within that field:
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(1) 48% - Language (First and Second Foreign Languages, Latin, Udmurt, Modern Russian, the Culture of English Speaking Countries).

(2) 18% - General Studies (History of the Motherland, Philosophy, Economics, Ethics, Sociology, Politics, Religion, Law, Russian Culture).

(3) 11% - Literature (Literary Criticism, History of Russian Literature, History of Udmurt Literature, History of Foreign Literature).


(5) 6% - Physical Education.

(6) 5% - Education (Psychology and Pedagogics, Teaching Methodologies for Foreign Languages, Technical Teaching Aids).

(7) 1% - Working with Children (Special Course on Organising Children's Leisure, Special Course on Children's Psychology, Special Course on Children's Summer Holiday Organisation).

The optional subjects studied during the period can be divided in the similar fashion:

(1) 40% - Language related Disciplines (Linguistic Analysis, Semantics and Pragmatics of Speech, Syntax and Sentence Structure, Vocabulary and Phonetics, Grammar).

(2) 38% - Education (Developing Teaching Aids, Educational Research, Scientific Research in the Teaching of Foreign Languages).

(3) 17% - Literature (Theory and History of World Literature, Goethe and the Problem of World Literature, E. Forster's Creative Activity and the English Novel, the American Political Novel from the Early 19th Century).

In addition, there are four four-week periods of summer work at (1) a children's camp, (2) translating from a foreign language, (3) teaching foreign languages at a school and (4)
pre-graduation teaching practice. In comparison to a British degree system, there is a vast amount of extra class time. Many of the options comply with Russian traditions for learning foreign languages but there is also a breadth of theoretical courses which their British counterparts would not be required to study. The teacher training mentioned above tends to be aimed at a general secondary level as is, in fact, the case for most ESP teachers in Russia (Harrison, June 1996, pp. 24-26). As general linguists, the teachers tend to have a background in literature and linguistics and then find themselves thrown into a class of subject specialists such as chemists or law specialists with little or no knowledge of the subject, where the students know the subject better than their teacher. Clearly the role of the ESP teacher is wider than that of a normal classroom teacher, so in addition to the essential skills of a teacher, he also needs to acquire a degree of specialised subject knowledge beyond the normal range of topics. In the English Section 4% of the teachers possess a Candidate of Science degree, 54% are of the rank of Senior Lecturer and the remaining 41% are Junior Lecturers. In the German Section, there are no Candidates of Science but 58% are Senior Lecturers and the remaining 42% are Junior Lecturers. In both cases the proportion of teachers with a Senior Lecturer rank is very high. It is evident that promotion to the rank of Senior is almost an inevitability (The rank of senior lecturer bestows an increase in salary but only of a minor sum). This fact is confirmed below in the synopsis of the following two E-mail answers (7th May 1999) provided by several Faculty teachers in consultation with the Dean of Faculty:

The transition occurs after a teacher has worked a minimum of 3-5 years. At that stage the teacher applies for the post of senior lecturer and must write down a report about their work over the previous three years and simultaneously present a list of written and published works (this can include booklets, dictionaries, lectures, anything). The Scientific Board of the Faculty then attends the teacher’s classes, studies the report and invites the teacher to a meeting where the teacher makes an oral presentation about her attributes. The commission draws a conclusion and then sends the protocol of the meeting to the Scientific Board of the University. The latter provides the official confirmation of the qualification of senior lecturer.
Chapter Two

The second excerpt confirms that the rank is conferred as of right as opposed to that of academic activity:

So, you see, people don't become senior lecturers automatically, but if you work five years and don't produce anything in writing, you'll nevertheless become a senior lecturer, but after that procedure above, only you don't mention any works, you write about your students results, anything you can show that you have worked.

There is no incentive for teachers to aspire to better things when the rank of Senior Lecturer is given automatically even to those who choose to wait for five years instead of the minimum three. In theory, the Senior Lecturer is meant to have less teaching hours but this happens rarely. He is, in theory, responsible for creating teaching programmes, syllabuses, tests and conferences but in reality only those who want to do the work do so.

2.1.4.2.2 The Distribution of FLSP Teachers in Each 'Host' Faculty

Table 2 below shows that the vast majority of teachers are employed on a full-time basis with only three out of 65 teachers employed in this capacity. All three of these teachers work in the English section as all 19 teachers in the German section are employed on a full-time basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>The Ranks Held by the Teaching Staff of the FLSP at UdSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td><strong>German</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate of Science</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer (full-time)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer (part-time)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Lecturer (full-time)</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Lecturer (part-time)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the English Section seven teachers work in more than one faculty. The spread of Candidates of Science, Senior Lecturers (primarily those over 35 years of age - see Table 3 below) and Junior Lecturers (primarily those under 35 years of age - see Table 3
below) who teach English in the seventeen faculties is revealing. Candidates of Science are isolated in only two faculties, with three in Public Relations alone (See Table 4). Bearing in mind the fact that teachers working in a faculty have little or no contact with other staff outside of their Faculty, there is very little chance for the majority of (less qualified) teachers to have frequent and direct contact with these better qualified teachers. Table 4 also shows that, in total, Senior teachers are present in thirteen out of the seventeen faculties (76%) and are the sole teachers in five faculties (28%). Among the four biggest faculties, only Law has a form of balance between Senior and Junior Lecturers. In the Faculties of Psychology and Pedagogy, Economics and Public Relations there is a clear cluster of more experienced teachers to the virtual exclusion of Junior Lecturers. Shared responsibility for the delivery of the curriculum only occurs in eight out of the seventeen faculties (47%). Junior teachers have a role in eleven out of the seventeen faculties (65%). In three faculties five Junior teachers are obliged to work independently without guidance.

Table 3
Table indicating whether the Teachers of the FLSP are Over or Under the Age of 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Under 35</th>
<th>Over 35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>English Section</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate of Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Lecturer</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German Section</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate of Science</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Lecturer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4
Table Showing the Number of ESP Teachers and their Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Candidate of Science</th>
<th>Senior Teachers</th>
<th>Junior Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and Pedagogy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A similar picture emerges from the German Section. Table 5 shows that there are no Candidates of Science at all but Senior Lecturers are present in thirteen of the seventeen faculties (76%) and exclusively teach in eight of those eleven faculties (47%). Senior and Junior Lecturers share teaching in five of the faculties (29%). Junior Lecturers, on the other hand, teach in nine of the seventeen faculties (53%) and teach exclusively in four of those nine (24%).
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Table 5
Table Showing the Number of DaF Teachers and their Qualifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Candidate of Science</th>
<th>Senior Teachers</th>
<th>Junior Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art &amp; Design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biotechnology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil &amp; Gas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and Pedagogy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the findings from Tables 4 and 5 are combined, 70% of all faculties across the English and German Sections have only one (38%) or two teachers (32%) working for them. Five faculties have a minimum of five teachers providing the required language teaching, namely Public Relations (thirteen), Psychology and Pedagogy (twelve), Economics (eight), Law (eight) and History (seven). Overall, the danger of such clustering of senior lecturers and the neglect of younger lecturers and their teaching will lead to greater disparity in what is already a two-tier system of strong and wealthy faculties with experienced staff and weak and poor faculties with inexperienced staff.

2.1.4.2.3 The Induction of New Teachers into the FLSP

The problem mentioned in the previous paragraph is most evident in the Faculty's treatment of new teachers. Every year new teachers join the FLSP from the Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology. There is only a vague introductory system for which there is no formal unified written policy. Advice is offered by Senior Teachers on an 'ad hoc good-will and a promise' approach but in reality the new teacher is left to sink or
Many young teachers often face problems in the classroom at the start of their career anywhere in the world but the nature of the problems at UdSU have their own unique slant:

(1) There is a lack of respect for younger teachers. In some cases, the latter may be only a year older than their students. This manifests itself in cheeking the teacher, sarcasm and even refusing to participate in class or to do homework. If the homework is done, it is often incomplete, badly done or even copied. This last issue is endemic in Russian education (and in the education systems of other former Warsaw Pact states) in the spirit of everyone being there to help even the weakest member of the group through. While this is fine in everyday classwork, there are limits to its acceptability. At the other end of the scale, the closeness of ages between younger staff and the students has led on several occasions to a teacher starting a full relationship with a student. The teacher cannot be objective in any assessment of that student. Simultaneously, this can give rise to jealousy and claims of favouritism from other students within the group.

(2) Where class relations are better, the students frequently suggest that the group do something other than that planned. Often this takes the form of watching yet another
video in English. While this activity is acceptable at certain times and in moderation, it is
not appropriate that it should form a large part of an academic course.

(3) As there is no system of internal standardisation of assessment in existence, teachers
use the five grade system as they choose. In the case of one new teacher in the Faculty of
Public Relations, no advice was given beforehand. The teacher then went on to award
every student the top mark of 5. This could not be reversed because of the tradition of
informing the candidate immediately of the result. This led to tension within the section
as the marks awarded by other teachers were less generous. Were this issue to be widely
known it could lead to some students making formal complaints about their scores.

2.1.4.2.4 Working Environment

Staff typically teach 850 hours p.a., which means a teaching week of 20-28 sessions.
They are contracted to teach and research but in fact rarely do the latter. Visiting
Western academics have observed that most teachers have no research training or
qualifications and are unable to carry out even the most basic research (This becomes
evident when they are on mobility in the West). Furthermore, the majority have little
time for preparation and marking as they have a second job of up to twenty hours per
week due to the precarious nature of the government's finances. Salaries (1997) range
from around £600 p.a. for a newly appointed teacher to around £20,000 for a rector
(vice-chancellor). While living costs are clearly much lower than in the West, it is
frequently asserted that £1,200 - £1,500 is the absolute minimum to support a family.
Teaching and lecturing (especially in the Arts) are therefore not for the breadwinner - in
effect not a man's work. The Faculty's statistics confirm this; there are only two men in
the English section. Consequently, most teachers work privately in order to earn
additional, or perhaps more honestly, their only real income. Types of work include
teaching private lessons in a school, tutoring, translating and interpreting. This they do
when they are free during the day or on their days off. In essence, the post of University
teacher often represents the key reason why the teacher gets the additional employment.
The Faculty understands the reality of the situation of its staff and has shown flexibility in meeting individual needs. The University offers an additional source of income for some teachers through its one or two week-long private tuition courses in neighbouring towns. The teachers may be delegated or elect to go. Frequently, the situation can prove difficult for those teachers with young families or those who are divorced and have custody of the children.

The necessity of having to work long hours in private tuition means that the teachers have little or no time to prepare for classes. In addition, as they work so many hours (upwards of six hours in some cases), the teachers lose their freshness and drive in the classroom which merely results in a less successful delivery of the teaching material. There is also a high rate of sickness among the teachers. When a teacher fails to fulfil contractual teaching (even when it remains unpaid by the government) disciplinary action may follow and ultimately the teacher may lose the position held. Again, there is a clear difference between theory and practice. One teacher 'disappeared' for a month without notice and on his return he was warned that his actions were unacceptable. This warning appeared to have no effect as he was proud of his month's earnings in a local private university where he had earned six times his normal salary. Obviously, a phone call made by him or the University early on would have solved the issue but this was not done. Instead, his abandoned classes were simply left without a replacement during this period as the University did not know when he would return. Such disorganisation can only be detrimental to the learning processes of the learners involved and convey the degree to which their learning is not important.
2.1.4.3 The FLSP Students

In order to judge fully the effectiveness of the teaching and learning at the Faculty of Language for Specific Purposes on its merits it is essential to build up a profile of the students which encompasses all aspects of their lives. This includes their background, schooling, previous linguistic experience and perceptions of issues. At UdSU, all students in every faculty can be taught Russian (for non-native Russians), Udmurt, German, Finnish and Chinese as their chosen language for specific purposes. French and Hungarian have been added recently but English is by far the most popular. Out of the 10,000 students at UdSU, over 6,000 study English. A large percentage of students take correspondence courses or attend classes on a part-time basis. The school system in Udmurtia, as in the whole of the Russian Federation, provides a substantial volume of time for input into the study of a foreign language. Generally the students should have had the following level of exposure:

- 1st year - 4 or 5 hours per week
- 3rd year - 3 hours per week
- 5th year - 3 hours per week
- 6th year - 1 hour per week

In interviews with students, it becomes apparent that the standard of teaching in their former schools varies greatly. School 56 in Izhevsk for example specialises in modern languages and therefore its students are at the upper end of the ability range. Conversely, students from rural schools around Glazov and Izhevsk with one (often older) language teacher find themselves struggling from the very first lesson at university.

University statistics for the academic year 1999/2000 confirm the complications with which FLSP teachers are faced at the start of a typical academic year. The background distribution of UdSU students in the Faculty of Economics and Management are as follows. The total number of full-time students is 673 and the breakdown of these is: 513 Russian (76%), 95 Tatars (14%), 54 Udmurts (8%), 2 Armenians, 5 Bashkir and 4
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Ukrainian (2%). 568 (84%) students come from Izhevsk, 15 (2%) from Votkinsk, 12 (2%) from Sarapul, 9 (1%) from Mozhga, 8 (1%) from Naberezhny Chelny (Tatarstan), 8 (1%) from Glazov and 53 (8%) from rural communities. It can be assumed that all students have a good knowledge of Russian, primarily as a Ll but for some students Russian has been learnt as a FL. The FLSP does not make any attempt to teach English or German in a different way to those learners who have acquired their knowledge of Russian in a manner other than as a L1. This is clearly an area which could be looked at in future years.

Attendance at university in Russia has been high because, traditionally, tuition was free with students receiving a monthly grant but UdSU is facing a difficult future which will involve difficult decisions. Already it has established a fee-paying stream which reflects the national picture in this respect. As tuition prices rise, students are demanding better value for money. Therefore the relationship between staff and some students is changing dramatically and if some of the above mentioned problems were to occur to the fee-paying students, there would be serious repercussions. Up until now, however, it appears that these problems are confined to the non-paying student population. The danger here lies in the fact that UdSU could develop a two-tier system of priority (privately financed students versus publicly financed students) in terms of the delivery of its curriculum.

2.2 Conclusion to Chapter Two

As can be seen in this chapter, Izhevsk finds itself in an extremely isolated situation on many fronts. Most notably, the geographical isolation is the one key factor which has shaped or hindered the development of UdSU, the FLSP, its teachers and its students. This has been more evident in the aftermath of the collapse of Communism as the FLSP struggles to gain access to all that it needs in order to progress in the modern world. Even in the areas where TEMPUS has provided technical support, such as Information
technology, the geographical isolation can play a decisive role. The transportation of parts for repairing the system or maintaining it can prove costly as well as taking a substantial period of time for delivery.

The FLSP is perceived by many influential individuals at UdSU as an unimportant faculty which merely provides a service role for the other dominant faculties. Its role is further weakened by a University set-up which undervalues the work of the FLSP teachers and not just allows but actively pursues the task of treating many of them as second class teachers in the host faculties in which they work. At the same time, groups of more 'elite' and highly qualified FLSP teachers are being gathered to serve the larger (wealthier) faculties such as Law, Psychology and Pedagogy, Economics and Public Relations. This has created in effect a two tier teaching system within the entire Faculty. The increasing problems of retaining teachers who go unpaid by the University have the potential to result in students receiving a variable standard in the quality of teaching provided by the Faculty. Ultimately, those who can afford the University fees will end up receiving a better quality of teaching than those who cannot afford to pay the tuition fees.

The issues which have been highlighted in this chapter reappear again in subsequent chapters when appropriate. Their inclusion at this stage should help the reader of this research to comprehend the extremely complex set of circumstances which affect the University and the function of the teaching in the FLSP. In addition, the material contained in this chapter exposes a range of everyday practical difficulties which both teachers and students encounter. While EFL theory is important for the advancement of methodology in FL learning and teaching, it is important to realise that it is often difficult to put the theory into practice either in part or in full. Chapter Three takes account of these findings next, as it explores Western and Russian language learning methodologies covering most of the twentieth century.
CHAPTER THREE - THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

As mentioned at the end of Chapter Two, the background material on Udmurtia, Izhevsk, UdSU and the FLSP has provided us with a vital backdrop for all the findings in this research. In this chapter on the theoretical background of FL teaching and learning methodologies, the observations collated in Chapter Two play a crucial role in the critical analysis of Western and Russian theoretical models as they allow the research to become more focused on only those aspects which are relevant in the UdSU context. Naturally, the general preparatory work carried out for this research has taken account of existing research in language teaching methodologies from both the East and West. The following section provides a critical overview of the key methodologies and approaches to language learning used in each. Where possible comparisons and contrasts are made. Within the analysis of each section, the following general areas have been dealt with: (1) general background of the methodology, (2) the key approach of the methodology including structure and design of the syllabus, (3) the types of learning and teaching activities employed, (4) the roles of both the learner and the teacher, (5) the role of the instructional material and how a lesson proceeds. However each methodology is treated individually and where some areas are deemed to be non-relevant for the purposes of this research in the UdSU context, they have been left out. At all times, the UdSU context is taken into account and remains the key influence in deciding which elements have been included in this chapter. It is anticipated that most readers of this work will have a better understanding of Western approaches to language learning than of Eastern ones. Therefore, more detail is given in the material on Eastern methodologies as this degree of clarification is vital for understanding of the research area. We begin by looking at the Western methodologies first.
3.1 Western Methodologies

The long history of the West's evolving approaches to FL teaching is rich in variety and well documented. In the early part of the nineteenth century, the model for teaching foreign languages was built on the traditional approach for teaching Latin. Innovations began in the middle of the same century with the appearance of the Grammar-Translation Method and later of the Direct Method. These forerunners laid some of the foundations for the new methodologies which were to follow later, including the Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching, the Audio-Lingual Approach, Communicative Language Teaching, Total Physical Response, The Silent Way, Community Language Learning, the Natural approach and more recently, the Intercultural Method. These methods are of most relevance in this research and have been selected on the basis that elements of these methodologies provide interesting points of comparison and contrast with developments at UdSU. For example the West's early notion of teaching modern foreign languages in the same fashion as dead languages enjoyed a much longer period of influence in Russia until the collapse of Communism because opportunities for Russians to meet L1 speakers were virtually non-existent. It is therefore not surprising that much of the teaching material found at UdSU is indicative of this approach. Each method or approach is dealt with individually in the section below.

3.1.1 Grammar Translation

Grammar translation is one of the oldest established FL teaching methodologies in the West. While it does not enjoy the same degree of popularity today which it once had, its individual elements of theory and practice remain of relevance within the framework of this discussion. Its origins lie in the traditional approach to teaching the classical dead languages, namely Latin and Greek when it was assumed to be the best method for teaching modern foreign languages. Its basic premise that the TL be learnt through the L1 is still applicable in the UdSU context although, unlike most FLSP teaching, grammar
translation relies almost exclusively on the L1 in the classroom to the neglect of the TL. TL vocabulary is not acquired but learnt in list form. Similarly a point of grammar is taught deductively on the basis of rules and examples with the focus being on the form and inflection of words. The learner must commit these rules to memory in order to apply them to other examples. The material learnt usually takes on a complete form, such as a paradigm of a verb. The reading of difficult texts begins at a relatively early stage in the learning process and the related exercises focus on repetitive drill exercises. Many of these practices overlap with the Russian Milashevich Method described in section 3.5 later in this chapter.

The main goal of the grammar translation course for the learner is to be able to read literature in the TL as opposed to spoken language which occupies a position of secondary importance. In order for the goal to be achieved, the learner must follow the teacher's instructions in order to learn what the teacher knows. Consequently, the teacher is in a position of authority which complies with current traditional Russian FL teaching values. The interaction in the TL classroom is primarily teacher-to-student as all other forms of communication are peripheral.

3.1.2 The Direct Method
The Direct Method was developed originally as a reaction to Grammar Translation because it attempted to incorporate more use of the TL into classroom instruction. The basic premise is the avoidance of the L1 at all times in classroom communication. Similarly TL to L1 translation is also avoided. This is achieved by relying on the use of pictures and actions which are introduced by the TL teacher. Lessons frequently begin with a dialogue using a modern conversational style and questions are generated about the dialogue in the TL.
Unlike Grammar Translation and much of the FLSP's practice, grammar is taught inductively whereby rules are established through exposure to and practice with the TL. For example, verbs are used first in context and only at a much later stage is the complete paradigm given when a greater degree of oral competence has been achieved. More advanced learners can read the TL for both academic and pleasure purposes. While literary texts are used in the Direct Method, they are not analysed strictly for grammar content. However, as the TL culture is considered an important aspect of the method it is taught inductively through exposure to it in the TL texts used for study.

3.1.3 Oral Approach and Situational Language Teaching
While this theory is not so relevant in the West today, many of its practices are still widespread. The origins of the theory lie with British Structuralism and the notion that structure is required to support the basis of language being speech. The importance of the habit learning theory originates from the Behaviourist habit-making theory: through this process, the learner receives, memorises and then uses the language and structures covered. The method does not support the individual needs of a learner but rather focuses on the group's needs. The descriptions of the six key stages in the approach fit exactly with Lozanov's Suggestopedia and Kitaigorodskaya's Intensive Method (see later in this chapter). Richards and Rogers (1989, p. 34) describe them as follows:
(a) The language material is taught orally before the material is presented in written form.
(b) The target language is the only language of the classroom, including explanations of structure.
(c) New language points are introduced and practised in context.
(d) There is advance selection of vocabulary to ensure that the essential general vocabulary is covered by the material.
(e) Grammatical items are presented to the learner in a graded sequence from simple to difficult.

(f) Only when the learner has gained a sufficient lexical and grammatical basis will reading and writing be introduced.

One obvious weakness in the method is that the learner has little freedom in the early and middle stages of the approach and needs constant guidance throughout, although a greater degree of freedom is gained later on when the learner has more linguistic knowledge and therefore greater linguistic independence. Essentially, what the learner is given by this approach is a set of linguistic crutches in the form of pre-selected phrases, words and elements grammar. At the start, he finds it difficult to move well in an unknown environment having been used to complete freedom in his L1 environs. However, in time he regains ever more freedom to express himself but this is only achieved through what the teacher provides for the learner. The role of the teacher is consequently over-emphasised in the early and middle stages of the method and a kind of dependency syndrome is established. This fact is evident in all aspects of the method but is most noticeable because it is the teacher who organises the timing of the lesson, gives oral practice to support the textbook, ensures that revision takes place, adjusts the lesson materials to the needs of each individual, checks on progress through testing and is responsible for developing other language activities outside of the book. However, all of this reflects a more dated approach which shifts emphasis away from the learner. Modern Western approaches have attempted to make the learner the focal point of the method to be used.

Like the lessons themselves, the instructional materials promote the same teacher-centred approach. The materials must be tightly organised and constructed in a way which allows the learner to communicate in structures which are both lexically and
grammatically correct. The materials should be tightly organised with the use of visual aids to assist learning. Again the linguistic crutch motif is relevant here because the materials are used in a non-naturalistic manner. The linguistic activities dictate that practice is carried out through drills, repetition, dictation and substitution activities for example. These same practices are widely preferred in UdSU circles, a fact which will become clear in the qualitative and quantitative findings of Chapters Six and Seven.

3.1.4 The Audiolingual Method

This is a scientific, mechanical approach to language learning which has its roots in the American Informant Method and the Army Method which are based on intense aural and oral contact with the TL. It involves a systematic comparison of English and the FL with the aim of solving the fundamental differences between them, using a system of listening and repeating in order to learn. The approach originates from 'structural linguistics' with its interest in phonetics, phonology, morphology and syntax. The linguistic approach is based on the construction of small units which build up to the whole as represented by the Diagram 1 below:

**Diagram 1**

Diagram Showing how Sentences are built up from Smaller Units into Whole Sentences

One of the two main areas of interest in one Russian method concerns this same issue of syntax and closely resembles the concepts contained in Diagram 1. The Milashevich
Method seeks to create an interlanguage by using the letter X, placed both in front of and behind different prefixes and suffixes, as well as in combination with other words in a specific order (such as a prepositional phrase). The intention is to create a system for the recognition of word functions without necessarily knowing what individual words mean. This method is explored in much greater depth later in the section on Russian methodologies.

Audiolingualism believes that FL learning is a mechanical act of habit formation and involves memorisation of dialogues through aural and oral training. Drills help in this situation as they are perceived to be 'inductive' and not 'deductive'. Consequently there is more focus on the learner as a predictable element in the learning process who can be directed by skilled training to produce a correct response. The order of learning which takes place in the method's drill exercise is sequenced as: (a) recognition, (b) discrimination, (c) imitation, (d) repetition, (e) memorisation. This sequence helps to minimise the chance of producing mistakes. Other tasks which help achieve this goal include repetition, inflection, replacement, restatement, completion, transposition, expansion, contraction, transformation, integration, rejoinder and restoration. The learner is not encouraged to initiate conversation in the early stages but to be reactive and have little control because it is the task of the teacher to dominate, control the class, monitor progress and vary the drills to retain the interest of the learning group.

Proponents of this method believe that human behaviour is dependent on three elements: (a) stimulus which elicits behaviour, (b) response which is triggered by stimulus and (c) reinforcement which marks a response as correct. According to the theory of learning, the sequence of stimulus (material), organism (learner), response behaviour (verbal) leading to positive reinforcement, results in the behaviour occurring again and eventually this becomes a habit. No reinforcement or even negative reinforcement can result in
behaviour which is not likely to occur again. Despite all this guidance, there is little
direction given about how to cope with mixed ability teaching groups and in particular slower learners within the group. There seems to be an assumption that groups contain learners of a similar ability and in this capacity the strength of the claims made by the method is weakened by a lack of realism.

There is no equivalent Russian method which promotes the use of the skill of listening for learning of a TL in a similar manner. At UdSU listening has long been an underdeveloped skill. This was primarily due to the lack of access to material containing authentic native voices. However, the importance of imitation is important in the Intensive Method but the importance of recorded dialogues is superseded by the importance of the voice of the classroom teacher whose job is to bring the dialogues ('polylogues' in Intensive terminology) to life and encourage the learners to understand at first, then imitate, leading ultimately to an autonomous usage of the same linguistic and grammatical items. In this capacity its goals correlate closely to those of the Audiolingual Method. However, the key difference is the route which each method chooses to realise its goals.

3.1.5 Communicative Language Teaching

Communicative Language Teaching is influenced by the writings of Chomsky. It is described by many as an approach rather than a method. The conceptual difference between the two terms is as follows: a method focuses either on language structure (form) or on language use (function) whereas an approach draws in elements of different methods but is not reliant on one single method. An approach can be biased in favour of one method but draw ideas from at least one other. Consequently, the Communicative Approach is functional as well as structural, and has (i) a notional category which consists of concepts of time, sequence, quantity, location, frequency and (ii) a
communicative function such as a request or denial. It is both the focus of study in the classroom as well as the general language of communication between the teacher and the learners. Howatt (1984, p. 279) describes this as 'using English to learn it'.

The Communicative Approach is open to many different interpretations, none of which fully define its boundaries. For example, Hymes (1972, p. 281) describes it as the acquisition of communicative competence and a knowledge and ability for the language in use. He identifies the four following categories:
(a) Whether (and to what extent) something is formally possible.
(b) Whether (and to what extent) something is feasible in virtue of the means of the implementation available.
(c) Whether (and to what extent) something is appropriate (is adequate, happy, successful) in relation to a context in which it is used and evaluated.
(d) Whether (and to what extent) something is in fact done, performed and what its doing entails.

These categorisations are helpful but not definitive. They can be interpreted in the following ways: (a) knowing how to say or write something, (b) knowing the limits of what one can say or write, (c) having a cultural awareness of whether something is suitable within the given context (d) to have an awareness of what the implications of one's statements might be. While these definitions prove helpful, some issues still remain unclear. In (b) and (c) not every learner is capable of knowing the limits of what is possible or what is culturally acceptable to the same degree. There are various factors which influence this, such as a learner's academic ability, linguistic penchant and the degree of exposure to the TL culture. Consequently, a degree of flexibility is required within the definition. The natural outcome means that there will be a range of learning outcomes within one teaching group. Often this will not prove a problem if the group has
been selected in advance. However, where the knowledge of some learners is vastly superior to that of others in the group (as is frequently the case at UdSU), problems of ensuring an even spread of progress will become more apparent.

In the case of most world languages, an individual language is spoken by one homogenous population. In FL methodology, the process of observing the linguistic production patterns of that group has clear boundaries for the purposes of studying and learning that language. However, English has two unique characteristics, one of which it shares with primarily Spanish (namely, that it is spoken in many different countries of the world as a L1) and one which it holds alone (namely, that it has become the dominant lingua franca for most foreigners as their second language of communication with others from a different L1 background in an international context). The consequence of these facts allows a greater variety of acceptable linguistic forms than in most other languages (what is acceptable in the United States, might not be acceptable in Australia, New Zealand or the United Kingdom for example). Indeed, it is possible to sustain the argument that English can be learnt without a specific TL culture. The latter is not required in a conversation between two non-native TL speakers from different L1 backgrounds. Therefore the four criteria quoted above from Hymes (1972, p. 281) can be perceived as either too vague for the purist, or perfectly appropriate for the pragmatic researcher. If one were to adopt the pragmatic (intercultural) approach, Hymes' definition would allow us to accept that Russians could teach a form of English to match the needs of the present situation in the country, which would be different to the needs which we in the West perceive that they require. Its current needs are not necessarily to teach English in a specific L1 context (be that UK or US based for example) but rather in a more internationalist (some critics might say more 'sterile') sense. In this sense, can the Communicative Approach be all things to all people? The answer to that question appears to be yes. Due to the lack of consensus about the nature of the Communicative
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Approach, there is no agreement about the exact nature of syllabus design. The system is therefore more flexible and less prescriptive than other methodologies but subsequently more reliant on the performance of the individual teacher. The tasks are more learner focused as each individual is seen as a negotiator of tasks as well as a partner within the group who needs to be open and co-operative in order to discover grammar rules. The teacher acts as a facilitator and independent participant within the group. He needs to be organised but at the same time have an ability to be flexible and let learners develop their linguistic ability freely and not over-correct them. Similarly, there are varying approaches to the Communicative Approach in text books. Some of these are text-based, others task-based or even based on the sole use of realia. In all cases, the key to success involves a good pace with a varied style.

The use of the Communicative Approach covers therefore a wide range of styles drawing on elements of different methods. For example English grammar is not taught systematically to British children. Instead the focus is on mastering simulated communication situations. Consequently an approach is required which takes that issue into account. Conversely, learners from a Russian background would not be taught the same skills. The focus would be on rigid structure and form because the very nature of the Russian language dictates that Russian children are taught grammar from an early age in order to master the L1. It is therefore more acceptable that grammar has a more critical role in FL teaching in Russia.

While the Communicative Approach's flexibility can be seen as an advantage, it can also be interpreted as a weakness. First, with the lack of precision, a learner who moves from one teacher to another may find the teaching style radically different. Progress may be slower in this case. The approach does not necessarily cater equally well for learners coming from different cultural and therefore learning backgrounds within a single
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teaching group. However, while this last point is not applicable at UdSU, the first criticism remains. In the UdSU context, the arrival of many thousands of Western EFL and DaF textbooks has led to the dichotomy as described earlier in this section. Should the FLSP teachers attempt to teach the FL according to the new Communicative Approach offered by the Western textbooks to their students when (1) the teachers have not learnt the FL though that method nor had little if any proper training in the Communicative Approach, and (2) the students have only ever been used to learning the FL in the traditional UdSU manner? Can the intended outcome of those who produced the textbooks in the West be remotely achieved by the UdSU teachers? Or should the FLSP teachers simply use the materials in ways which they feel are appropriate given the UdSU context? Whatever the UdSU teachers choose to do with the communicative materials, will their chosen path not merely fit in with flexible definition of what the Communicative Approach is? In intercultural terms, the UdSU teachers are simply exploring a new dimension of the approach. In Chapters Six and Seven, the nature of this new path is defined for the first time and Chapter Eight offers a way forward for UdSU based on the findings of Chapters Six and Seven.

3.1.6 Total Physical Response

Total Physical Response (TPR) is not a complete methodology but a strategy for teaching, elements of which are incorporated into a diverse methodological approach. Some features of teaching approaches observed at UdSU resemble aspects of TPR. Consequently it is essential to include some theoretical background on this approach in order to allow for theoretical comparisons between the two.

TPR is linked to the Trace Theory from psychology and focuses on developing memory in the early stages of learning through practice. It is seen primarily as a tool for language learning and not a method for all occasions in the process of TL learning. TPR draws on
the key theory of the Bio-programme. This involves the co-ordination of speech and action. The sequence of importance around which languages and learning are organised comes in the following order:

(i) Children develop listening skills before speech - Sometimes this may require the speaker to repeat words or even rephrase them until the message is clear.

(ii) Children are required to respond physically to their parents' commands - Here, the teacher plays the role of the parent but corrects little, which mirrors the situation of a child learning the L1.

(iii) Speech evolves naturally and effortlessly - This occurs primarily because the learner has not been forced to speak until he is ready.

The adult second language learner is the equivalent of a child learning his L1. To diminish the negative effects of stress, teaching should emphasise the naturalistic approach experienced by the child-learner by focusing on meaning rather than form (similar to Infantilisation in the Intensive Method - see section 3.4 later in this chapter). In the initial stages of a TPR course more importance is therefore attached to receptive skills which can be acknowledged by the learner through actions and then single words rather than productive skills. By contrast, the expected outcome in the Intensive Method is passive understanding at this stage. At the end of the course the beginner should be orally proficient in a range of linguistic situations. The assumption made by TPR (and also Suggestopedia and the Intensive Method) is that every learner is able to or would want to suspend reality and enter this world. External factors affecting an adult's (or even a teenager's) life (such as relationship problems experienced shortly before the class) mean that the simulated child-like state is not always attainable to the adult in his world. The assumption is also made that all the learners in the class are there because they want to be. However, learners are frequently obliged to study the FL (as at UdSU) and this will affect their attitude towards it.
The similarities between TPR and the Intensive Method are also evident in two other key areas:

1. Brain Lateralisation - TPR places demands on the right-hand side of the brain (i.e. Appositional thought) whereas most methods work on the left-hand side of the brain (where logical, analytical thought is processed linearly). This occurs because the learner indicates comprehension through actions or gestures in the early stages. The Intensive Method seeks to draw on the strengths of both sides of the brain and uses music to increase the brain's potential to take in more knowledge than through conventional means.

2. Reduction of Stress. - Learning a TL should be similar to the L1 learning pattern. By tapping back into this child-like state of mind, the learner has a stress-free experience which liberates the self-conscious learner. The learner becomes the listener and the performer while the teacher is a kind of director of a play. The approach to teaching includes making use of voice, actions, gesture, props and realia. The importance of these same aspects is self-evident in the Intensive classroom at UdSU but there are subtle differences in how the outcomes are achieved. These differences will be pointed out in greater detail in section 3.4.

3.1.7 The Silent Way

The reason for including the Silent Way in this chapter may not appear immediately obvious since there is no directly comparable Russian methodology. However, there are elements which the Silent Method shares with several Russian methodologies and others which offer useful contrasts. We begin by looking at the differences.

The Silent Way differs from Russian methods in that the teacher is meant to be as silent as possible, while the learner should speak as much as possible. Gattegno who devised the method believes that the quality of learning is better if the learner discovers or
creates rather than repeats or remembers what has been taught (a kind of differentiation by outcome). The learning can be facilitated by making use of physical realia and when the teacher uses material which promotes problem-solving. Scott and Page (1982, p. 273) define the learner role as a return to a 'baby-like' state (similar to TPR, Suggestopedia and the Intensive Method) when learning the TL. This reflects the original way in which the learner gained knowledge about his L1. Silence is seen by Gattegno as the best way of learning fully, as it helps the process of learning to learn (which shares similarities with the passive concert phase in Suggestopedia). The method can only serve the learner well in the early stages of TL learning. It establishes oral/aural skills (in the opening classes, 15 minutes per hour are spent on pronunciation alone) and furnishes the learner with an immediate, basic and practical knowledge of the necessary grammar for early language production. Due to the above, the syllabus is structured around grammar and topic-related vocabulary.

As the course progresses, the learner becomes independent, autonomous and responsible for his own learning. He gains a 'feel' for the language through the lack of teacher explanation. Therefore, the learner must generalise and draw up his own set of rules. This is achieved through a process of risk-taking (sometimes the risks will be rewarded but at other times the learner will discover that the risk taken does not yield success) which enables the learner to become a good problem-solver. Within the class environment, each learner has a strong influence on the other, which increases the quality of learning. Eventually, the learner comes to dominate the class which leaves the teacher in a subordinate role. Gattegno (1972, p. 80) describes the teacher's role as 'demanding' due to the limited nature of his role. For example, the teacher must strictly avoid repetition as this stimulates the learner to remain alert and aware at all times. This notion contrasts sharply with the traditional Russian approach which promotes the teacher as the key source of knowledge for the FL learner.
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The language to be taught through the Silent Way is structured through a system of coloured rods which serve to facilitate learning. Each sentence is broken down and taught therefore in units. In total there are twelve colour-coded charts which contain between 500 and 800 words in both the L1 and TL. These charts contain codes for such aspects as plural markers, personal pronouns, adjectives, question words, verbs, numbers, prepositions, family relationships, words of quantity, space and time. More specifically, three types of lexical groups have been devised into which words are characterised and consequently organised chronologically throughout the teaching materials. The categories are: (a) Functional Language - These are versatile words which are required for key areas of grammar. They include prepositions, numbers, pronouns and quantifiers: (b) Semi-luxury vocabulary - These are words used in every-day life TL settings and include food and travel: (c) Luxury vocabulary - This includes ideas and opinions. The last three categories do not appear in Russian methodologies but the colour-coded charts strongly resemble the Milashevich Method in the areas of syntax and verb forms.

Evidently, there is a clear gradation of language and structures but this appears balanced by the greater degree of autonomy which the Silent Way learner has in choosing what expressions he wishes to learn. However, the theoretical assumption has been made in the Silent Way that the FL learner knows best what he requires in order to master the FL but this cannot be the case for most learners. Russian theorists might argue that young and inexperienced FL learners would not know what type of knowledge they require. Conversely, other more experienced class members could come to dominate the proceedings in the early stages and work at a pace which is inappropriate for slower learners. Their actions cannot be checked by the teacher who is unable to affect change because the method is learner-led. Consequently, individuals would be better served by the method than the whole group. A teacher-centred approach would counteract this.
3.1.8 Community Language Learning

Community Language Learning is a unique approach which helps it to stand apart from the other Western methods discussed in this section. It is concerned primarily with oral work in introductory conversation courses in TL learning but can be used to some extent with written work. It was developed by Curran, a Chicago psychologist, and is the language version of Rogerian inspired Counselling-Learning. Curran (1976, p. 6) believes that the personal commitment of the learner is required for language acquisition to take place and uses the four following headings (known as SARD) to highlight his theory:

(a) Security - The learner must feel this in order to learn.

(b) Attention/Aggression - Without learner attention, there is a lack of involvement. Conversely, the latter is increased when the attention happens. Aggression merely implies that the learner must seek to communicate.

(c) Retention/Reflection - The whole person is involved if proper retention is to occur. A conscious period of silence within the lesson would allow the learner to reflect on the language covered during the lesson.

(d) Discrimination - Once the learner has retained the information, the next stage is to process the information gained and learn to use it.

All four of these labels comply with the aims of the Intensive Method. The Intensive learner needs a secure learning environment in order to open up to the suggestopediaic elements. The polylogue promotes learner attention in the passive concert phase during which the Intensive learner begins to reflect on and then retain parts of the polylogue before ultimately beginning to use the material independently.

The teacher acts as a counsellor to the group of students and stands outside their seated circle unlike the Intensive teachers who has the students placed in a semi-circle around him. His role is to translate the utterances offered by the learners in their L1. The learners
are seen as clients in the classroom and are not viewed in isolation or in competition but in collaboration with each other as the group develops organically in a safe learning environment in which they are all in control of their own learning. The interaction between the learners is symmetrical, as it is between equals whereas the interaction between the learner and the teacher is between unequals and therefore asymmetrical. However, a similar problem exists in Community Language Teaching as in the silent Way. In particular the ability (both academic and linguistic) and confidence of learners are not equal and there appears to be no mechanism to ensure that the strongest do not come to dominate and that the weakest do not come to be totally passive. By a lack of reference to it, there is also an implied assumption that learner motivation is not an issue which needs to be addressed. How effective the method would be, if taught across an entire year group at university or school, remains unexplored and therefore unanswered but in the UdSU context, the method is not feasible given the current teaching and learning environment in the FLSP.

3.1.9 The Natural Approach
Terrell and Krashen are the key exponents of this approach. While Terrell believes that in communication, the primary function of language is meaning and that language is the vehicle for conveying that meaning, Krashen (Krashen and Terrell, 1983, p. 55) believes that:

Language is best taught when it is being used to transmit messages, not when it is explicitly taught for conscious learning.

The Natural Approach is aimed at beginners and interestingly, Terrell states not just the goals for the course but also the 'non-goals'. There is an attempt here to be realistic which contrasts with the many unfounded claims which some methods put forward, notably Russian ones whose assumptions often go unchallenged.
The Natural Approach is based on five key principles:

(a) The Acquisition/Learning Hypothesis

There are two distinct ways of developing linguistic competence. Acquisition is seen as more natural in its development whereas learning is perceived as more formal and artificial. Table 6 below summarises the key characteristics as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acquisition</th>
<th>Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naturally experienced</td>
<td>Knowing rules</td>
<td>Consciously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-conscious</td>
<td>Similar to child first language acquisition</td>
<td>Formal knowledge of language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implicit knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td>Explicit knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal teaching does not help</td>
<td></td>
<td>Formal teaching does help</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acquisition focuses on understanding the message in the TL. The ability to speak emerges by itself after a sufficient amount of competence has been acquired through input. Each student is not forced to speak until he is ready and speech errors which do not interfere with communication are not corrected. Fluency is not forced but comes from what the individual has picked up (The issues concerning unmotivated or compulsory learners are not addressed however.). Formal knowledge only serves as a function for checking and making repairs on the output of the acquisition system, i.e. it is only the learning process and cannot initiate production. In a Russian context, the same distinctions are not appropriate. Much of Russia's methodologies, including Galperin's Theory of Mental Acts and the Milashevich Method, could be described as conscious learning but Kitaigorodskaya's Intensive Method transcends each individual definition. It is primarily a learning technique but seeks to place the learning in a pseudo-natural context which promotes acquisition.
(b) The Monitor Hypothesis

As language is acquired, conscious learning has a limited role of serving as a monitor or 'quality control' checker of what is produced. Three factors which limit the role of the monitor hypothesis are (i) the time which is required to choose and apply the rule, (ii) the issue of focusing on correct forms of output and (iii) the knowledge of rules is limited to the quantity and quality of linguistic rules which the learner has gained in his head. A monitor over-user is too conscious of rules; a monitor under-user produces language by feel; while the optimal monitor user uses rules correctly where appropriate. No reference has been made to the underdeveloped monitor or the monitor as yet unaware of its role. Both of these types have the same consequence, namely that the monitor will function in a way other than those described by Terrell and Krashen. In any case, all Russian methodologies promote a conscious monitor, most notably the Milashevich Method. Consequently issues concerning other monitors fall outside the remit of this research.

(c) The Natural Order Hypothesis

The hypothesis suggests that the acquisition of grammatical structures or morphemes follows a natural order in both first and second language acquisition. The same is said to exist for L1 errors also. In the Natural Order Hypothesis, certain structures tend to be acquired early or late and in groups. For example, in morphemes or function words (i) 'two hats' and (ii) 'he is doing' are acquired early, whereas (iii) 'he sings' is acquired late. Of course FL instruction can affect this natural order, both in terms of what is included and what is left out of a syllabus but it is also true to say that the L1 background of the TL learner plays a crucial role. Russians are more acutely aware of certain issues of grammar than a German or French native speaker is and vice versa. Therefore many Russian FL academics believe that a TL course should play to the strengths of the learner population. Given that most EFL books are published with an international learner population in mind, the view is often expressed at UdSU that the textbooks purchased by
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TEMPUS do not meet all the needs of the FLSP students. In this sense, Krashen and Terrell's hypothesis is lacking in sufficient detail to apply to the UdSU context and therefore not convincing.

(d) The Input Hypothesis

The Input Hypothesis relates to acquisition and not learning. An individual acquires language by understanding input beyond his current level of competence, achieved with the help of context. Therefore reading and listening are of prime importance (writing and speaking develop on their own at a later stage). For this to happen, the acquirer must hear and read messages containing structures of gradationally sequenced difficulty and understand their meaning. The gap between the latter and former can be bridged by use of visual aids, extra linguistic content and general knowledge of the TL culture. For reading strategies this can be best represented by Diagram 2 taken from Krashen and Terrel (1983, p 133):

Diagram 2

Diagram Showing how Reading Strategies can be developed in the FL Learner

- Read for meaning
  - Do not look up every word
- Predict meaning
- Use context
- Text
  - Look ahead
  - Back
  - Illustrations
- Outside Text
  - Real world information
  - Knowledge of language
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The same strategies are available in the learner's L1. This process is described as 'i + 1' theory because the 'caretaker' talk should be directed to the acquirer, so that input automatically contains 'i + 1'. The 'i' represents the knowledge already acquired by the learner and the '+1' contains the grammatical structures which the learner is 'ready' to acquire. When required, caretaker speech can be used to come down to the appropriate level of the child or learner to ensure that 'i + 1' takes place. The same is also true of foreigner talk which involves more simplified language (for example, slowing down, repeating teacher talk in the TL). In both cases, the learner is the central focus of the teacher's actions.

In a Russian context, the 'i + 1' cannot be the same as it is in a Western context. First, the learner's background is radically different on so many levels, including micro and macro-socio cultural issues. The term 'real world information' was subjected to Soviet propaganda for many decades with the result that both the learner and even the teacher are ignorant of cultural issues. Chapter Five explores this issue in greater depth through a taxonomic analysis and seeks to ascertain the extent to which this is present in the FLSP at UdSU. Second, the learner's linguistic history and perceptions of FL learning have been nurtured in a different way. The comments in Chapter Two on the background of UdSU and the observations on Russian teaching methodologies, made earlier in this chapter, confirm this view. Third, an ESP learner in Russia is obliged to take classes in a foreign language and therefore his motivation is unclear. His attitude can affect the success of the input hypothesis not just for himself but also for others. Chapter Seven attempts to find answers to these questions by providing the results of student attitudinal and perception questionnaires with subsequent analysis.
(e) Affective Filters Hypothesis

A low filter means that the performer is more open to input which strikes deeper. Possessing the right attitude is the key which encourages the learner to give more input and to be more receptive to the input they receive. Interference occurs when knowledge of the L1 gets in the way of the TL (see Diagram 3 below).

Diagram 3
Diagram Showing the Affective Filter Hypothesis

In the case of Russian learners of English, the interference is more obvious because there are less similarities between the languages than there are between, for example, Russian and German or German and English. The filter in Diagram 3 has therefore more effect on the success of the input. As we have already read, Russian linguists have devised methods which are both familiar and alien to FL teaching in the West. The purpose of this research is to ascertain within a Western FL methodological framework how successful these are in the UdSU context.

3.1.10 The Intercultural Approach

Current FL thinking in the West is dominated by one key word, namely 'intercultural'. While the word has broader ramifications beyond and even within the field of education, in Europe the term is used to describe the acquisition of facts about the customs, institutions and history of a society other than one's own. An Intercultural Approach seeks to go beyond the traditional boundaries of cultural knowledge and attempts to observe how these characteristics are interrelated. Hitherto, the approach was to teach language and culture separately but the Intercultural Approach suggests that the
traditional boundaries of 'self' and 'other' should be called into question and that language should be taught as culture. In order to fully understand the significance of this shift in perception, it is essential to establish parameters for the term 'culture'. It is extremely difficult to reach agreement about what exactly 'culture' implies but the following are all relevant: language, way of life, ways of thinking and feeling, values and beliefs, courtesies and entertainment, taboos and obligations.

Unlike previous approaches to culture in FL learning, the Intercultural Approach seeks to establish an egalitarian relationship between the TL and L1 cultures. Therefore it rejects ethnocentrism and embraces an amalgam of the TL and L1 cultures on an equal basis. Given the current situation at UdSU, the potential exploitation of the Intercultural Method in that environment is great. Cultural encounters do not need to be avoided as they can take place within a framework of parity of esteem.

The three key stages of the approach concern the three stages of de-centring, penetrating the other cultural system and negotiation. It is difficult to see how these principles can be fully realised in an UdSU context given the fact that all the financial funding for the TEMPUS project came from the European Union. In this sense, the ideals of the Intercultural Method are flawed from the inception of the TEMPUS project. However, it could be argued that in the post-TEMPUS era the intercultural approach is the best way forward for the FLSP. Chapter Eight addresses this question when future methodological implications are assessed.

3.1.11 Conclusion to Section 3.1
The above analysed theories are precisely what they claim to be, namely theories. Any teacher working in any educational establishment is aware of the gap which exists between theory and practice but accepts that the guiding principles will affect the long-
term outcome of what the learners gains form the lessons. In one respect the theories are idealistic. They describe ideal learners who want to learn. At tertiary level in the United Kingdom, only those students who are interested in foreign languages pursue FL studies. It is solely at secondary level (up until GCSE) that the pupils of an entire academic year study a FL. Here, the main areas of contention lie in the discussion as to whether classes should be streamed according to ability or organised into mixed ability groups. What is gained by one approach, is lost by using the other. Mixed ability teaching reduces disaffection among weaker learners who are not labelled 'weak' as they are in streamed teaching. Stronger and more able learners are held back in mixed ability teaching because the teacher must give equal time to all levels of ability whereas the end product of the top set in streamed classes is much superior. Given that UdSU teaches all non-specialists a foreign language, the description of the secondary model is more applicable. The methods in this section do not make sufficient reference to this issue and are therefore weakened by that omission.
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3.2 Russian Methodologies

The evolution of FL teaching methodologies in the former Soviet Union has taken on a distinct character to that in the West. Rezaev (1996, p. 116) identifies four stages of Soviet Higher Education:

(i) The Utopian Phase (1917-1939) of idealism and experimentalism.
(ii) The 'Realist' Tradition (1939-1961) during the process of urbanisation.
(iii) The 'Anti-Realist' Stage (1961-1991) with the numerical expansion at HE level, there was a battle between the idealists and the realists.

Characteristics of all four of the above can be seen in the current state of Higher Education in Russia. The following section deals with these and is broken into two subsections. First, key characteristics about current FL teaching in Russia are noted and second, the key Soviet theories in the fields of Linguistics and Psychology are presented.

3.2.1 Key Characteristics of Current FL Teaching in Russia

In order to ensure that a proper understanding of FL teaching in Russia is achieved it is essential that the following points are mentioned in advance of the analytical discussion which follows this section:

(1) Learning foreign languages in the Soviet Union has had a mixed reception during the twentieth century. From being an enemy of the fledgling Communist state when FL teaching was seen as a luxury only for the wealthy aristocracy and bourgeoisie, it became a subject which could be taught to the masses. It fell out of fashion again because it was perceived as unpatriotic for a citizen not to be content with the tongue of the motherland. Those who were involved in FL teaching in the 1930's and 1940's were viewed with suspicion by the authorities. Today, traces of this sentiment of suspicion still prevail,
particularly among older teachers in Russia (Ter-Minasova, 1996a, pp. 8-9) and consequently at UdSU.

(2) The complete isolation of Soviet citizens from Western culture during the Soviet period was so complete that it has left a huge gap in their cultural knowledge. During this period, most foreign languages were taught as dead classical languages because teachers and students had little chance to practise their skills with native speakers. Consequently Western methodologies had little or no relevance in places such as UdSU.

(3) The USSR was a multi-cultural state with Russian as the lingua franca. Russian had to be learnt by many Soviet citizens (including Udmurts) as a foreign language. Consequently, a whole unique genre of FL theories evolved which were used to teach Russian to non-Russian speaking citizens. Much of this theory was transferred across to the methodologies for teaching other foreign languages as were Soviet ideological influences.

(4) The way in which methodology in Soviet theoretical writings is expressed often appears convoluted and relies heavily on technical-scientific or even pseudo-scientific jargon which is often oblique. There is a tendency in Russia to offer theories which are not always backed up in the way to which Western theorists are accustomed. The practice of UdSU teachers fits in with this pattern.

(5) Within the Soviet educational tradition three key characteristics stand out:
(a) Depth, thoroughness and perfectionism were pre-requisites. Being pragmatic was seen as being capitalist and therefore not acceptable. The goal was to teach everything within an area of grammar or lexis. While this is a noble aim, the human reality is that this goal is impossible.
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(b) Mass-production techniques and mass-production teaching materials were a characteristic feature of FL teaching because Russia had several million students. For economic reasons alone, FL teaching materials had to be teacher-oriented to the neglect of the individual learner. Within a Russian educational institution, the practice of copying and using centrally produced material was and still remains widespread. In Chapter Five, this issue is explored further within the UdSU context and shows how material is often used without source references or acknowledgements.

(c) Ter-Minasova (1996a, p. 11) writes that a solid theoretical basis was essential for good FL teaching practice and included areas such as lexicography and socio-linguistics. UdSU's ESP teaching clearly follows this tradition as shown in the taxonomic survey in Chapter Five. This is in contrast to the West's perceptions of naturalistic learning.

(6) There has always been a preference for the British variant of Standard English (Received Pronunciation) over the American variant. Within the USSR, there was a need to teach Standard Russian to all students, including those of non-Russian origin and similarly, there was a need to have a standard form of English. Traditionally, the British variant has been the dominant one for many reasons. First, it is the original, historical and cultural source with a world famous literature (useful for a country in isolation like the USSR as a safe source for linguistic analysis) and for this reason is viewed as more prestigious. Second, Russian teachers teach this variant because few know the American variant although the situation is constantly evolving. At present the FLSP has only one young teacher who speaks the American variant of English. Third, the British EFL industry has always been more pro-active in its promotion of British English in Russia, thanks in great part to the role of the British Council (and more recently, under the auspices of the EU's TEMPUS projects). Fourth, due to the Cold War and its aftermath, there have always been many negative connotations attached to the United States in Russia (Ter-Minasova, 1996a, pp. 60-61).
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(7) The Soviet traditions of English for Specialists and Non-specialists
Two strands of English teaching existed in the USSR and still exist in today's Russia. These are: (a) the students who choose to specialise in foreign languages and (b) all other students at university level who are obliged to study a foreign language alongside their main speciality as an integral part of their degree. The majority of the latter choose to study English. This type of teaching, known as Language for Specific Purposes (LSP), dates back to the 1960's in the USSR. The main needs of the students were identified for interpersonal, international and research purposes. By the mid 1970's, LSP had become the dominant mode of teaching for non-specialists. The FLSP functions only in this area.

3.2.2 Key Soviet Theories in the Fields of Linguistics and Psychology
It is important to contextualise the material which follows within the seven point framework provided in section 3.2.1 above. Furthermore, it is essential to bear in mind that the subsequent sections on Russian and Eastern European theoretical methodologies have been selected to reflect the past and present teaching practices of the FLSP teachers. Where appropriate passing reference is made to provide clarity of the UdSU application of these Russian methodological theories.

3.2.2.1 Conscious Learning Leading to Unconscious Language Production
Originally, many Russian teachers believed that it was impossible to arrive at a definition of 'language mastery' solely through linguistics. Eventually, psychology was adopted as a complimentary system as it also involves speech skills and speech habits. Vygotsky, a key figure in Soviet psychology, created a school of thought which has endured. In his early research, Vygotsky wrote that a child learns its own L1 in the opposite way to which it will learn a TL given that L1 learning involves no study of the alphabet, no focus on reading and writing, nor the conscious and deliberate construction of sentences or the study of grammar. The learning of the L1 is sub-conscious and involuntary.
whereas the learning of the TL is deliberate and consciously aware - the complete reverse of the former and in contradiction to the Natural Approach. Vygotsky (1956, p. 291) argued that whereas the simplest elements of the language are learnt early in the L1, the more complex aspects of the TL are developed first. The acquisition of the TL is thus dependent on the degree of maturity of the learner in his own native tongue and consequently presupposes that the learning of the TL will be achieved in part through an analysis of the L1. It was believed that the only possible exception to this pattern occurs when a person acquires a second language in the same way that he acquired the first one - namely when a child learns two languages from an early age.

The idea of both the L1 and FL learning methods going in opposite directions was later found to be valid only to a certain extent. This was due to the fact that the levels of mechanism have already been built up in the L1 and therefore they transfer to the process of learning the TL naturally. Several Russian theorists believe that the student always sees the TL through the knowledge obtained about the L1 and that any other psychological path is impossible. In this respect, the Russian theory shares elements of methodology which are similar to Grammar Translation.

It is only logical to actively direct the learner down this path in the teaching process and abandon all other approaches. The best way forward is to draw up an algorithm (structured rules of grammar) to raise awareness of L1 grammar which can be automated and later transferred to the FL. For the psychologist, there is a need to be aware of the psychological mechanisms for conscious awareness and automatism. In Western terms, this matches the Behaviourist theories of automating good accurate language production in the classroom before the learner comes fully to understand the nature of what he is doing (as in the Audiolingual Method). However, Soviet psychology has always made a greater issue of conscious awareness and rejects the comparison with Behaviourism as a
result. For both methodological and psychological considerations, the Vygotsky school rejects the Behaviourist view that verbal behaviour can be reduced to reflex responses to verbal and non-verbal behaviour (See Leont'ev 1967 for further details on this aspect). It does so on the grounds that the issues of motivation and the speaker's environment need to be taken into account.

Consciousness is a leading principle in Soviet methods of FL learning which distinguishes it from other primarily Western methods because the end product of this approach is an unconscious state. How consciously aware the speaker is of what he is doing is important, as it indicates to what extent the speaker is 'free' to use the skills acquired. There are different levels of 'conscious awareness':

(a) Central, cognized awareness - which is the goal of the act in the early stages of classroom teaching.

(b) Conscious control - an action shaped by a previously conscious goal-directed act but which has now gained a degree of autonomous usage (Leont'ev, 1946, p. 21).

(c) Unconscious control - an innate skill which limits the freedom of the speaker in speech realisation (Leont'ev, 1965, pp. 123-124).

(d) No cognized awareness - the speaker is not aware of any action of speech realisation (i.e. 'spontaneous speech' has been achieved) where the issues of grammar and vocabulary are being dealt with at a 'sub-conscious' level. This practice is evident in section 3.4 on Kitaigorodskaya's Intensive Method, a teaching strategy which is advocated by a small group of FLSP teachers.

3.2.2.2 The Theory of Internalisation of External Acts

One current trend in the School of Russian psychology of conscious learning can be traced back to the ideas of Galperin, a member of the Vygotsky School. The theory expresses the view that inner activity (theoretical, intellectual, mental) is closely linked
to external activity (practical). Acts with material objects are internalised and consolidated to become skills. Once they are automatic they become components of more complex acts and finally they develop into habits (See Galperin, Zaporozhets, and El'konin, 1963). There is a clear distinction here between the elements which make up an 'activity':

(a) The activity is an independent goal of which the subject is consciously aware (e.g. the learner wants to ask someone for directions to a shop).

(b) The act is each element of the activity (e.g. the learner creates a series of questions and statements first to obtain the information and then to clarify the details).

(c) The operations are the components of the act and depend on circumstances surrounding the act. The learner may not necessarily be conscious of these operations as they can be automated (e.g. the learner reacts to the response from the other person and uses words and phrases to formulate the statements and questions in order to clarify the essential detail).

A comparison is drawn between a learner of a new language and somebody starting a new job. Each individual element of the job (namely the acts and the operations) must be taught separately before the whole sequence of actions (activity) can be performed without support. Similarly, in order to be able to speak a language properly, the learner must practise and master each individual act which, when put together, make up normal free speech. Overall, this model requires a high degree of structure but fails to meet the needs of the individual student in a mixed ability classroom which is the typical composition format at UdSU.
3.2.2.3 Definition of Speech

The activity of speech can be either oral or written and is divided into two key areas:

(a) Monologue - which demands special training. The ability to produce monologue presupposes the ability to select the most appropriate means for a specific utterance (e.g. persuasive, expressive). The distinctiveness of the tone of voice is also relevant in terms of intonation, for example when making statements or asking questions.

(b) Dialogue - which requires drill exercises on a limited number of speech stereotypes. (for example, Do both partners know the context? Is there non-linguistic communication? Is there involuntary reactive speech?) This starts at a very simple beginner level and ends with full native-speaker-like competence (For further details see Zimnaya, 1964).

In both cases, monologue and dialogue vary according to whether the speech is situation-bound, contextual, non-situational or non-contextual. Further to this, distinctions between three sub-types of speech can be found:

(i) The criteria linked to the inner organisation of human thought and language capacity. The speaker is participating in:

(i.i) Communicative speech - i.e. social intercourse (which occurs more in L1).

(i.ii) Nominative speech - aimed at designating things in reality (which occurs more in TL learning).

(i.iii) Echolalic speech - speaker repeats words without being aware of its content (which occurs more in TL learning).

(ii) The criteria associated with the fundamental structure of activity and with the socio-psychological functions of speech leads to the question of whether speech is stochastic (i.e. is it generated as a unique string of inter-related elements or is it constructive? Does speech have an inner schema? Is there any inter-verbal behaviour such as translation
from one language into another?). This question is not central to the current research but is an area which requires further exploration at a later stage.

(iii) The criteria linked with the characteristic features of the utterance (Leont'ev, 1973, p. 14). Does the utterance have the criterion of unconscious or conscious speech, controlled or spontaneous speech?

3.2.2.4 Speech Situation in the TL Classroom

An important question in Russian linguistics is how speech should be taught in a TL lesson. There are three speech situations which occur naturally in any TL classroom. These situations are:

(a) The 'structural unit' of a textbook - the material around which the lesson is built. The situation provides unity of vocabulary within the lesson. Russian theorists criticise a textbook which is built around an account of people and events, which bears no relation to the student, and which distracts the teacher from the real job of teaching because he must provide clarification of the external (and therefore to the student) alien information about another culture. Often there are also non-relevant materials such as pictures, lists or objects, which cause the student to play the role of the outsider as they have no relevance to the theme. This contradicts more recent thinking in the United Kingdom, as is evident in the Communicative Approach used in secondary schools. The GCSE examination is based on a tourist visiting the TL country and encountering the TL through a series of simulated authentic settings. Often there are major gaps in the learner's TL cultural knowledge which can hinder linguistic progress. By contrast, many Russian publications focus on the L1 environment through the TL in order to reduce learner alienation.
(ii) related to the characteristics of the activity. Creating the right circumstances for the achievement of the latter is the task of the TL teacher. Where true authenticity is not possible, the term 'fictitious circumstances' can be used to imply creating a system whereby the student accepts the situation as real and relevant to him fully (but not as perceived by the Communicative Approach) and therefore true communication can take place. The latter can be textbook generated or teacher inspired. A parallel is drawn with detective novels in that the reader often finds himself in the role of the detective in trying to work out who the criminal is. Thus the student can be motivated to act in a specific way and effect a 'transformation' or in psychological terms a 'transference' through the creation of 'fictitious circumstances' in a textbook designed like a work of fiction with its heroes. For the student, this will involve the suspension of reality which allows him to act 'together with' or 'instead of' the hero. Some Russian theorists believe that the best method of achieving this goal would be to have professional writers produce a textbook which contains verbal communication in real situations in which the student could find himself in the TL country. There is clear evidence of this practice at UdSU in the form of the UdSU variant of the Intensive Method.

There are several weaknesses in the theoretical arguments so far. First, the issue of learner motivation has not been dealt with. Given that the ESP learner is obliged to study a FL at all Russian universities, more theoretical work is required in this area. Second the centralised education system fails to acknowledge that each individual learner has his own specific needs. The stated theory does not appear to take account of the practical realities of such implementation. Third, the notion that non-linguists would be better suited to textbook production is oversimplistic as there would still be a need for TL specialists to review the work and advise on changes.
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(b) The way of presenting the students with the material. The situation is built around a particular aspect or aspects of grammar. The problem of creating a proper functional grammar is seen as major because the exercise related to a point of grammar should place the student in a problem situation and not become a mechanical operation. This operational structure depends (i) on the language, (ii) on the general psychological nature inherent in the speaker and (iii) on the particular method used in forming the appropriate skill. However, there is insufficient supporting evidence in this area to sustain a convincing argument.

(c) The way of organising the exercises in order to consolidate the knowledge gained by the students. This places great emphasis on the teacher who needs to know his students well in order to know how to best support their learning. The weakness in this theory is the over-reliance on the teacher. The practical realities of teaching in the FLSP at UdSU, as shown in Chapter Two, prove that it is not possible to assume that all teachers are in a position to deliver the teaching as suggested by the theory.

3.2.2.5 Galperin's Theory of Mental Acts

Galperin's Theory of Mental Acts draws on the principles of interiorisation of external activity and its conversion into inner intellectual activity. According to the theory, the student must be lead through the five following stages:

(a) The act is divided into operations which are scaled according to the student's abilities and adapted to the knowledge and skills which he has at the outset (Galperin, 1959, p. 449). When the student has comprehended the schema, it is transferred to new material. Thus the student will be able to progress from one reference point to the next, through the separate operations without any of the skills and habits which the new act might involve. Orientation is achieved through one of three ways:
the separate operations without any of the skills and habits which the new act might involve. Orientation is achieved through one of three ways:

(i) When acts are performed according to a model - such as the act itself, the model of the product or the result of the act.

(ii) A model of the act and the instructions on how to perform it properly are provided.

(iii) The teacher's primary emphasis is on planned instruction. An analysis of new tasks will enable the student to discriminate reference points and conditions for performing new tasks. In section 3.5 of this chapter, we will see how Milashevich makes use of this idea in developing an approach to English verbs.

(b) The new stage is the external act which is executed on material objects (Galperin, 1959, pp. 450 - 451). The student can draw on many sorts of learning supports such as diagrams, outlines, schemata, drawings, models or even written notes. They reproduce the key characteristics of the specific things which are essential for the acts. They enable the student not just to perform the acts with them, but also to manipulate and alter them. For the teacher to achieve this, the first task is to find the initial material and then to establish the best purpose for which it can be used. In some cases, the material can become a kind of interlanguage which acts as a support for the learning.

(c) This involves the shortening and subsequently the transition of the act to the plane of speech without the support of the objects. This is achieved at first by producing language which is external but accessible to teacher control.

(d) The audible speech is now replaced by inner thought which leads to the production of the finished utterance and involves no teacher control.
(e) The final stage is the complete automatism of the speech act. What exactly 'complete automatism' means can be interpreted in two ways. Many have queried whether (i) it is possible or not to think in the foreign language thus leading to a 'translationless' mastery of the foreign language or (ii) does the TL speaker pass through a mental L1 field before speaking? This issue remains unresolved both in Russia and the West.

The sequence of acts is achieved by first creating the basis of an act through isolating the individual units operative in speech and then establishing their hierarchical interrelationship. Second, the student must be taught to perform conscious operations on the language with the aid of external supports, such as diagrams. Third, the student is taught to carry out these operations without external supports. Fourth, the student begins the abbreviation and automatism of the conscious operations in order to get it committed to his memory. Finally, the student fully abbreviates everything practised to the point of mastery and makes his speech completely automatic. The portion of language study devoted to conscious treatment of the material must be reduced gradually to zero, by increasing the automatism of language. Belayev (1967, p. 67) talks of a 'conscious, practical mastering' of a foreign language although the final mastery is a direct and intuitive one.

3.2.2.6 The Importance of the Textbook

One favoured option for the production of textbook materials is the use of comparative and contrastive linguistics for analysing the morphological structures of words. It can help to create a specific algorithm of grammatical analysis which can be passed quite quickly to the oral form and then automated. The use of a word form scheme reveals the syntagmatic structure of the word (for example, affixes) and the grammatical meaning of the individual morphemes (which is the same as parsing). In this way, the learner begins to perceive every word through this schema and is supposed to understand the semantic
and morphological features of a word immediately. However, the realities of the classroom are not as easy as this and it is not always possible to direct learners fully at all times.

In Russia, it was and still is believed that an analytical approach to syntax in the textbook can yield better academic results. The views expressed by Gokhlerner and Eyger (1966, pp. 175-178) are still relevant for teachers such as Milashevich (1991). The former put forward the following scheme for textbook generation:

(a) Functional grammar analysis of the L1 and discrimination of basic grammatical meanings.

(b) Introduction of the word forms of the FL and their functional grammatical analysis.

(c) Comparison of the schemata for word generation in the L1 and FL on the basis of the system of grammatical meanings.

(d) Transition to elementary syntactic models.

More important than how to teach is what to teach. In LSP textbooks, there needs to be a learner's commentary, oriented towards the background knowledge of the student (given that the student knows more than the teacher within the topic area). The commentary must also be socio-linguistically determined and contain sufficient support material for the learner without overburdening or undersupplying them. It must explain issues such as facts, literary allusions, quotations and linguistic difficulties such as idioms, puns, obsolete words, slang and neologisms. Chapter Five addresses all these aforementioned issues related to textbook production in the taxonomic survey of UdSU's in-house publications.
3.2.2.7 Syntactic Structures and Lexicology and the Need for Models

In contrast to the view of the native speaker of English, it is obvious in the mind of the Russian learner that there should be some equivalent of the paradigm of case. To this is tied the issue of lexis. The tradition in Soviet linguistics has been to play to this strength. There is a different syntactic constituent tree structure in each language with varying depths of sentences permissible in different languages. Most FL language learners make their mistakes in this area as they transfer their L1 structures across to the TL. The view is held that to gain mastery of the TL, the pre-requisite is mastery of one’s own L1 structures first. This focus is gradually reduced until automatism occurs without rules. A system of learning models compliments this knowledge of the structure of speech generation. The syntagm (as opposed to the paradigm) is accepted as the best unit to achieve this.

A related issue concerns vocabulary and how it should be taught. Ter-Minasova (1996a, p. 24) mentions the concept of 'slovoschetanije' (word collocation) which entails syntax and the study of speech construction. The issues which have been studied include how to build a sentence and what to build it out of, given that there are so many ready-made phraseological units (idioms) in English which can also be represented by word-combinations. Ter-Minasova (1996a, pp. 24ff) offers the following examples:

(a) I rarely go there (word-combination)
   I go there once in a blue moon (idiom)

(b) to visit (word)
   to go and see (word combination)
   to pay a call (phraseological unit)

In both cases, the same message is conveyed but knowing when to use what requires much practice and analysis. It is the job of the teacher through the use of specific
teaching methodologies to provide the framework and the required practice for the learner to master these skills.

Another aspect of word combinations which causes problems concerns the issue of word collocation (e.g., a blue dress but a blue joke - the word blue does not carry the same meaning in both). One possible solution offered is to combine work on collocation with colligation. While the latter is the study of the abstract (i.e., creating a formula such as adjective + noun + verb + proposition + noun), the former is the concrete application of the latter (i.e., filling in the formula such as clear water trickles down the mountain).

3.2.2.8 Conclusion to Section 3.2

It is clear from section 3.2 that the theoretical background to Russia's approach to FL teaching has evolved in a distinct manner to that in the West. Just as the entire education system was centralised under Communism, it is not surprising that the similar degree of central control dominates the FL classroom through the various teaching methodologies discussed in this section. Conscious learning typifies this kind of control. It is a long-established tradition which has evolved over many decades and theories such as Galperin's Theory of Mental Acts originate from the methodology. Sections 3.4 and 3.5 show that the legacy lives on in the form of the Intensive Method and the Milashevich Method. However, Russian methodology has not just influenced teaching in Russia alone. It has influenced the teaching practices of those countries which were closely affiliated to it politically during the Communist period. Section 3.3 deals with Suggestopedia which originated in Bulgaria but which drew much of its methodology from Russia. In turn Russia was then influenced by the new suggestopedic developments emanating from Bulgaria.
3.3 Suggestopedia

In this section, much detail is supplied about a method which is not actually Russian but which has strong roots in Russian educational traditions. There was invariably a tradition of sharing new theoretical approaches between the former USSR and its satellite states in Eastern Europe. This movement worked in both directions. Not surprisingly, it has its roots in earlier Russian linguistic and psychological theories as its creator, the Bulgarian Lozanov, was influenced by them. The justification for its inclusion lies in the fact that it is the method on which the Russian Intensive Method is based. The latter has been used widely at UdSU and, in turn, has been the model on which two UdSU teachers have produced an UdSU variant. In order to trace the full impact of both Suggestopedia and the Intensive Method, it is essential to analyse both in depth. We begin with Suggestopedia before moving on to the Intensive Method and finally the UdSU variant of the Intensive Method. At each stage in the detailed analysis of the individual methodologies, where the Intensive Method is the same as Suggestopedia, reference to this is made. Where appropriate and relevant, specific reference will be made to the actual Intensive teaching practices witnessed during FL classes at UdSU.

Generally accepted definitions are that Suggestology is the science of suggestion, while in the specific field of pedagogy, this has come to be known as suggestopedy. Uncontrolled and insufficiently understood suggestion can occur in any form of education and in any communicative act in general but 'organised, purposeful suggestion' is given complete prominence in the practice of suggestopedy. Lozanov (1984, p. 1) explains suggestion as follows:

The extension of the personality's freedom to choose is realised through the organised utilisation of the paraconscious contents of the mind which give shape and 'volumeness' to the integral conscious-unconscious communicative process and may create a disposition favourable for tapping the reserve capacities of the personality.
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The above definition is heavily burdened with terms which are difficult to define. What is the 'organised utilisation of the paraconscious'? What is the 'shape and volumeness given to the integral conscious communicative process'? These and many more questions need to be answered through a closer examination of the specific characteristics of Suggestopedia.

It is quite obvious that there exists a psychological technique often not comprehended by teachers themselves which helps to hold the attention of their students. Teachers can exert an influence on the students not only with what they say, but also with the intonation of their voices, their smiles, gestures, clothes, movements and their whole attitude towards the pupils. According to Lozanov, this influence is applied only in the normal waking state. In the process of teaching and learning, besides the problem of understanding the material in a given lesson, there is that of memorising and automating it. This is where the power of suggestion takes prominence.

In the field of anatomical and physiological research, Russian science has shown that in all probability man uses only 4% of the brain's capacities. The other 96% are inactivated potentials (Lozanov, 1984, p. 6). In suggestopedic FL learning, courses can vary from several lessons a week, to courses of 'whole day' immersion. However the leading factor is not the number of lessons but the psychological organisation of the process of instruction. Lozanov argues that on average four times more words are given per lesson in suggestopedic instruction than in instruction by other methods, with one further advantage being the absence of obligatory homework.

3.3.1 Claims

On a 24 day course with four lessons per day, Lozanov claims that the following specific results can be expected from an ab initio course:
(1) The learners assimilate on average more than 90% of the vocabulary which comprises 2000 lexical units per course.
(2) More than 60% of the new vocabulary is used actively and fluently in everyday conversation and the rest of the vocabulary is known at translation level.
(3) The learners speak within the framework of the whole essential grammar.
(4) Any text can be read.
(5) The learners can write although making some mistakes.
(6) The learners may make a few mistakes during speaking but this does not hinder communication.
(7) Pronunciation is fairly satisfactory.
(8) The learners are not afraid of talking to foreigners who speak the TL.
(9) The learners are eager to continue studying the same FL and, if possible, in the same way.

Such claims are difficult to substantiate. They offer a combination of precision (as in point 10), imprecision (as in point 5) and the impossible to verify (as in point 9). Lozanov has never provided rigorous evidence on which to base his claims. This point of criticism is often levelled by Western researchers. Research into the learner outcomes achieved by Western variants of Suggestopedia has confirmed that a higher level of learning can be achieved over the same period of time in comparison to a non-suggestopedic course but usually the outcomes remain much lower than the claims made by Lozanov.

Bancroft (1999, pp. 55-83 and pp. 229-243) describes two versions of Suggestopedia promoted by Lozanov. Suggestopedia 1 (Novakov's version) is the original version and the one which is said to have influenced Russian educationalists the most. However, Suggestopedia 2 (Gateva's version) is also of value as it shows how the Suggestopedic process has been refined since the publication of Suggestopedia 1. Both are analysed
below. Where Suggestopedia 2 retains the characteristics of Suggestopedia 1, this is indicated. To avoid repetition, the section on Suggestopedia 2 contains only those details which are distinct from the original version. In both cases, the findings will be used later in this chapter to compare Suggestopedia to the Intensive Method and its UdSU variant.

3.3.2 Suggestopedia 1

The six principles of Suggestopedia 1 are:

(a) Authority of the Teacher and the Prestige of the Educational Institution.

It is essential that the student respects the teacher and acknowledges that the latter has knowledge to impart to him. There is no room for the student to be critical of the academic ability of the teacher, or of the way in which the teacher delivers the material. The same principle of prestige applies also to the academic institution in which the course is delivered. Without this faith in the academic establishment and the teacher, the bond of trust, which is required between the teacher and the learner, would not be strong enough to ensure that proper suggestion takes place. The selection of the group is important because not everybody is suitable for suggestion.

It is the teacher's duty to create a joyful, tension-free environment in which the learner can gain as much knowledge as possible. While the teacher must have total control, he must appear flexible and to a large extent theatrical in the delivery of the dialogues, role plays and songs in order to inspire his students with a sense of adventure, change and discovery. His authority, combined with a need to be supportive to the students and ready to share his experience or knowledge with the students means that the teacher needs to convey a sense of 'distant closeness' which will lead him to the teaching goals of the method (i.e. to create conditions for an emotional deblockage, freeing the students of any oppressive factors and stimulate their progress). It is important that the teacher observes
proper and strict ritualization in the structure and organisation of the process of instruction. To achieve this, it is imperative that the teacher be trained both theoretically and practically in psychology, singing and acting in order to engage the student 'wholly'.

The teacher, as an authority figure, can be compared to a conductor of an orchestra who is meant to establish harmony in actions and intentions. He must have meticulous planning with the very first lesson being of particular importance as the relationship of trust must be established from the outset. Simultaneously, it is important to retain a discreet difference between the teacher and the learner.

The authority of the teacher and educational institution must extend naturally to the textbook as it is the very basis on which the whole suggestopedic course depends. Usually, eight or ten specially written dialogues constitute the framework of the course. These tell the story of twelve or fourteen people who are gathered together to participate in a humanistic venture of one sort or another. The themes which have been used include a congress on 'Man and Nature', a convention on 'Communication between People' and an exhibition on 'Contribution to World Civilisation'. Texts should always be rational, logical, high in cultural content and reassuring. They should try to bring out the child side of the learner. By being long, the dialogues are meant to help the student think that language learning is easy. This is an example of positive suggestion, like a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy, as the teacher has every confidence in the student's ability to learn the large quantity of material. It is claimed that students often remember the passages from the dialogues word for word weeks later because the texts are evocative, emotional and aesthetic.

By inference, it is clear that Suggestopedia cannot be used widely at a university such as UdSU given that the ESP learners are all obliged to study a foreign language.
Furthermore the difficult conditions under which the teachers and student live, work and study (as described in Chapter Two) mean that it would be very difficult for most to fulfil all the theoretical pre-requisites specified above.

(b) Infantilization (or Confidence and Spontaneity of the Student).
What is meant here, is not that the student becomes a child but rather takes on key child-like characteristics, namely curiosity, spontaneity, good memorisation skills and confidence which in turns means less adult reserve in the classroom and more openness to the suggestion. Lozanov (1984, p. 192) calls it a 'selective mental set-up' which helps create a play situation during which it is unimportant if the student makes a mistake.

The student does not act as himself in the class but assumes another role which carries more prestige with it. The student is encouraged to act out the role as best he can. Throughout the suggestopedic textbook, all twelve to fourteen characters have been made attractive in every way. They are intelligent, sensitive, civic-minded, socially successful and professionally prominent. During the entire period, each student will play the part of one of the characters and is known only as that character to their fellow students and their teacher. This 'mask' represents a break from the past and any other unsuccessful learning experiences. It allows the students to become something different and helps them overcome learning blocks of how their learning is limited in normal FL classes.

In the Intensive classroom at UdSU the above goals have been achieved by entire teaching groups but inevitably some learners are able to suspend reality better than other more self-conscious learners. In all cases, however, great enjoyment among the learners is evident.
(c) Double Planeness (the Importance of Appearance of the Classroom, Body Language, Tone of Voice and Personality of the Teacher)

Bancroft (1999, p. 40) writes that the physical and social environment have always played a crucial role in Soviet pedagogy which was heavily influenced by the Marxist-Leninist view of psychology as posited by Sechenov, Bekterov and Pavlov. They believed that both the physical and the social environments affected the unconscious. Lozanov was drawn to this and incorporated elements of it into his work. The idea of the unnoticed stimuli, he felt, had a profound effect on the learner's ability to absorb and memorise the material in a lesson.

The suggestopedic classroom should be a large, bright room with windows and natural daylight, carpeted with twelve comfortable armchairs organised in a semi-circle. There is a flip chart and a table with stereo equipment. There should be a 'club-like' atmosphere which contrasts sharply with a traditional classroom. Pictures on the walls, flowers on the table and soft lighting suggest relaxation while comfort and success avoid any negative school associations. At no stage, however, was such a room seen at UdSU. While an attempt had been made to reduce the formality of the classroom used (such as soft armchairs placed in a semi-circle and several colourful posters on the walls), UdSU does not have enough money to set up such rooms and retain them for exclusive use in Suggestopedic or Intensive teaching.

Normal body language and facial expressions can send both negative and positive messages such as anger, warmth, hostility and acceptance. It is these negative messages which the suggestopedic teacher must avoid in a role which can be described as that of an actor. The same is also true of the teacher's tone of voice. At UdSU, this is clearly practised but only by a small group of teachers who have received full proper Intensive training.
In contrast to many other methodologies, all suggestopedic situations have been thought out to avoid triggering any negative feelings from the students which might turn them off. The adventures are all non-threatening, pleasant, humorous and even naive. Consequently, there are certain realms of experience which fall outside of this category and would therefore never be included in a suggestopedic manual. Some critics may feel that Suggestopedia, by avoiding such issues, is not preparing the student for the linguistic conflicts in which he will find himself in real life. However, the argument is sustained that all such situations and registers are in fact incorporated into the suggestopedic manuals but in a suggestopedically non-threatening way. Expressions of anger and frustration can be simulated in short sketches (For example, an irate customer in a book shop complains about a salesperson who is unwilling to sell him a pair of shoes). This technique is meant to shield the student from harsh realities and as a result prevent the student from reaching a learning block which is a natural defence reaction to some kind of disturbing input. In the UdSU classroom, the intended sense of the dialogues is always understood by the learning group, though some learners understand the humour faster than others.

Gold (1985, p. 10) argues that the learning block comes about when the input has come up against:
(a) The critical-logical barrier which can reject the illogical and the disorganised. Disorganisation of the story and/or material should be avoided. It takes confidence away from the learner as it is difficult to be both distrustful and receptive at the same time.
(b) The intuitive-affective barrier, which can reject the painful and the dangerous. Illogicality should be avoided, such as when someone comes in the door, the student expects to hear 'hello'. The student feels good because this was predictable in the target language. If something else is said, this may bewilder and discourage the student.
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(c) The ethical barrier which can reject the immoral and the unprincipled. The 'morally questionable' must be avoided. There will be jokes and good-natured tricks but never anything dishonest. Controversial subjects such as divorce, birth control and sex are avoided.

(d) Rhythm (the Variety of Rhythm incorporated into the Language Class and into the Music World)
Lozanov believes that rhythm has a very positive influence on memorisation. In early research, a metronome was used in order to keep in time with a rhythm which was seen as conducive to proper suggestion. The regular rhythm helps the student to breathe deeply and thus removes any tensions which he may have brought into the classroom.

During the presentation phase, the text is read to classical music, primarily baroque music, due to its calming qualities. Music is used throughout the various stages of the lesson and fulfils different functions. At the start of the lesson, the tape recorder is turned on and for a few minutes the students are allowed to get into the mood of the stimulating music. Then the teacher begins to read the text, following the intonations of the music. This 'ceremony' is known as the active concert as the students follow the dialogue which can last up to 45 minutes. During this period, the 'spiritually elevating' experience, during which every utterance is coded with a certain emotional content has served to inhibit the rational, analytical faculties (i.e. the left hand side of the brain) and activate the creative, artistic and imaginative functions (i.e. the right hand side of the brain). The UdSU practice of the Intensive Method follows this pattern closely.

(e) Intonation, Pronunciation and Phonetics (the Soft Soothing Voice of the Teacher)
Lozanov took ideas from the Soviet school of psychology and psychotherapy, especially from Platonov's 1959 publication. He believes that the 'word' becomes a stimulus itself,
just like a piece of music. The teacher must pronounce the words with firm authority and calm confidence. As he repeats the words or phrases being taught, there is sound intensity and accent of meaning which result in a physiological reaction. Three variations of tone are available: (i) a normal and declarative tone, (ii) a quiet, soft, ambiguous tone (or whispering) both of which offer a subtle influence, and (iii) a domineering, sure tone (a loud command which permits no objections). The intonation should be in harmony with the music. Lozanov talks of the horizontal intonational swing (when a phrase is repeated three times, but each time with a different intonation) and the vertical intonational swing (when three phrases are read together but each with a different voice level). The issue of intonation is vital in the issue of double-planeness as it can affect the student on both a conscious and sub-conscious level. Consequently, the teacher achieves communication with the 'whole' student. Whether the intended outcome of the teaching is fully achieved at UdSU is questionable and would require extensive quantitative research. Therefore it falls outside of the ramifications of this research. However, the quality of the teaching is our focus and once again UdSU's Intensive teachers do follow the patterns described earlier in this paragraph.

(f) Concert Pseudo-Passivity (the Psychological Relaxation associated with the Concert Session)

This is based on Savanna Yoga (literally meaning the 'Corpse Pose') which leads to muscle relaxation and which in Lozanov's view facilitates memorisation (Bancroft, 1999, p. 46). The suggestopedic goals are best realised when the recipient is totally relaxed. The more relaxed he is, the more open he becomes to the power of suggestion as he is gaining rest and energy and even increased motivation. Lozanov carried over to Suggestopedia 2 the rhythmic yoga breathing. It is built into the second of the three phases described below but is less used at UdSU.
3.3.3 Suggestopedia 2

In comparison to S1, Suggestopedia 2 does not rely on mysticism or hypnosis and there is more emphasis on traditional language learning approaches such as grammar, reading and translation. There is greater use of arts (music, painting, dancing, theatre) which form an integral part of the course. These help to create psychological relaxation which enhances learner motivation. In S2, the same six principles are retained but three new ones are added. These help the student to overcome the psychological and sociological blocks which may be encountered. Bancroft (1999, p. 234) defines the three new principles as follows:

(a) Joy and Absence of Tension
The removal of stress which blocks the unconscious allows the student to enjoy learning at the same time. However, this should be a goal for all teachers be that in the Suggestopedic, Intensive, TPR or the Communicative classroom.

(b) Unity of the Conscious and the Para-Conscious
This stresses that both sides of the student's brain (i.e. both the creative and the logical or learning sides) must be addressed through the classes in order to appeal to the 'whole' student and further increase the level of learning.

(c) Suggestive Link
Through positive suggestion, the student will learn the material but will need practice and reinforcement.

Details on the practical implications of these three new principles in the classroom are limited and therefore it is not possible to analyse them any further for the purposes of this research.
3.3.4 Structure of a S1 or S2 Course

A suggestopedic course (regardless of whether it is based on S1 or S2) is highly structured. Every new lesson is presented during the second 90 minute session of the day. The first session is always a carry over from the previous day, and all new material is introduced when the students are already warmed up. The most widely used structure is 24 days with four lessons per day. The same holds good for suggestopedic courses at university where there are few possibilities of changing the curriculum to introduce an intensified form of instruction. However, the volume of material taught and assimilated will be much larger than the volume usually taught and assimilated in this period of time. All the characteristic features of the suggestopedic system of instruction are present in the course book. At UdSU the recommended structure cannot always be adhered to completely. It is impossible to follow these guidelines during regular timetabled university classes. However, teachers who give private lessons to paying students offer a three hour session in the evenings when it is possible. Some teachers offer such classes several times per week, while others hold their Intensive classes once per week. In both cases, but particularly in the last example, we must question the effectiveness of the teaching approach because the material learnt by the learners in one class is not reinforced quickly enough by the next class, according to the theory's principles.

3.3.5 Page Layout

Every page of the suggestopedic dialogue is divided into two with the TL text on the right hand side and the L1 translation on the left in accordance with research which reveals that in countries where people read from left to right, the human eye has a tendency to focus on the right hand side of the page. Consequently the student's reading gravitates towards the TL side of the page with the L1 text for support on the left when required.
3.3.6 Grammar

While S1 placed less emphasis on the role of grammar, the Gateva-led S2 version made a further shift in this direction. However, the directions for this area are less proscriptive than they are in other areas of the methodology. Hence some suggestopedic manuals adopt a traditional sequential approach to grammar, while others are more functional and have a more even spread. After every three lessons, a grammar session is often slotted in, the purpose being to allow the students to take stock of what they already know with activities following to help clarify the points.

3.3.7 Stages of Lesson

There are three separate phases to the lesson. These are:

(1) The Activation Phase

A student returns to class having read the text twice - once in the evening after one class and once in the morning before the next one. The activation phase involves activities and games which are fast moving, fun, varied and stimulating with the emphasis on communication. Songs and jokes are also used. In total, there might be 10-12 changes of activity but the subject content remains the same, as all activities are grammatically and lexically relevant to the theme.

(2) The Passive Concert

The curtains may be drawn and the lights dimmed and the chairs are put into a reclining position. Music is played for about five minutes with baroque music then for a further fifteen to another piece of classical music. This slows down the heartbeat, the body temperature drops slightly and the electrical rhythm of the brain waves changes. Lozanov calls this state 'pseudo-passiveness' as it is particularly conducive to learning. The student may appear passive but inside there is much internal activity going on. The teacher reads the text aloud, giving every utterance meaning. The students are mentally hypersensitive and thus hyper-receptive. Therefore, they are able to absorb more than when physically
active. At the end of the concert the teacher leaves the room and the students leave without talking to their classmates in order to let the text work on in their brains.

(3) The Adaptation Phase
The situations, games and activities do not stay as close to the actual text at this stage. They constitute an extrapolation of the text, a kind of free stage where students use what they have assimilated. As they grow in confidence, so too will the range of vocabulary, structures and general ability to communicate freely. The activity range includes (i) aural practice where students listen to a cassette and sequence the pieces of text in the correct order, (ii) written comprehension where each partner has a different newspaper clipping and must help his partner find the right article by description and (iii) written expression where the students must create something based on a situation e.g. an advertisement. There are some areas of freedom which allow the teacher to choose the exact timing of the sequence. Some teachers, for example, go directly from the active concert into the passive concert while others have a question and answer period or give an explanation of the text between the concerts. This phase is known as the 'Decoding Session'.

3.3.8 Conclusion to Section 3.3
Section 3.3 has shown clear links back to Russian methodological thinking, most notably in the area concerning psychology and learning. The very specific claims of the method share a similar clarity with Russian methodology and the claims which it makes. This is most apparent in the six key principles of SI. The authority of the teacher, for example, is unquestionable and therefore requires that the teaching be based around the all-knowledgeable expert.

Suggestopedia contains many absolutist statements. All aspects are seen precisely and therefore can be dealt with in a similar fashion. However, the reality of a situation is frequently not matched by the more idealistic nature of the theory. The success of the
course is dependent on the individuals who both teach using it and learn through it. Similarly the course structure and the required room layout cannot be guaranteed within a working academic establishment. These issues will remain relevant for the Intensive Method but the question must be asked whether their practical implementation can be fulfilled at UdSU and if so, to what degree? Section 3.4 seeks to address these key questions as our attention now shifts to one of the Russian variants of Suggestopedia.
3.4 Intensive Method

In the following section, we turn to the Intensive Method and analyse it by tracing the history and nature of the method since its inception. Where possible, the findings are compared directly to Suggestopedia (both S1 and S2 variants) and those characteristics which are unique to the method are highlighted. The explicit and implicit theory of the method is analysed for elements which are influenced by Russian educational traditions.

Theory and practice are always difficult to unite in constructing a textbook and once the theory behind the Intensive Method has been critically analysed, our attention will turn to its practical implementation in Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992). This book is analysed in detail for two reasons: (i) because it is the only Intensive Method book which is used relatively widely throughout UdSU and (ii) there is a need for greater analysis of specific lesson material in order to compare the theory and practice of the Intensive Method.

After our analysis of Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992), it is possible to move on to the most relevant section of the material on Suggestopedia and the Intensive Method for the purposes of the research question: namely UdSU's practical implementation of the Intensive Method theory, in the form of Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) can be compared and contrasted to the Intensive Method both in terms of its theory and its practice, namely Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992). Finally the observations and findings are evaluated from a Western perspective.

3.4.1 Background

When writing about suggestopedia, Felix (1992, p. 45) wrote:

'Originally, the method was shrouded in mystery since only incomplete information was available from Bulgaria'
The same description is still applicable to its equivalent method in Russia called the Intensive Method as there is a dearth of knowledge about it in the West. Evidently, the Intensive Method has its origins in Lozanov's Suggestopedia. Bancroft (1999, p. 265) describes the Intensive Method as an adaptation of Suggestopedia I (the Novakov version) which has been combined with other elements and renamed 'Intensive Teaching'. However, she gives no more details about the method in her book, which is extremely wide-ranging in terms of the variants of Suggestopedia which it covers (Those areas covered include Sophrology, Soviet Hypnopedica, the Tomatis Approach, the Suzuki Method, Schuster's SALT and Dhority's ACT). In fact, Bancroft's use of the term 'other elements' is vague and unsatisfactory for the demands of what the Western academic world should know about a method which has enjoyed a great deal of prestige throughout various parts of Russia and the former Soviet Republics.

The distinct lack of clarity in the West about the Intensive Method is exemplified further by a vague reference found in Felix (1992, p. 54) when he comments on Baur's (1980) work, by implying that the latter 'may be referring to the Russian model of Suggestopedia'. Again, this reference is inadequate as it sheds no light on the issue. In fact, the Bancroft and Felix comments fail to register the fact that within Russia, there are four variants of the suggestopedic method. Galina Kitaigorodskaya (1991a, pp. 9-10) who created the Intensive Method with her team of researchers, identified the four models of suggestopedia in practice in the Soviet Union in 1991 at an Accelerated Learning Conference. They are:

(1) The system created by L. Gegechkori from Tbilisi in Georgia whose course combines suggestopedia with periods of traditional teacher training.

(2) The system created by I. Shechter which is an emotional-semantic system which lasts three months.
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(3) The system created by Petrusinsky called a suggestive-cybernetic system which covers several subjects including a language.

(4) The Intensive Method which has been developed at the Centre for Intensive Foreign Languages Instruction at Moscow State University.

Although these four Russian variants of suggestopedia exist, the aim of this research remains an evaluation of the methodologies used at UdSU for teaching English for Specific Purposes to non-specialists. Consequently the focus will be on the last of these, namely the one which Kitaigorodskaya and her team have disseminated to staff members at UdSU.

3.4.2 history of the Origins of the Intensive Method

Suggestopedia appeared early on in the Soviet Union. Lozanov visited Moscow in 1969 to introduce his new method and by January of the following year, Kitaigorodskaya went to Sofia where she was trained in both theory and practice. On her return to Moscow, she formed a team of interested academics from the fields of pedagogics, linguistics and psychology and founded the Centre for Intensive Foreign Languages Instruction at the Moscow State University. By 1976, the group was running Intensive Method training courses for teachers. Kitaigorodskaya, (1991a, p. iv) writes that an institute for the Intensive Method was finally opened in 1988. To date, method books have been published for teaching in sixteen languages.

The origins of the term 'Intensive Method' are uncomplicated. Kitaigorodskaya sensed that there was public scepticism in the USSR about sub-conscious teaching and psychotherapy. By changing the name and subsequently, elements of the original SI version, she has claimed that she has made it more acceptable. The new version drew from social psychology which was not present in the same sense in SI or even in the
revised S2 form. Kitaigorodskaya also chose to draw more elements from psycholinguistics, from which Lozanov had originally drawn elements of his theory. Similarly, account was also taken of the Soviet tradition of pedagogical psychology and teaching methodologies. In essence, therefore, the Intensive method was the Soviet version of the Lozanov model, modified to suit the needs and realities of life in the country at the time. One particular difference emphasised by Kitaigorodskaya was the fact that the Intensive Method was not the Russian equivalent of the American Accelerated Learning or SALT programmes. In contrast to the latter, the former involved the activation of psychological and creative potentials of the personality.

Following the political upheaval in Russia in 1991, the FL needs of the country changed. As Russia was opening up to the world, the position of English as a virtual 'dead' language, (as described earlier in section 3.2.1) had been metamorphasised into the one key language to know for travel anywhere in the world, as well as for use in commerce and academic study. The political, social, economic and cultural conditions which have existed ever since in Russia have led to a massive increase in demand for English language courses both at learner and also at adult level. Within that framework, the relevance of having a specific course which can deliver fast and substantial linguistic success has been met, at least in part, by the Intensive Method. Most noticeably for the purposes of this research, the Intensive Method has been used at Udmurt State University.

Between the period 1979 and 1991, around 2,000 teachers throughout Russia were trained in Kitaigorodskaya's Centre for Intensive Foreign Languages Instruction. Among the teachers employed at UdSU, only a few have managed to gain admission to this course but no confirmed statistics are provided by the University. It is claimed that there is a high level standard in the selection procedure for the two month course, which
includes a series of tests and interviews. No further detail is supplied on the exact nature of these screenings, although a similar selection procedure exists for learner entry to some Intensive courses (See the section 3.4.5.1 for the entrance criteria to courses which use Hello Britain).

3.4.3 Key Characteristics of the Intensive Method
Kitaigorodskaya presents the Intensive Method in a similar fashion to the way in which Lozanov presented Suggestopedia (both the S1 and S2 versions). As was indicated throughout section 3.3, the Intensive Method shares areas of strong parallel primarily with the original principles of S1. These include the authority and prestige of the teacher and the educational institution, infantilisation, double planeness, the use of rhythm, intonation of the teacher's voice and the concert pseudo-passivity with the three phases of activation, passive concert and adaptation.

The influence of S1 and Russian education is also apparent in the choice of material used in Intensive Method books. The first part of the Intensive Method course, Ignatova (1992), is set in the L1 culture where the Russian characters greet their foreign guests. Lozanov himself advocated that it is best for the learner to begin by learning to describe what is around him and of practical value. Subsequently, the second book, Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992), is taken one stage further and set in an international environment which incorporates a visit to the TL country. However, the atmosphere is predominantly an international one.

As stated earlier in section 3.3, there are areas where Kitaigorodskaya extends the detail of the original, much of which remains strongly influenced by Russian educational traditions and not Suggestopedia. These areas include:
(1) As in S1 and S2, great prestige is attached to the Intensive Method. Grand statements are made, for example that an Intensive Method teacher is not so much trained as born to be one because the method requires a special type of personality (Kitaigorodskaya, 1991a, p. 41). In total there are thirty-two qualities listed which Kitaigorodskaya believes an Intensive Method teacher must possess. These range from 'love and devotion to the learners and teaching' to 'mental stability' and from 'artistic talent' to a 'knowledge of psychology, physiology and sociology'. Such grand statements are characteristic of Russian educational claims. Without the rigour of putting the theory to the test in order to provided substantiated evidence, as is the tradition in the West, it is difficult to support such claims. Kitaigorodskaya (1991a, p. 10) pre-empts such criticisms by putting forward the argument that an outside visitor who is untrained in the Intensive Method and who visits a lesson, will find it difficult to comprehend the strategy employed by the Intensive teacher. Her response to such a critic is:

He or she will find it difficult to see through the teacher's intentions, as what he or she sees seems sheer improvisation to him. It may seem paradox but the more competent the teacher, the more improvised his/her lessons look to the visitor.

However no firm evidence exists to support Kitaigorodskaya's claims. She is not alone in this capacity. She is merely following the pattern set by her mentor, Lozanov.

(2) Evidently, the teacher has a prestigious role in the Intensive classroom. However, in a break with the Soviet educational tradition of being a dogmatic instructor and following the collective approach to teaching, the Intensive teacher must develop a more individual response to the needs of the teaching group in his care in order to resolve their problems. While these strategies may seem unoriginal in the West, such pronouncements were at the time and in many respects still are ground-breaking, as Kitaigorodskaya was attempting to establish a new direction for foreign language teaching in the USSR. She
identifies three roles for the Intensive teacher using language which conveys a different message to that posited by Lozanov in S1 and S2. These are:

(a) The teacher is a source of information for the learners and also a kind of scriptwriter, director and producer for the scenes which are acted out by the learners as well as an actor who must act out the dialogue in the concert phase.

(b) The teacher is an organiser of all levels of communication within the group which involves initiating, sustaining and concluding the group communication and eventually the role changes from the role of the teacher with superior knowledge to that of an equal partner among the participants.

(c) The teacher is a model of social, moral and ethical correctness in terms of behaviour and an example of linguistic competence which the learners can strive to reach.

(3) In the Intensive Method, the notion of educational communication is highlighted through the five key principles of Intensive teaching and learning which differ in emphasis from those of Suggestopedia:

(a) Person-Centred Communication

Conditions are created so that the learner's attitude to the subject can be formed through the relationships established between the teacher and the learners. The hypothesis states that everybody communicates with everybody else. This incorporates communication at the levels of teacher-learner, learner-learner, teacher-group and learner-group. The personality of the learner is important as active participation in the group as well as emotional involvement are pre-requisites for successful learning. As in Suggestopedia, the optimum number of learners in one group is twelve to fourteen and of mixed composition with chairs arranged in a semi-circle to enable more open communication.
(b) Role-Playing in Teaching Materials and Procedure

In all tasks, learners should be motivated through the role playing (i.e. communicative learning and playing). The role plays should be relevant to the intellectual level of the learners and give social roles to the learners. Rather than teach isolated communicative scenes which are not incorporated directly into a unified, singularly-directed sequence of inter-related natural events, (a criticism levelled by Russian educationalists against the approach adopted by many Western textbooks), the Intensive Method attempts to approach the idea of role-play in a gestaltist-like manner. Each long polylogue (note that use of the word 'lesson' is avoided in the Intensive Method) cycle contains between 7-10 micro-cycles which are intended to lead naturally one from each other. The continuity is further enhanced by the character assignment which takes place at the start of the entire course when the learner is given a new role. This mask stays on the learner during the entire course and any creative role-playing is carried out under the same guise. Kitaigorodskaya uses the term 'real life-situations' to define the nature of the role-playing. Later analysis in section 3.4.5.3 will challenge this claim.

(c) Collective Communication Through Team Work

This is the principle on which the Intensive Method is based. The organisation of group actions lead to the inner mobilisation of the learners. The importance of team work has its origins in Soviet socio-psychology, psychotherapy and pedagogy. In many ways its emphasis here marks a return to the Vygotsky school which advocated the importance of the role of the group collective. Basically, it denotes that the learner learns not only from the teacher but through group dynamics by communicating to and with the group at both a conscious and an unconscious level. Kitaigorodskaya identifies three key benefits in the use of team work. First the learner gains knowledge and improves speech production through participation in discussion. Second, through inter-personal contact, the learner fosters 'friendly and ethical relationships' and third, the learner's progress is closely
linked to the progress made by the fellow group members who are dependent on each other.

There are different forms of team work including (i) individual group work i.e. the individual in the teacher role with the group, (ii) pair work (Diada) and (iii) rotating pairs (which focuses on the first and second persons singular), (iv) working in groups of three (which focuses on the third person singular) and (v) larger sub-groups (but this is limited in its usage because only a few learners can communicate at any one time). While the same terms are also used in the West, the specific application of the above focuses on collective forms of co-operation between all the participants on the course which has an echo of socialist tendencies as reflected in all sections of Soviet society.

Vorotsova is a pupil of the Kitaigorodskaya School who works in the French Section of the Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology at UdSU. She has published Intensive Method French language textbooks for use in schools throughout Russia. In interviews she has stated that she believes that with a 500 word morphology, oral communication begins to stabilise and that pronunciation follows soon after. Learners should be taught 25-30 hours without writing, concentrating on oral work and aural comprehension: thereafter they learn reading and writing. The problem which Russian learners of English face when learning is that of the Roman alphabet but with the Intensive Method the key is to ignore the alphabet at the start. After about twenty-five hours the learner knows enough language to make it easier to work with the Roman Alphabet because the hours of contact have already removed any sense of alienation.

(d) Concentrated Teaching Materials and Procedure

Through active learning it is claimed that large amounts of material can be absorbed by the learner, up to 5,000 words per course (a similar figure to that put forward by
Lozanov). Kitaigorodskaya describes a three step model for acquiring oral and written skills, based on (i) Synthesis 1, (ii) Analysis and (iii) Synthesis 2. Synthesis 1 implies the forming of 'communicative nucleus priority' with oral communication on a relatively simple level for which between 800 and 1,200 lexical units are needed. The Elementary Level is mostly in the oral form without any texts (i.e. just dialogues and listening comprehensions). Thus the learner acquires language but does not understand what all the structures and words mean. Analysis has less material than Synthesis 1 but is in principle the same (i.e. a lot of new material). This stage is necessary to achieve the transition from reproduction to situational variety and active production. Synthesis 2 occurs when a further substantial number of lexical items are introduced but almost new grammar material. These words can then be fitted into the models acquired in the analysis stage.

(e) Poly- or Multi-Functionality of the Exercises

Kitaigorodskaya (1991a, pp. 6 and 23) explains that every communicative task solves several aims at one time in a hierarchical sequence for every level of teaching. Communicative training, for example, uses grammar, vocabulary and phonetics. In fact, each Intensive Method book is a cycle and within each cycle there is a series of micro-cycles which include the core text (polylogue), additional texts (samples of writing), language commentary, homework, poems, songs and funny stories. The recommended break-down of time allocation within the micro-cycle is 2 hours for the introduction of material, 6-8 hours of training to communicate and 2-4 hours for authentic communication.
3.4.4 Comparisons with Western Theory and Key Criticisms of the Intensive Method

There are findings which reveal close correlation between elements of Western methodology and the Intensive Method and simultaneously areas which show a clear contrast. The eight key points are:

1. The use of mnemonics and psychology resembles aspects of the Behaviourist habit learning theory. Both approaches aim to assist the TL learner in retaining and activating the TL taught through controlling of the learning experiences.

2. The child-like state is also present in the Silent Way. The security which infantilisation gives in the Intensive Method contains aspects of the SARD principles in Community Language Learning. A learner who feels secure in his learning environment is disposed to more effective learning.

3. Total Physical Response also seeks to create a stress-free environment by activating the right-hand side of the brain through movement. The Intensive Method tries to achieve proper suggestion through relaxing music.

4. The Intensive principle of concentrated teaching results in the TL forming the basis of all classroom communication between all participants, corresponds to what Howatt (1984, p. 279) describes in Communicative Language Teaching as 'using English to learn it'. The TL is used to maximum potential at all times in the classroom to produce better understanding and communication.

5. The Intensive Method principles are strikingly similar to five of the six stages of the Oral Approach and Situational Language Learning: (i) The material is taught orally, (ii) The TL is the only language of the classroom, (iii) Any new language points are introduced and practised in context, (iv) There is a high degree of selection of the TL lexical items to be taught through the construct of the polylogue, (vi) Reading and writing are introduced at a later stage when the learner has gained a sufficient lexical and grammatical basis. The only stage not followed is: (v) The graded sequence of
grammatical items in the TL. This observation is supported by Vorotsova (Interviewed at UdSU in April 1997) who believes that the chapter system of the Intensive textbook does not need to be followed as each unit is self-contained. Learners can go beyond the natural sequenced order of learning TL grammar and simulate the texts into their heads because the message is the most important aspect of communication.

(6) Similarities concerning the Intensive Method extend to Krashen's definition of Language Acquisition in the Natural Approach, but only to a certain degree. There is subconscious acquisition of the TL in both the Intensive Method and the Natural Approach, but thereafter, the similarities end. On one hand, the Natural Approach seeks to allow acquisition to occur naturally in a similar fashion to a child acquiring its L1. The knowledge required to manipulate the language properly is implicit. Formal teaching does not help in this process. In contrast, the Intensive Method seeks to teach the TL naturally but in an artificial environment in which reality is suspended through infantilisation. The method can only be successful if the learners in the teaching group comply fully with the requirements of the method and allow themselves to act child-like. Furthermore, the method is dependent on the Intensive teacher and the use of key teaching strategies.

(7) In the Intensive Method, the learning environment is crucial to the successful transfer of knowledge from the teacher to the learner but cultural competence in the TL is less important and can lead to echolalic speech. While the method teaches the learner what to say, it fails to teach him when and how to say it. Socio-linguistic competence can assist in this goal of proper communication but is clearly neglected by the Intensive Method. Not even the compromise offered by the Intercultural Method is feasible at present using the method books in existence.

(8) When compared to Krashen's Monitor Hypothesis, the Intensive Method creates a 'monitor under-user' who develops a feel for what is right in the TL. The Intensive learner is meant to be capable of more complex discourse at an early stage which is the sixth and
final stage of Krashen's Principles of the Natural Approach. Therefore, the Intensive Method does not comply with the Natural Approach's 'i + 1' theory. By inference, it is evident that the structural foundation of the Intensive learner's TL knowledge is not secure, though he may have a greater degree of communicative competence.

3.4.5 Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992)
There is always a difference between theory and practice in the development of methodology. With the publication of Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) and its subsequent usage at UdSU, a great opportunity has presented itself for closer investigation of the methodology. The aim of this section is to explore the relationship between theory and practical implementation of that theory in a method textbook. In Russian terms, Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) is unique as a course book for one key reason: it is more structured and organised than any other Russian publication found at UdSU, given that it comprises three books, including the Course Book, the Learner's Work Book and the Teacher's Book. They provide more practical detail than is present in Kitaigorodskaya's writing. Each of the three books is dealt with individually below.

3.4.5.1 Teacher's Book
The Teacher's Book contains the following features:
(1) A methodological introduction or support for teachers of the Intensive Method. Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) state that Hello Britain is designed to be used with learners who already have 2,500 lexical items and related grammar. It follows on from the first cycle of Ignatova's method book (1992). There is a cyclical organisation of the teaching approaches. Within one unit, the introduction (Synthesis 1) lasts 2 hours, the
training (Analysis) 6-8 hours and the practice of communication (Synthesis 2) 2-4 hours. The development of skills follows the order of speaking, listening, reading and writing.

(2) A guide to the structure of the entire course, including its aims, the life histories of the characters, advice on how to teach the grammar, lexis and phonology.

(3) An Entrance Test (see Appendix 9).

In order for an individual to gain access to the group, the learner needs to pass a psychological test in the presence of a teacher and a psychologist. No further information is provided on this aspect. Next, the prospective candidate must sit a language test. The test contains grammar, multiple choice, translation from the TL to the L1, a text for reading, thirty sentences with tenses, articles, countables, un-nouns, comparatives, passives, time clauses, subjunctives and the complex objects. In total, the test lasts 30-40 minutes. The reading text contains a joke and the candidate must understand the humour and explain it during a period of seven minutes and 260 words. During that time, the teacher should look through the examination paper in order to ascertain the level of ability of that candidate. To be successful, the candidate should not score less than 19 out of 20 in the test.

(4) Syllabus-styled tables of content with detailed individual listings indicate the subsequent areas: topics, grammar, syntax, functions, word formation, idioms, clichés, set phrases, speech patterns, and phonetics (see Appendix 10).

(5) Tables about key grammar points.

(6) Tests for assessment at the end of each unit.

(7) A final summative test based on a random selection of the entire contents of the course book.

There are substantial similarities between the key aims of the Intensive Method as listed in the Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) Teacher's Book and those specified by Lozanov. These aims reflect simultaneously key characteristics of the traditional Russian
approach to educational theory, as pointed out by Ter-Minasova (1996a, p.11), namely (i) those of depth, thoroughness and perfection, (ii) the notion of teaching everything and (iii) providing a solid theoretical basis in lexicology and socio-linguistics. The aims of the Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) Course Book, listed below, elucidate these points clearly:

(a) Mastering speaking skills in a social-cultural sphere and forming speech in the social-political sphere.
(b) Forming the skills of being able to argue in monological speech.
(c) Develop interactive skills in the above areas.
(d) Forming skills to understand gist and details, scheming authentic materials.
(e) Understanding gist and details while listening.
(f) Acquiring up to 3,000 new words.
(g) Understanding derivatives for writing and speaking English.
(h) Learning formulas of speech etiquette.
(i) Mastering grammatical structures and syntax typical for oral and written English at a profound level.
(j) Forming skills for pieces of work and translating scientific texts.
(k) Mastering writing skills.

Similar to Lozanov's goals in Suggestopedia, the success of the above aims is difficult for any researcher to quantify because of their open-ended wording. Interestingly, the upper limit of learning potential is stated in (f) at 'up to 3,000 words' but there is no specified minimum threshold. Nevertheless, the intended outcome goals, which the learner should have acquired, give further detail. These include:

(i) Solve communicative tasks in social-cultural and social-political spheres.
(ii) Give opinions and views or attitude to questions or problems.
(iii) Build up a monologue of not less than 10-15 sentences.
(iv) Make a well-prepared or spontaneous speech.
(v) Read for gist or details (scheme and scar) authentic texts at 400-450 signs per minute with not less than 70% understood.
(vi) Listen for gist or details using authentic texts at 400-450 signs per minute with 70% to 80% understood.
(vii) Understand unknown words by knowing the roots of the words and if necessary knowing how to build up from the root.
(viii) Write a letter or summary to annotate or summarise listening or reading material.

In (iii), (v) and (vi) a minimum is specified this time but again the authors have never published research to support these claims. Consequently scepticism exists among Western researchers about the validity of such claims.

3.4.5.2 Course Book

The Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) Course Book contains eight units of unequal length, ranging from 15 to 28 pages. Within each unit there are five distinct sections which recur throughout. Their titles reflect the innocent child-like security (in suggestopedic terms, read infantilisation) which the method seeks to create as well as conveying a sense of being the all-knowledgeable (The latter is a goal of Suggestopedia also). The five sections are:

(a) The Polylogues

Some of these are up to one-third longer than others. There are 49 half lines of dialogue per page and the length of individual speeches ranges from a few words to a maximum of seven lines. The polylogues introduce most of the new lexical and grammatical items. The identities (names, occupations, places) are camouflaged pronunciation exercises, each identity representing one particular sound. Hence the learners are constantly
working on sound when they introduce themselves or another character in the group. In all cases, the views and actions of the characters are definite and often predictable which makes the sequence of events easy to follow for the learner and provides him with reassurance and confidence. The setting of the opening polylogue is on a cruise liner, called Moby Dick which is described as 'a good looking holiday ship with modern facilities'. It is located in Istanbul at Pier 5 and it will head to Venezuela via ports in Europe and Africa although the majority of the polylogues are set in the United Kingdom. The action moves on at a fast and consequently superficial pace with the result that the learner has no time to become bored. A constant interested state is a prerequisite for the Intensive Method. Humour is also mixed with serious issues. For example in unit six, the issue of drugs in sport is dealt with alongside the humour of the commentary of the football match (see section 3.4.5.3 for a detailed specific analysis).

(b) Mr. Encyclopaedia who is described as an old and wise English man. There is nothing that he does not know and he is good at explaining things, for example different cultural aspects. In this section the learner is addressed informally but directly, for example 'No doubt you've noticed'.

(c) Mrs Rights' Guest House. Mrs Right is described as a charming elderly lady who keeps a guest house and who tells her guests many things. Her favourite topic is grammar and nobody can equal her. The learner is advised not to hesitate in turning to her if they are in difficulty as she will always help the learner.

(d) Fascinating World of Words offers the learner a chance to build words through the use of suffixes and prefixes and putting nouns, adjectives or prepositions together in different combinations to produce new longer words.
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(e) Mrs Extra's Shopping Basket provides supplementary reading material. It is doubtful that all the text would be used in the classroom so they serve the course in a support role.

The repeated structure portrays a sense of continuity and familiarity on which the learner can come to rely and the use of names is consistent with the attempt to make the learning process more personal and simultaneously create a child-like learning environment. After the final unit, there is a nine page section of songs. There are designated songs which are to be used alongside the material contained in each relevant unit. These serve both to reinforce material covered in the individual sections of each chapter and to increase the enjoyment of the learning experience. At UdSU the tradition is to use the tunes of familiar Russian folk songs to these words.

3.4.5.3 Analysis of the Polylogues

In the Analysis 2 phase of the Intensive Method, much of the polylogue is recycled in the games and role plays which help to consolidate the practical usage of the polylogue in communication. In the classroom, this leads to comfort from familiarity, and to a certain degree of predictability of what a learner's masked character will do and say in the creative open-ended dialogues. There is a consistent and even distribution of the different sections in Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) running throughout the book, as can be seen in Table 7 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total pages</th>
<th>Polylogue</th>
<th>Mr Encyclopedia</th>
<th>Mrs Right</th>
<th>World of Words</th>
<th>Mrs Extra</th>
<th>No. of Songs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In every unit there is a polylogue with five to ten micro-situations which are connected with one idea or theme. For the purposes of this research, Unit Six has been selected for closer analysis as it contains the key characteristics of all the polylogues (see Appendix II for a reading copy). It has been analysed under the following two headings: (1) References to Prestige; (2) Discourse (the distribution and length of the speech turns of the different characters and the nature of the turns). By focusing on both aspects we can ascertain the degree to which the theory behind the Intensive Method has been implemented.

(1) References to Prestige

Such references are achieved through a combination of individual words and expressions and also at times through the actions and notions of the characters or others mentioned. The references are well spread throughout the polylogues and also among the various characters. The choice of words conveys a sense of prestige in the areas of educational establishments (‘Prep school’ and ‘Eton’ - see Section 1, Turn 6), educational qualifications (‘He’s a highly qualified computer analyst’ - Section 2, Turn 3, and ‘your references are excellent’ - Section 2, Turn), sporting excellence (‘Surrey won the South East England Championship in ladies’ fencing, golf, netball, soccer, rugby and something else’ - Section 3, Turn 3), professions, (‘I wonder how you manage to keep the nursing profession prestigious?’ - Section 6, Turn 4), knowledge about injuries (Section 4, Turn 15), culture (Section 6, Turn 2 - reference to Shakespeare) and health (‘I’m on top form’ - Section 5, Turn 9). In order to gain knowledge from this approach, the learner must pass beyond the critical-logical barrier by allowing himself to become more infant-like, in the sense of adopting a naivity which does not apply an adult-like logic.
(2) Discourse (For extended details on the methodology used consult Appendix 18)

A speech turn implies a single uninterrupted contribution by a character in conversation. The number of words spoken per turn has been counted and their totals appear in Tables 8 and 9 below. The mean length of a turn is 19 words but there is high concentration of shorter turns throughout the polylogue. 36% of the 80 turns contain between 1-10 words (with 10% of those turns comprising of 5 words or under), with a further 29% containing between 11-20 words and 24% of turns have 21-30 words. Only 11% of all turns are longer than 30 words. These figures would suggest that the polylogue imitates real-life conversation closely, however, the distribution of speech turns emits a sense of artificiality on several levels. These include prerequisites for the Intensive Method, such as misunderstanding (In the opening two scenes, the Admissions Tutor mistakes Alistair McAndrews for an entrance student at the university), characters not always listening to what each other says or not taking cognisance of what the previous speaker has said (See Section Seven of Polylogue Six in particular when there is a so-called group discussion on the issue of drug abuse) and exaggeration (In Scene Five, Bert Murphy wants to see if the pills offered Greg Terekhov have any side effects after he had hurt his leg). On another level however the characters exude a confidence which allows them to interact with each other, express opinions and ideas, tell each other off in a way which fulfils the requirements of ethnocentricity in TL material.
Table 8
Table Showing the Length of Turns in Unit 6 of Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) (Part One)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words Per Turn</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 4</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Part 6</th>
<th>Part 7</th>
<th>Total No. Of Turns</th>
<th>Total No. Of Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See next page for Part Two
### Table 9
Table Showing the Length of Turns in Unit 6 of Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) (Part Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words Per Turn</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 4</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Part 6</th>
<th>Total No. Of Turns</th>
<th>Total No. of Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>1487</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given that the purpose of the Intensive Method is to allow 12-14 learners to achieve a speedy mastering of the TL through the new character identity given to each in the group, it should be assumed that there is a fairly even distribution of dialogue turns for all characters within the group. Tables 10 and 11 below show the distribution of turns per
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character and the number of words spoken by each in the same polylogue. An analysis of these findings follows the tables.

Table 10
Table Showing the Number of Turns per Speaker in Unit 6 of Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 4</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Part 6</th>
<th>Part 7</th>
<th>Total Turns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alistair McAndrew</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Schaden</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Lydney</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Twain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Crighton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hawk</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Terekhov</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Faraday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Eden</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rostan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Tutor</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11
Table Showing the Distribution of the number of words spoken by each Speaker in Unit 6 of Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 4</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Part 6</th>
<th>Part 7</th>
<th>Total Words</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alistair McAndrew</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Schaden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bert Murphy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>197</td>
<td>13.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Lydney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Twain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliza Crighton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Hawk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Terekhov</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Faraday</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Eden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Rostan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour Guide</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>99</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Tutor</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>30.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-graduate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LH</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Tables 10 and 11, the following conclusions can be drawn:

(a) The distribution of turns is uneven, both within a scene and across the entire polylogue. Only three characters speak in Part 1, compared to eight in Part 4. In Part 4, two characters contribute only once, five contribute twice but only one speaks more than twice (Joe Home, five times).

(b) One of the twelve principle characters, Alistair McAndrew has twelve turns (15% of all turns in the entire polylogue) in the opening two scenes and then does not say anything throughout the remainder of the polylogue. In contrast, Robert Rostan does not contribute a single word throughout the entire polylogue.
(c) The most turns are spoken by a character, who only appears within this polylogue and nowhere else in the entire book, namely the Admissions Tutor (24% of all turns or 30% of all words spoken).

(d) Six turns (8% of all turns) are spoken by characters who only speak once each throughout not only this but all the polylogues.

(e) There are no turns of one word in length, such as 'yes', 'no' and 'hi'. These three examples are commonly used in everyday speech. Their absence here is evidence of an unnatural level of discourse.

The implications of these findings have important ramifications in the Intensive Method classroom. First, it is accepted that it is impossible to provide an even distribution of turns for all twelve protagonists in each polylogue, but there is a clear imbalance in the distribution of turns. Just two characters (the Admissions Tutor and Alistair McAndrews) speak 39% of all turns while four characters speak only 8% of the same. Added to the latter is the fact that one further character actually contributes nothing in this polylogue (Robert Rostan). Second, the necessity for introducing new characters only once in a polylogue is questionable. Why, for example, could some of the twelve characters, who have said little or nothing in the polylogue thus far, not have spoken? In this way, there would have been a more even distribution of turns among the group of learners following the book. Instead, some learners in the group have less active participation than others in this polylogue. This calls into question the validity of the Intensive theory which suggests that all learners in the group have parity of importance and relevance to the group.

3.4.5.4 Learners' Guide

The purposes of this guide are self-evident. First, it provides supplementary material for the teacher to support the learning process of the classroom, primarily in the skills of reading and writing. Its function can be termed Analysis 2, as described in
Kitaigorodskaya's theoretical writings. The material itself serves the role of differentiation in two ways: (i) support material for those learners who need extra practice and (ii) extension work for those who want to expand their knowledge base beyond that offered in the main course book. Second, it encourages individual or autonomous learning. The provision of the answers to the activities at the back of the book confirms this finding.

The material in Unit Six in the Learners' Guide covers nine pages with six sub-sections. These sections are called (with the abbreviated forms used in Table 12 below in brackets):

(1) 'For Grammarholics' (GR) which contains four pages and seven questions and deals with the grammar highlighted in the syllabus using the topics covered in the polylogue.

(2) 'What's in a word?' (WIAW) which contains one and a half pages and four questions. Activities include describing words for a partner in a game, looking up words in a dictionary, paraphrasing and sequencing sentences to make a story.

(3) 'Foreigners always spell better than they write' (FASBTTW) which covers half a page and contains two questions. Both deal with pronunciation, the first using the letters of the phonetic alphabet to assist with pronunciation and the second exercise offers further practice through tongue-twisters.

(4) 'What will the English say?' (WWTES) which covers half a page and contains one question. It deals with ethnomethodological conversational phrases which should be used in certain circumstances.

(5) 'Rack your brain' (RYB) which covers one page and contains one question with three similar sub-sections, concerning word families (nouns, adjectives, verb and adverbs)

(6) 'Writer's corner' (WC) which covers one page and contains three questions. The topics are based on the vocabulary of the polylogue and the exercises which follow it in the
textbook, therefore serving a re-enforcement. The activities range from writing notes to letters.

Table 12
Table Showing the Distribution of the Subsections in Unit 6 of Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Total pages</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>WIAW</th>
<th>FASBTTW</th>
<th>WWTES</th>
<th>RYB</th>
<th>WC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.4.5.5 UdSU's Practical Usage of Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992)

Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) is used by a group of ten FLSP teachers in five 'host' faculties at UdSU. There is no selection process of the students who are taught the course, nor is there an Entrance Examination. Sections of the course book are used in combination with other teaching methodologies in a weekly teaching cycle. Some teachers use the material in private lessons but the gaps between the lessons are too long to comply with Intensive Method theory. Therefore the approach does not adhere completely to the rigor described in the Intensive theoretical writings. Furthermore the material in Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) contains General English and cannot provide the ESP material which the FLSP teachers are supposed to use. In addition, the FLSP class size is less than the ten to twelve learners specified in Kitaigorodskaya's theoretical writings.

3.4.6 Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) - The UdSU Variant

Nowhere in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) does it actually state explicitly that the book follows the Intensive Method or the teachings of Kitaigorodskaya. Nevertheless, there are several key pieces of information which, when combined, provide substantial
evidence to support the view that the book is in fact an UdSU attempt to produce an 
Intensive Method variant. As with the Milashevich Method, not only was the Intensive 
Method adopted by some teachers in the 1980's, but those working in the Faculty of Law 
have tried to revise the method for their own individual purposes at UdSU. The sections 
below analyse the material in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) in a similar way to 
Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) in order to test the above hypothesis.

Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) contains no stated aims or objectives. Its TL culture is 
set in the United Kingdom. The subtitle to the book uses the word Экспериментальный 
(i.e. experimental) in its description of the material and methodology of the book. This 
suggests strongly that the book represents an UdSU attempt to produce an ESP variant of 
the Intensive Method. The layout of the entire book and each individual page is the same 
as used in the Intensive Method. Most obvious is the presentation of the polylogue in the 
TL on the left hand side of the page and the L1 version on the right hand side. The book 
itself is short, containing only fourteen sides and a polylogue of six sub-sections 
containing 1939 words in total. The use of the sub-heading of Часть 3 (Part 3) suggests 
that the Criminal Case is one polylogue in a possible series but the usage of such terms 
as Часть is common practice at UdSU. In all other cases, it has proved impossible to 
trace the remaining books which, by implication are meant to form part of the series. The 
opening paragraphs of Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989, p. 3) which set the scene to the 
polylogue confirm the assumption that the book is not part of a series:

The participants of this criminal case are: the Chief of the Investigators 
Department Mr. Roger, police inspectors: Mickle Green, John Brown, 
investigators: Robert Fox, Antony Roman, an expert - Jane Crane, a 
physician - Linda King, some witnesses, victims, and criminals (principle 
of the first degree, principle of the second degree, accessory before the 
fact, accessory after the fact, traffic policeman, judge, jury counsel, 
solicitor, procurator)
Chapter Three

The action took place in London on the twenty second of June of 1986, in Hollywood Street at the police station. It was a square red-brick building, had a blue lamp outside with "police" written on it. There were steps up to the door. The door was open. The sergeant, Paul Norman was on duty. He was in a dark blue uniform, but without a hat. The telephone was ringing.

Neither of the above paragraphs suggest a continuation of any previous polylogue because they set the scene and provide a list of all the characters. By implication, the conclusion can be drawn that this particular polylogue is free-standing. The appearance of Частъ serves merely as a stylistic convention in the production of textbooks at UdSU.

Before, between and after the six sections of the polylogue, there are substantial quantities of text which either set the scene, move the story along to the next scene or provide supplementary reading on a topic not directly related to anything else in the book (See Korneva and Reshetnikova, 1989, pp. 4, 5 and 17). In total, there are 1644 words of text (46% of all words in the entire book) as compared to the 1939 words in the polylogue (54% of all words). Therefore the general aims of Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) are less focused on improved oral competence than the Intensive Method books published by the Kitaigorodskaya School, for example Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992).

3.4.6.1 Analysis of the Polylogues

Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) is analysed using the same criteria employed to analyse Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) under the following headings: (1) References to Prestige and (2) Discourse (the distribution and length of the speech turns of the different characters and the nature of the turns). A reading copy of the entire polylogue can be found in Appendix 12.
(1) References to Prestige

References to prestige fall into several categories. (i) There are direct textual references to the characters' abilities. Jane Crane is 'a young expert' who 'has just graduated from London University' in law. 'She is eager to become a first class expert' in her field (Part 1, p. 4). The university in which she studies is also esteemed. Her university tutor is called Professor Grey who 'is a recognised genius in criminalistics' (Part 1, p. 4). (ii) There is implied expertise in what is said by individual characters. Jane Crane says 'I consider that the murder has taken place here' and 'I've identified these spots on the rug here as blood' (Part 1, Turns 10 and 13). In both cases, it is implied that only her knowledge in the field has led her to these rather obvious assumptions. (iii) The characters give prestigious descriptions of others. Jane Crane tells Mickle Green that: 'Everyone knows you to be an unrecognised genius' (Part 5, Turn 12).

(2) Discourse

There is a high degree of reciprocity throughout the polylogue with frequent and seemingly appropriate use of first and second person singular pronouns between the current speaker and the partner in conversation. A similar pattern emerges with other anaphoric references, examples of ellipsis and lexical cohesion. However, the coherence of the TL is not complete. There are many examples of a lack of coherence in context. Below are several examples (Korneva and Reshetnikova, 1989, p. 7):

(a)

Jane Crane: It's incredible but the fact is that I've found a lot of fingerprints. And still I have an idea.
Robert Fox: What has occurred to you? Have I prompted you anything?
Jane Crane: I think that there was a quarrel between those four persons and . . .
Robert Fox: How many of them were in the flat? Do you think that they probably killed each other or was there anybody else?
Jane Crane: I think that they were five and the fifth killed all of them.
Robert's question about prompting is extremely odd and too formal in tone for such a conversation. His interruption, as Jane thinks, is technically correct TL but not coherent in terms of discourse. He is a policeman and chooses to ask facile questions. Why would he do this considering that he too can see the bodies, like Jane?

(b) As in Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992), there are examples of misunderstanding and exaggeration. When Mrs. White's daughter arrives, the conversation develops thus (Korneva and Reshetnikova, 1989, p. 11):

Jane White: Hello, mum! I've left my key at home. Oh, a policeman! What's wrong? What's happened? Have we broken the law? Have we made a public nuisance of ourselves? Mum, did you forget to pay the fare? Officer, whatever she has done, she'll never do it again. It is not like her at all.

Mrs. White: Stop making a fool of the policeman! He is investigating the murder.

Jane's comments are completely exaggerated and in context lack any sense of coherence. The only plausible explanation is the use of humour. At the same time, the humour is used as a vehicle for teaching law related terms, such as 'public nuisance'. This fact is more evident in the TL classroom where the teacher makes use of voice intonation and gesture to convey the funny side to the story.

Analysis of Tables 13 and 14 below shows that the mean length of a speech turn is 20 words. There is a higher degree of concentration of shorter turns (39%) but thereafter an even distribution, with 26% of turns between 11-20 words, 15% between 21-30 words and 20% over 30 words in length. This distribution falls within the same range of results obtained from Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992).
### Table 13
Table Showing the Length of Turns in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) (Part One)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words Per Turn</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 4</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Part 6</th>
<th>Total No. Of Turns</th>
<th>Total No. of Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 14
Table Showing the Length of Turns in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) (Part Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words Per Turn</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 4</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Total No. Of Turns</th>
<th>Total No. of Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1939</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On reading Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989), a strong impression is gained that the choice of expression is often inappropriate for the nature of the discourse. One method of explaining the latter is to refer to two of the four aspects identified by Wierzbicka (1992, pp. 396 ff.) concerning Russian expression (See Appendix 17 for clarification of the methodology and terms used in this section.). There are key characteristics to these examples of inappropriate socio-cultural competence in the TL which can be divided into the following aspects:

(a) Emotionality.

(i) 'I am not going to argue or resist a policeman' (p. 10) - This is an example of patientive orientation.

(ii)

'Oh a policeman! What's wrong? Have we broken the law? Have we made a public nuisance of ourselves? Mum, did you forget to pay the fare? Officer, whatever she has done, she'll never do it again. It is not like her at all.' (p. 11)

This is an emotional yet trivial over-reaction which also reveals a need to submit to authority.
(b) Non-Agentivity.

(i) 'It's incredible but the fact is that I have found' (p. 7) - Here the speaker uses an impersonal expression.

(ii) '... and still I think that I have an idea' and 'Have I prompted you anything?' (p. 7) - These both convey a sense of passive reception on the part of the speaker and the addressee.

(iii) 'I see that you are distressed by what you are faced with' (p. 10) - The passive experiencer experiences emotions about something which is not of his own making.

(iv) 'It's top secret for me' (p. 10) - The passive experiencer, through his choice of words accepts that he is unable to access the information.

(v) 'I've visited the Whites and the results are the following' (p. 12) This quotation shows non-agentivity.

(vi) 'I had to use my connections, to pull all the ropes which was incredibly difficult and almost to no effect' (p. 13). Although the task has been completed, the speaker subscribes to a lack of individual control of events through the choice of language.

Wierzbicka (1992, pp. 396 ff.) would interpret the above points as examples of L1 influence on TL discourse. While it is accepted that Intensive Method practice is to make use of exaggeration for effect, it is clear that Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) has developed this aspect much further than Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) to a point where it is difficult to sustain the argument that the methodology behind the text's construction has been well thought-out. Rather it can be argued that the authors' work is influenced by their own TL discourse background, even despite any attempts to label these examples as evidence of an intercultural methodology. This argument supports the opinion that Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) is an UdSU attempt to create a variant of the Intensive Method for the purposes of ESP in the Law Faculty.
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A closer analysis of the plot development in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) adds further evidence to the belief that the polylogue is an early UdSU prototype of an Intensive Method manual. In the introduction, the names of seven characters are listed specifically with three unspecified groups of witnesses, victims and criminals. The witnesses are easily identifiable in the plot, but there are no criminals in evidence and the victims lie dead already on the floor by the time the police arrive. One of those named is Inspector John Brown and though it is stated in the notes that he is present in different parts of the polylogue, he never contributes anything to the conversation. In total, ten characters make a contribution. However, there is confusion in Part 4 when a second character called Jane appears. The notes only indicate that 'Jane' is speaking. Up until this point, it has been Jane Crane but in this part only, it is Jane White, the daughter of Mrs White who is being interviewed by the police. Such confusion could have easily been avoided with better labelling of the current speaker. Tables 15 and 16 below indicate the distribution of speech turns throughout the polylogue.

Table 15
Table Showing the Number of Turns per Speaker in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 4</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Part 6</th>
<th>Total Turns</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sergent Paul</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. White</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector Mickel Green</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Fox</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Crane</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda King</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antony Roman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Inspector Roger</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Tables 15 and 16 show that each of the six parts of the polylogue is short but that the dialogue develops quickly at each stage. There is an uneven distribution of the number of turns in each part. Part 1 is the shortest containing 13 turns and 202 words, while Part 4 is the longest with 2 turns and 468 words. Five of the ten characters who speak, appear in only one part of the dialogue, namely Sergeant Paul (61 words) and an unnamed Woman (5 words) in Part 1, Linda King (97 words) in Part 2, Antony Roman (16 words) in Part 3 and Jane White (65 words) in Part 4. The remaining five characters (Mrs. White, Inspector Mickle Green, Robert Fox, Jane Crane and Chief Inspector Roger) dominate the dialogue with 85% of all speech turns (and 91% of the words used) with a relatively balanced distribution of turns between them. The number of speakers in this polylogue reflects the class sizes in the Faculty of Law which contain usually a maximum of ten students.

3.4.7 Similarities between the Intensive Method and the UdSU Variant
There is an absence of any overt theoretical background to Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) which would confirm or reject the hypothesis that the book is a variant of the Intensive Method. Similarly, there are no listed aims or objectives to confirm this.
However, there is sufficient external and substantial internal evidence to support the view that Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) is firmly based on Russian educational theories and in particular on the Intensive Method approach.

In terms of external evidence, the position of the TL on the right hand side of the page in the polylogues in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) is in direct contrast to the position used in the suggestopedic approach but follows the same pattern as Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992). However Ignatova (1992) follows the same pattern as the suggestopedic books. It is impossible to find a clear answer to this issue. The traditional Russian thinking in Soviet Hypnopedia tradition also prefers to print the L1 text on the left hand side of the page and the TL on the right (Bancroft, 1999, p. 188). Otherwise the general presentation and layout of the material in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) mirrors the Intensive theory. There are six parts which can be labelled micro-cycles in Intensive terminology.

In terms of internal evidence, several of the key characteristics of the Intensive Method have a strong presence in the contents of Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989). First, the material supports person centred communication. Second, the role play approach and its unified theme is relevant to the UdSU learner and his subject, namely Law. Third, the materials are concentrated with little unnecessary padding. In addition, the characters in the role play share similarities with their Intensive counterparts in Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992). Some of them have prestige and all are confident in their ability to express their opinions and feelings, even when they are rejected by others. In contrast to the rhyming names in Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992), here the names do not rhyme but they consist of familiar words, such as White, Green and Fox. There is also clear evidence of humour and misunderstanding. (see Jane White's over-reaction in Part 4) both of which entertain the learner. Equally, the entire polylogue is based on a murder
(a relevant topic for Law students) and thus a morally questionable act but even this is dealt with in an over-the-top and therefore funny manner.

### 3.4.8 Differences between the Intensive Method and the UdSU Variant

There is evidence that the material in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) differs from Intensive theory. This evidence does not contradict the hypothesis that the book is a variant of the method but rather confirms that it is just an underdeveloped variant. First, the material has structural weaknesses in its logical development which are not present in the Intensive original. Second, there is less coherence in the development of the micro-cycles within the body of the discourse than in Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1991). Furthermore, the emotionality and non-agentivity of many expressions have a strong presence in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) but are much less obvious in the more developed Intensive Method book. Critical comments made by Canale and Swain (1980, p. 9) about basic communication skills in Western methodology which tend to put less emphasis on 'the appropriateness of utterances with respect to socio-cultural context or knowledge of discourse' are directly applicable here. Third, there are less characters in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) than recommended by the Intensive theory. However, there are less learners in a typical UdSU class than the twelve in the Intensive Method, so the number of characters is appropriate for the needs of FLSP teachers.

### 3.4.9 Conclusion to Section 3.4

The evidence obtained in section 3.4 shows that Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) is used by teachers at UdSU for their own purposes. The book is taught as a complete unit and is not used intermittently with other core books. The material contained in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) is at an early stage of development of an ESP variant of Kitaigorodskaya' original methodology. The book has specifically unique characteristics of the educational institution from which it comes, namely UdSU. These
characteristics include less characters to match the smaller class sizes and the ESP topic of law. With the shift to EFL, Reshetnikova and Korneva (1989) have not been able to retain the methodological rigor which is evident in Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992).

The above process has marked similarities with the development of the Milashevich Method variant (see section 3.5 below) which has already undergone a period of review before the new revised version was established. As we shall see in the following section, the key difference between Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) and Reshetnikova and Korneva (1991) is the fact that there is no evidence that the former has been developed any further, while there is substantial evidence that the latter has been extended considerably. Therefore, Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) has reached the first stage in the process of adaptation and transfer into an UdSU variant but evidence gathered at UdSU confirms that this has not passed on to the next stage of variant development.
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3.5 Milashevich (1991)

A key teaching methodology, though employed by only a few teachers at Udmurt State University, in particular, by those teachers who work at the Faculty of Law, is the Milashevich Method. As there is no information available on the Milashevich Method in the West and also very little in Russia, it is essential first of all to provide extra background information on this hitherto little known method before proceeding with an analysis of the UdSU variant.

Vladislav Vitoldovich Milashevich was a Japanese specialist at the Far East State University in Vladivostok. His main discipline was Japanese. It is said that he had little background in English but it has proved impossible to confirm or refute this fact. In 1993, he visited UdSU to give lectures on the methodology which he had developed in his technical scientific translation of the English language. Evidence from Milashevich (1991) suggests that this adaptation for English was in its early stage at that time, given that the variant produced at UdSU has developed beyond the original in several key areas. It is important to point out that no references to Milashevich have been found in Western sources during the course of this research. When interviewed, many Russian teachers did not know anything about the method, although some teachers in Moscow, St. Petersburg and Izhevsk as well as Vilnius in Lithuania had heard of it but questioned the validity of its methodological approach. However, the Faculty of Law at UdSU is one distinct teaching group which uses the method. For this reason alone, it is important that this research analyses the methodology in full.

3.5.1 The Development of the Theory of The Milashevich Method

One of the apparent key concepts behind this method stems from the feature of English verbs having no regular morphological feature to assist recognition for non-native speakers, whereas in Russian this is the case. Milashevich took it upon himself to try and
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create such a system for Russian learners of English and simultaneously, it appears that he also found the beginnings of a system which could be used for the same learner population for the purposes of syntax. In the following sections, the original version of the Milashevich Method for English and its subsequent development and elaboration at UdSU are analysed and evaluated. The analysis incorporates the texts in the following order:


The aim of this section is to trace the origins of the Milashevich Method and to analyse the original version. Next, the UdSU variants of the method are scrutinised and analysed in a similar manner, noting key differences in comparison with the original. In addition, a German language textbook Ziozenkova, O M and Milashevich, V V, Ekspress-ovuchniye ponimaniyo i perevodi nauchno-technichkoi literaturo s nemetskogo yazika, St. Petersburg, 1992 is based on the Milashevich Method. Its presence confirms that Milashevich's method is fairly widespread in Russia. For the purposes of this research however, it has not proved helpful to analyse it.

Milashevich (1991) is a short book containing 35 pages in total. However, there are only three pages of TL at the back of the book with two pages of L1 translation to accompany the TL version and three pages of vocabulary related to the texts. There is a short introduction to the methodology in the L1. In this, Milashevich (1991, p.2) himself describes his method as follows:

(1) It is a scientific research method which can be used to help Beginners and False Beginners of English, German and French.
(2) A typical course should comprise between 40 to 70 hours of study within a period of one or two weeks in order to consolidate the material quickly.

(3) The method can be employed at both tertiary and secondary levels.

The book contains no index or bibliography although the exercises do contain a numerical sequence with an alphabetical sub-sequence. There are no source acknowledgements at all, both in terms of the theoretical influences on the method and the technical text used for analysis. This standard of presentation and sourcing is typical throughout Russia and very typical for books printed at UdSU (see Chapter Five for more detailed comments on these aspects). Therefore it is impossible to draw specific conclusions from these observations.

3.5.2 A Practical Analysis of The Milashevich Methodology

It has been possible to analyse all the areas of grammar covered in Milashevich (1991). In this section they are sequenced according to their appearance within the textbook. There are several reasons for this: (1) to remain true to the sequence chosen by Milashevich; (2) to present the material in detail with the assumption that the reader has not met this method before; (3) to allow for a full comparison with the content and order of the same in the UdSU publications. Comparative and contrastive comments will be made with reference to both Russian and Western theoretical sources in a summative comment after initial presentation of the methodology.

In an interview held at the Faculty of Foreign Languages for Specific Purposes at the Udmurt State University on 4th July 1996, advocates of the method at UdSU stated that Milashevich's teaching is based on the notion posited by Galperin, that a teacher can help a student learn by giving them what is termed the general idea or abstract. In section 3.2 we learnt that the Theory of External Acts has three steps: first knowledge, then ability,
then understanding. The knowledge can be presented in different ways using a schematic approach and employing different semantic markers. While there is no clear internal structure in Milashevich (1991) which reflects the three stages of Galperin's theory, close analysis of the book reveals that such a structure is in evidence. This structure breaks down as follows:

**Stage One (Part A)**

Milashevich tackles the entire English sentence structure by dealing with the individual parts within the sentence framework first. This section begins by analysing the different functions of individual words or groups of words. The grammatical labels used include subject, predicate, object, adverb, prepositional object, genitive, attributive noun, passive participle, active participle, infinitive and gerundive. At this early stage, the analysis is carried out on the L1 with examples given in isolation, rather than as full sentences. The terminology used is in the L1 with letter abbreviations also supplied.

The prime importance of the L1 becomes more evident in the first four drill exercises in which the L1 dominates, to the complete exclusion of the TL. These exercises incorporate the routine of labelling in the L1 the different syntactic elements within the sentence. The emphasis is on the formation of a ritualised habit of labelling and identifying the syntactic function of elements within the sentence, creating a restricted form of an interlanguage where all the interlanguage elements carry syntactic value.

**Part B**

The learner's knowledge base is next extended through the use of TL words and suffixes in the fifth exercise. Here the typical endings of words with specific grammatical functions are introduced using the general prefix 'x' in all cases. Again the intention is to train the learner to recognise the endings and position of words in the TL sentence. Thus
the learner will come to recognise the specific function which the word has in the sentence in the same manner as nurtured in exercises one to four. Examples include:

- adverb
- prepositional object
- genitive
- infinitive
- active participle
- passive participle
- gerundive

Past C

In exercises 6, 6A and 6B, Milashevich uses the grammatical abbreviation labels used at the start of the book to show what types of words would logically follow one another in certain syntactic combinations. These exercises are repetitive in structure and continue for several pages, where clearly the mastering of the theoretical system is perceived to be of greater importance than the use of the TL in any meaningful communicative sense. Here the system resembles a series of mathematical equations or formulae (in linguistics terms an interlanguage applies here) into which words in English and Russian can be fitted or interchanged thus providing the correct answer for the language learner, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Formula Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) С СК О</td>
<td>The X at the X X the X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) С ДП СК О</td>
<td>The X at the X X the X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) С (Г О) ДП СК О</td>
<td>The X (with Xing the X) at the X X the X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) С (Г О) СК О</td>
<td>The X (with Xing the X) X the X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) С (Г О) ДП СК О</td>
<td>The X (with Xing the X) at the X X the X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Part D

Milashevich introduces a parallelogram (see Diagram 4 below) to help the Russian learner master translation by taking Russian perfective and imperfective verbs and placing them in a parallelogram which they will later use as a foundation for working out a good Russian translation of English verb forms and the reverse.

Note that the letters which appear in Diagram 4 below carry the following meanings: A = делал = was doing; B = сделал = did or have done; C = делалось = was being done; D = было сделано = was done or has been done.

**Diagram 4**

Diagram Showing Basic Concepts of Milashevich's Parallelogram

Exercise 9 deals with the parallelogram as shown in Diagram 4 and is a device to train the learner to produce an automatic response to the symbol and understand its significance. The focus remains therefore the interlanguage or coded system created by Milashevich and not the TL.
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Next Milashevich introduces a new direction in the methodology with the introduction of the first proper TL lexical items. The objective for the learner is to apply the theory learnt in Stage One. In order to move on to Stage Three, the material learnt must now be practised through exposure to the TL. However, at this point, the lexical items are single syntactical items. The lexical items covered include:

(i) Ordinal and cardinal numbers.

Here the learner must convert the following ordinal numbers to cardinal numbers - e.g. three, four, nine, one, five, ten, eleven etc. to (for example) third, fourth, ninth, first, fifth, tenth, eleventh etc..

(ii) Demonstratives.

Here the learner must convert A1, an 2, the 3, this 4, these 5s, that 6, those 7s, all 8s, any 9, any 10s to (for example) this book, an avenue, the day, this part, these parts, that show, those shows, all jobs, any tea, any pens.

(iii) A list of quantifying words.

This focuses on words such as all, some, any, no, many, much, more, most, few, little, less, least.

(iv) A list of subject and object pronouns.

(v) A list of question words.

(vi) A limited amount of conjunctions and prepositions. The prepositions are presented through the use of imagery in diagrammatic form as shown in Diagrams 5, 6 and 7 below.
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Diagram 5
Spatial Prepositions Shown in Milashevich (1991)

Note that the letters in the diagram refer to the prepositions listed below.

Diagram 6
Temporal Prepositions Shown in Milashevich (1991)

Note that the letters in the diagram refer to the prepositions listed below.
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Diagram 7
Miscellaneous Prepositions Shown in Milashevich (1991)

Note that the letters in the diagram refer to the prepositions listed below.

A against M about
B around N in
C across O behind
D on P under
E along Q below
F out R for
G near S by
H at T with
I among U without
J between V as
K over W because of
L above X on = upon
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After the appearance of Diagrams 5, 6 and 7, there follows a long series of exercises which (i) focus on each of the above individual categories and (ii) provide a random selection of all the above prepositions. The learner is meant to develop an automatic and therefore ever faster reaction to the prepositions and be able to label the syntactic nature of the lexical items given. The purpose of the jumbled-up items described in (ii) is intended to instil in the learner an automatic or mechanical ability to label these items when encountered in a random sequence. In both cases, the exercises are long, repetitive and detached from any real sense of communication.

Stage Three

There is a three page practice text for the learner to complete the training in the method by applying the now developed and well practised knowledge gained and nurtured in Stages One and Two. For this purpose, there is a factual article on the sanddab and California halibut (see Appendix 6 for a reading copy). A Russian translation of both texts appears directly after each. The text uses some technical language which would probably not be known to most TL learners. In this sense, the text has been well selected as it serves its purpose appropriately, namely by obliging the learner to understand the meaning of the text by using the now taught syntactic analysis skills. The sentence length ranges from ten through to more than thirty words. By way of example, a sentence from the text:

*The preliminary results of the tagging program conducted by the Department of Fish and Game show that the larger and older halibut tend to move the greatest distance.*

could be analysed as follows:

- The preliminary results of the tagging program conducted by the Department of Fish and Game
- the X Xs of the Xing X Xed by the X of X and X
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show that the larger and older halibut tend to move the greatest distance.

where the words carry the following syntactic value:

The preliminary results of the tagging program conducted by the Department of Fish and Game show that the larger and older halibut tend to move the greatest distance.

3.5.3 Assessment

Lastly, there is a brief one page assessment activity at the end of the book containing eleven questions. The assessment serves to test the ability of the learner to identify the function of the jumbled lexical items which require syntactic labelling. The format of these exercises mirrors exactly that of the practice exercises which appeared earlier in Stage Two of the book. Interestingly, the test is based on the individual lexical units and not those within the context of a full sentence. The impression clearly gained is that the learner would not be in a position to break down a text adequately well under test conditions as the aim of the book aspires to.

3.5.4 Discussion from A Russian Methodological Perspective

The Milashevich Method possesses many characteristics which are inherited from long-standing Russian educational practices:
(1) The language of explanation is technical and pseudo-scientific, and by its presence is judged to add prestige to the method.

(2) The theory builds on the Russian tradition of depth, thoroughness and perfection.

(3) The approach is didactic and teacher-centred and matches the description given by Lane (1990, p. 263) of Russian methodologies. This method therefore requires a skilled teacher who establishes a strong teacher-dependency syndrome, especially in the early stages. The learner is rendered incapable of working through the textbook himself and is thus dependent on the all-knowledgeable teacher to lead him through this linguistic minefield. However, it is important to recognise that Russian students are used to a system of didactic teaching methods which involves the comprehension of memorised factual knowledge. Echoes of Marxist-Leninist theory radiate from this and tie in with Price’s (1977, p. 221) comments about Marx and the importance which he placed on mental education. This included a developed sense of discipline and organisation.

(4) The method seeks to direct the learner down the conventional Russian path of learning about the TL through the L1. The emphasis in lexicology is placed on both the form and position of a word or group of words within the TL sentence so that the learner can deduce some meaning before the need to look up unknown items (Zajda, 1980, p. 37). The Milashevich Method is evidently a firm example of contrastive linguistics whereby the L1 system of expression is compared directly to the TL equivalent with the former being the starting point of the whole process. In terms of grammar, the same is achieved by means of employing an algorithm through which the learner is presented with the grammatical analysis. Naturally, one key interpretation of the above finding is the way that English was taught as a classical language for passive non-interactive use.

(5) There is evidence to indicate that the Milashevich Method can be traced back further than the UdSU teachers suggest. Galperin's findings are rooted in Russian theories on conscious learning. Based on the scale of the learner's conscious awareness, two observations can be made. First, the Milashevich Method fulfils only one of the four
criteria, namely the creation in the learner of a central cognised awareness of TL syntax. The next stage is conscious control of the TL but the Milashevich Method falls short of the Russian theory and only encourages the conscious control of an interlanguage and not the TL.

3.5.5 Discussion from A Western Methodological Perspective

There are several similarities between the Milashevich Method and Western educational approaches to FL learning. At the same time there are areas of Western methodology which challenge several of the underlying assumptions made by the Milashevich Method. Both are dealt with in the points below:

(1) The most distinct comparison can be drawn with the Silent Way. This method's use of colour-coded charts and rods for different linguistic functions is akin to the arrows in the parallelogram, each of which carries specific pieces of grammatical information. However, the parallelogram in Milashevich (1991) lacks detail about where all English verb forms should be positioned on its arrows. As will be seen in the section which follows on the UdSU variant, Korneva and Reshetnikova have also failed to resolve this weakness.

(2) The method is also similar to the Structuralist views in the West, where language was viewed as a system of structurally related elements for the coding of meaning (Richards and Rogers, 1986, p. 15). In mastering this system, the student can learn to identify the word collocation and consequently its syntactic function within the sentence. The key criticism which can be made of the method as presented in Milashevich (1991) is that it focuses too much on the interlanguage as the learning outcome of the material and not the TL itself.
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(3) Lado (1966, p.1) believed that the:

'most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific
description of the language to be learned, carefully compared to a parallel
description of the native language of the learner'.

The Milashevich Method fits this description according to its own claims. It introduces
the teacher to a method which analyses Russian syntax in a way that allows it to be
compared to the system employed in English. However, it follows the Russian tradition
of depth and perfection which can affect learner motivation in the classroom. UdSU
students who are taught using this method often struggle to fully comprehend the system.
Issues concerning student motivation and how it can affect learning are dealt with in
more detail in Chapter Four (for theory) and Chapter Seven (for results).

(4) The characteristics of the Milashevich Method are strikingly similar to Krashen's
definition of language learning as an activity distinct from language acquisition. Krashen
and Terrell (1983, pp. 27ff.) believe that language learning comprises the learner being
conscious of the process involved and requires formal knowledge and teaching of
language in an explicit manner. The latter is a valid summative comment on the
Milashevich Method. However, in his Monitor theory, Krashen categorised the 'Monitor
over-user' as someone who was too conscious of rules and therefore inhibited in free
expression. In essence, this is the chief criticism which can be levelled at the learner of
the Milashevich Method because, as Swan (1992, p. 187) states, 'learning to perform in a
careful style is not the same as learning to perform in a vernacular style'. Larsen-Freeman
supports Krashen's view, believing that instruction affects SL production and
performance by triggering over-supply of grammatical morphology. It inhibits the use of
the ungrammatical.

In conclusion Milashevich (1991) is an incomplete system whose methodology has not
been thoroughly thought out in advance of being presented as a method for use in EFL
classes. It is lacking in detail and its material is not well sequenced. Nor is its presentation learner friendly. These criticisms do not mean that the method is completely lacking in methodological validity but it does not share the same status as Kitaigorodskaya's Intensive Method. The latter has reached a much higher level of development than Milashevich (1991) but is still not devoid of criticism from Western researchers. To raise the Milashevich Method to a similar level as the Intensive Method, substantial methodological improvements are required. Where UdSU has failed to achieve this progress in the Intensive Method, it has made tangible advancements in the methodological development of the Milashevich Method, so much so that the work carried out by Korneva and Reshetnikova (authors of the UdSU variant) has passed beyond the level of development achieved in the original, Milashevich (1991). Just how successful the authors have been, is analysed in detail in the following section.

3.5.6 Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994) - The First UdSU Variant

Teachers in the Faculty of Law at UdSU believe that the Milashevich Method is a vehicle for balancing the differences which are apparent in each new intake of students at First Year level in the FLSP. The method is being used therefore as both a revision aid and a gap filling technique for students who have come to UdSU from all over Udmurtia with differing previous linguistic experiences and abilities. At UdSU, proponents of the Milashevich Method have argued that the method works both from the TL into the LI and from the LI into the TL. One of the key tasks of this section is to challenge vigorously this assertion in order to test fully the validity of the claims made.

The Milashevich Method was adopted enthusiastically for English teaching within the Law Section of the FLSP at UdSU following Milashevich's visit there. Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994) is UdSU's in-house adaptation and subsequent elaboration of Milashevich (1991). It relies heavily on the latter, going so far as to copy or imitate as
closely as possible some of Milashevich's material, including tables of explanation and
the parallelogram in Diagram 4 above, though without making reference to their original
source (The Russian practice of not acknowledging a source has created difficulties for
those of us trying to evaluate the Russian system of understanding and learning English.
Without the sources it is impossible to trace where the original ideas come from.
Furthermore it leaves the likes of the book *Logical Grammar In Exercises* exposed to
applied criticism from the West because of its distinct lack of theoretical explanation or
source references.). At the same time, the authors introduce several new ideas, not
covered by Milashevich (1991), which extend beyond the basics introduced in the latter.
These areas will be dealt with in the order in which they appear in the book itself.

One of the first observations made, is the fact that there is a substantial difference in
length between the Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994) and Milashevich (1991). The
former is double the length of the original with 73 pages. This has allowed for a greater
expansion of detail of the methodology and greater use of TL texts. Unlike Milashevich
(1991), Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994) does contain an index although there is no
bibliography. There is a short explanatory prologue in Russian which explains that the
book is designed for students in the first and second year courses at the Faculty of Law,
as well as for students of other faculties (In practice, the book is predominantly used with
first year lower intermediate, elementary or false beginner groups. The Law Faculty at
UdSU has a streaming policy which results in weak students doing an intensive course
before beginning with the method. Those students who are slightly stronger begin
directly with the Milashevich Method.). The method is to serve as an aid for translation
into the TL from the L1, thus enabling a better understanding of the English language
and helping to take away the difficulty of translation.
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The explanatory section of the book is divided into seven parts after which there are five further parts on the application of the material. These parts are dealt with now in the order in which they are presented:

Part One

The opening two and a half sides contain grammar tables with their L1 equivalents. The topics are: subject and object pronouns, possessive adjectives and possessive pronouns, reflexive pronouns, demonstrative adjectives and some/any/no plus body/thing/where. Then follows one short and one long cloze exercise based on the grammar contents previously listed with the L1 equivalent given in brackets. The presence of the L1 terms emphasises the contrastive linguistics approach of this method.

Part Two

A similar pattern of explanatory notes is repeated in this part, as in part one, but here the focus is on the adjective and the adverb. As well as the regular pattern of comparative and superlative formations, the following exceptions are offered: far - farther/further - the farthest/furthest, little - less - the least, much/many - more - most, good/well - better - best and bad/badly - worse - worst. The conversion of adjectives into adverbs is conveyed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjectives</th>
<th>Adverbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td>brightly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careful</td>
<td>carefully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quiet</td>
<td>quietly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are no practice exercises for any of the above which is unusual as UdSU books tend to use more of the page to exploit a point of grammar through exercises than they use to explain the grammar point in question.
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Part Three

The initial focus here is on the formation of plural nouns from singular ones. In addition to the regular suffixes of 's' or 'es', frequent exception forms are included in a short list which includes men, women, children, feet, teeth, geese, oxen and data. The plural form of 'formulae' is given as 'formular' but this appears to be an error (The Oxford English Dictionary does not contain the word 'formular'. It states that the singular is 'formula'). Three invariable plurals are also offered (money, snow, news) after which follows the difference in usage between quantifiers. This is shown diagramatically in Diagram 8 below:

Diagram 8
Diagrams of Invariable Plurals as shown in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994)

```
   Много
     ↑
   many, roubles, books

     ↓
   Мало
     ↑
   few, girls, boys

   much, money, information

   little, butter, evidence
```

Part Four

The focus is compound constructions. Three possible variations are presented:

(i) (N N) + N = A concrete and glass hotel

(ii) (Adj. + N) + N = Warm water port

(iii) Number + N + N+ N + Adj. + N = A five star concrete and glass modern hotel
There are five different styles of exercises which focus on the above possibilities.

(a) A numerical interlanguage is employed to practise the above. One such example:

on the 1 2 3 of 4 5 of 6 7
could be lexically represented by:

On the twenty (1) year (2) sentencing (3) of murderer (4) Wilson (5) of Great (6) Yarmouth (7)

(b) Non-existent words such as 'dist' and 'dand' are employed to move the analysis on one stage further, as follows:

on verb dand dist of visit dash of start

(c) Examples of the three possibilities are given in the TL, such as the following (Korneva and Reshetnikova, 1994, p. 16):

A thirty-six year old African nationalist leader

would be labelled:

a Number + N + Adj. + Adj. + Adj. + N

(d) Variants on the above patterns are offered with sentences in the LI. the two variants offered include:

(i) N + N + N . . . + (ii) N and Adj. + N + N Adv. . . . + N

(e) Further practice is offered in the LI where the learner has to merely convert the material to the TL.

Part Five

(1) To assist Russian learners with understanding the various differences between the TL and the L1 in terms of aspect and tense, Milashevich (1991) designed the original parallelogram (see Diagram 4 above). However, Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994) provide more detailed labelling in an attempt to make the system more comprehensive and student-friendly. It is essential to point out that each line in the parallelogram in
Diagram 9 is in fact an arrow and there are two sets of three arrows with each arrow in the pair mirroring the other in reverse. In total there six arrows each of which has its own name and description as follows:

(A) **Up** - a diagonal arrow pointing upwards in the top triangle.

(B) **Down** - a diagonal arrow pointing downwards in the bottom triangle.

(C) **Vertical Up** - an arrow going straight up in the bottom triangle.

(D) **Vertical Down** - an arrow going straight down in the top triangle.

(E) **Left** - an arrow going horizontally left in the bottom triangle.

(F) **Right** - an arrow going horizontally right in the top triangle.

**Diagram 9**

Diagram Showing the Function of Arrows as Shown in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994)

The top triangle in Diagram 9 is for the active voice, the bottom one for the passive voice. The vertical arrows match the Russian perfective aspect while the horizontal and diagonal arrows correspond to the imperfective aspect. Each arrow of the triangle carries...
a further label to help the learner clarify the difference of usage. The diagonal arrows are labelled with the term '2-3' which implies an habitual action which is therefore imperfective by nature in any grammar. The horizontal arrows are labelled 'every day' which implies a repeated action, thus also rendering it imperfective. The vertical arrows carry the label 'already' which implies a completed action and thus they carry a perfective connotation.

Each arrow carries further specific pieces of information. First, the arrow indicates whether the voice is active or passive and also whether the subject is 'who' or 'what'. The active triangle in Diagram 10 carries the label 'who', while the passive triangle carries the label 'what'. These two terms refer to the subject - verb - object system whereby the student can look for these three features of a given sentence in English and once found, the student can identify the sentence as an active sentence. In the case of a passive sentence, the student will only find a subject and verb, where the subject of the passive sentence is the object of the active sentence.

Diagram 10
Diagram Showing the Active and Passive Triangles of the Parallelogram as Shown in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994)

![Diagram showing active and passive triangles]

To assist students in working out exactly what tense, voice and aspect a verb in English has, students are taught to use the following criteria in tabular form. Although Table 17
does not appear in the book itself, it is presented by the FLSP teachers in class when explaining the rules of the method.

Table 17
Table showing the Sequence Through Which a Learner must pass in order to Categorise English Verbs as Shown in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>what</td>
<td>yesterday</td>
<td>already</td>
<td>verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who</td>
<td>today</td>
<td>from 2 to 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tomorrow</td>
<td>usually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reshetnikova and Korneva (1994) goes beyond Milashevich (1991) in the attention to detail on verbs by covering more of the different verb forms and their tense variables. In a typical class, students would work in threes with a list of verbs giving the name of the arrow, then the formula and then the Russian translation. A typical verb session might last ninety minutes. Diagrams 11, 12 and 13 are used to expound these issues as follows:

Diagram 11
The Present and Past Simple, the Present and Past Continuous and the Present and Past Perfect
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Diagram 12
The Verb 'to be' (Present, Past and Future Simple)

WILL BE

BE

I AM
YOU, WE THEY ARE
SHE, HE, IT IS

WAS

WERE

Diagram 13
The Verb 'to have' (Present, Past and Future Simple)

WILL HAVE

HAVE

I, YOU, WE, THEY
HAVE

HAD

SHE, HE, IT HAS

When the verb forms from Diagrams 11, 12 and 13 are listed together, the individual English verb forms are located as follows on the arrows of the parallelogram in Diagram 9:

(A) Up -

am writing  Active Present Continuous

was / were writing  Active Past Continuous

shall / will be writing  Active Future Continuous

would be writing  Active Future In the Past Continuous
Although not present in any of the method textbooks, a loop is sometimes added by the UdSU teachers to explain four other verb forms which do not appear to fit the parallelogram in Diagram 9. This loop is shown in Diagram 14 below as follows:
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Diagram 14
Diagram Showing the Additional Loop Which is Added by UdSU Teachers to Explain Additional Verb Forms

The four additional verb forms represented by arrow G are:

(G) has been writing Active Present Perfect Continuous
had been writing Active Past Perfect Continuous
shall / will have been writing Active Future Past Perfect Continuous
would have been writing Active Future In the Past Perfect Continuous

To identify whether the subject is singular or plural, the same labelling is used as in Milashevich (1991). Thus either X or Xs is used whereby the former stands for a singular subject and the latter for a plural subject. Examples of this can be seen in action in the rubric exercises:

e.g. where possible answers are:

X 1 I walk
X 2s he walks
X 3es she reaches
XS 4 we reach
X 5ed you jumped
X shall 6 I shall jump
X are 7ed you are helped
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As this method purports that the teaching of the general abstract is the key to greater understanding the next logical step is to learn to apply that newly acquired knowledge. The authors felt that such a point could be best made by creating a model verb of their own. Hence, they created the non-existent verb 'to ronk' in order to show how a system of rules can be applied logically across their parallelogram just as one could do with all regular verbs. Its appearance is ahead of the first proper verb in the TL (to ask) and demonstrates the primacy of the interlanguage created by this methodology and also emphasises the overriding importance of the use of a general abstract in language learning. Examples of this made up verb include: I had ronked, would ronk, will be ronked, was ronked, will ronk, would be ronking, will have ronked, should have ronked, were ronked, ronks and will have ronked (Korneva and Reshetnikova, 1994, p. 21). Proper English verbs only make their first appearance in the exercises after the appearance of the verb 'to ronk'. After fourteen short practice recognition exercises on regular and irregular verbs, attention is turned to modal verbs in Diagram 15.

Diagram 15
Diagrams showing the Forms of Modal verbs Taught in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994)

(a)  can = could ≠ will be able to

(b)  may = might ≠ to be allowed to

(c)  должен обязан

must

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>to be to</th>
<th>to have to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Of the above three, (c) has a complete exercise of twelve practice tasks related to it. Some of the examples given include:

(i) We are to find these starting compounds to carry out a new experiment.
(ii) Another possibility was to utilise the cogent.

In (i) however, it is difficult to assess whether the verb form given is the most appropriate as the context is not entirely clear. The more frequently used verb forms are 'must' or 'have to'. In (ii) and throughout all sentences in the same exercises, the context is clearly not law-based but rather science-based. The origin of these sentences is not clear as they do not appear in Milashevich (1991) either.

Diagram 16 provides a further section on how to deal with infinitives of verbs in accordance with the original parallelogram of Diagram 9.

and Diagram 17 gives further detail on the use of the perfect infinitive:
Following Diagrams 16 and 17, there is a series of related exercises to practise the material covered. Where a verb is irregular then a list of irregular verbs is given in a four-page section at the back of the book. The exercises are long and repetitive, like most exercises throughout the book.

Syntax

The other key area of the Milashevich Method concerns syntax. It is only used for work from English to Russian in Reshetnikova and Korneva (1991). In the following examples the numbers used merely refer to the sequential number of words left out of the sentence and not any specific word type within the sentence. Any endings attached to the number supplied is meant to allow the learner to identify the function which the numbered word is meant to hold. All other material up until this point has been building towards this more complex activity. Examples include:

(i) The 1 2 the 3. S + V + O
(ii) The 1 at the 2 3 the 4. S + A + V + O
(iii) The 1 to 2 the 3 at the 4 5 the 6. S + V + O + A + V + O
While the simpler practice sentences above might seem straightforward, the following example is the longest and most complicated:

(iv) Ily 2ing the 3, the 4ly 5ed 6 7ing 8ly the 9 with 10ing 11ly the 12 along the 13 14ly 15 the 16ly 17ing 18 19ed 20ly from the 21 to 22 23ly for the 24.

The identification of the functions of the twenty four lexical units in this last example would (in theory) lead the student to see the word functions as follows using the following labels:

\[(1) \text{A} + (2) \text{V} + (3) \text{O} + (4) \text{A} + (5) \text{V} + (6) \text{S} + (7) \text{V} + (8) \text{A} + (9) \text{O} + (10) \text{V} + (11) \text{A} + (12) \text{O} + (13) \text{A} + (14) \text{A} + (15) \text{V} + (16) \text{A} + (17) \text{V} + (18) \text{S} + (19) \text{V} + (20) \text{A} + (21) \text{O} + (22) \text{V} + (23) \text{A} + (24) \text{O}\]

and the following word equivalents in the L1:

(1) How (2) doing (3) something (4) how (5) done (6) who (7) doing (8) how (9) the something (10) with doing (11) how (12) something (13) along something (14) how (15) does (16) how (17) doing (18) what (19) done (20) how (21) from something (22) in order to do (23) how (24) for something.

It is difficult to understand the reasoning which lies behind the inclusion of such a long example, other than to state that it follows the long standing Russian tradition of breadth, depth and perfection. The key notion which lies behind this practice is that you can convince a learner that a topic is easy to learn if it is presented in its most convoluted and difficult format. From a Western perspective, it is not easy to accept this logic.

Use of Text

The 'fish' texts at the end of Milashevich (1991) are replaced with law related material in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994) and fit in with the requirements of teaching students
ESP for law (see Appendix 7 for a reading copy). There are five pages of practice sentences containing legal terminology for students to practice the methodology. There are four chief sources from which the texts are taken: (1) American legal articles containing legal jargon: (2) British legal articles containing legal jargon: (3) American newspapers: (4) British newspapers but the related sentences appear to be mixed together in an apparently non-systematised manner.

In terms of date, one sentence can be traced back to a 1967 source with a reference to the name Games C. Haggerty who worked for President Eisenhower. It is not unrealistic to assume that this date would fit many of the sentences provided as this was the date of the materials available at UdSU in the pre-TEMPUS period. While teachers at UdSU readily accept that they lacked relevant up-to-date material and that they had to make do with what they had, there is nevertheless a knock-on effect of using such dated material. First, the law terminology is not current and second, the facts contained in the sentences give students a false impression of the system of law in the United Kingdom and the United States. The lack of appropriate ethnomethodology leaves the UdSU authors open to a criticism of dogmatism and propaganda from the West as the material was produced at a time of political tension between the USSR and West. There are for example several political references to negative aspects in the West, namely Hitler, negative treatment of Communist political groups in the West, and protesters jailed for illegally marching. By contrast there is little positive presentation of the West.

There are also numerous factual and typographical errors. The latter is a more common and in essence less important but nevertheless it remains a weakness. Given the precision required to apply the system of grammar which the authors propound, basic errors including 'Tokio' and 'secretory' (Korneva and Reshetnikova, 1994, p. 67) should not be made. What is worse, of course, are the factual errors. Such slips expose another problem
in the UdSU approach to teaching ESP, namely that the UdSU teachers (including the authors of the books) are not subject specialists, even though their students are subject specialists. This can lead to the teaching of inappropriate language such as 'to snitch on somebody' (Korneva and Reshetnikova, 1994, p. 69) as proper legal jargon. The following samples clearly indicate that some of the texts are not from any legal document:

(1) An eight-man jury took only eight minutes to reach their verdict.

(2) Prosecutor, who did not appear to argue the case, have not ruled out an appeal to the US Supreme Court when asked for comment, Douglas Coullly District Attorney David McDade responded :"Did they suggest what a 10-year-old should do when he finds drugs in his parents' possession? I'm at a loss to give kids advice in the future."

(3) Quantities of the hallucinatory drug LSD worth £250,000 on the illicit market were found by Scotland Yard Drugs Squad men, a Bow Street magistrate was told yesterday. Six men and women who appeared on charges of possessing or receiving drugs were remanded for a week.

The consequences of inappropriate or factually incorrect input have not been explored in depth yet in Western theory but given the context in Russia and more specifically at UdSU, it is an area which requires research.

3.5.7 Reshetnikova and Korneva (1996) - The Second UdSU Variant
Reshetnikova and Korneva (1996) is the second book on the Milashevich by the same authors. It is slightly longer and contains more content than Reshetnikova and Korneva (1994), though it this is presented in a more compact format. This book shows signs of progress both in terms of methodological development and the selection of TL texts, although it follows basically the same order as its predecessor. Nevertheless, it is ground-breaking in one key area. It is the first UdSU textbook which has been word-processed.
This has resulted in a vast improvement in the presentation of the material, both in terms of text and graphics. Texts are both left and right hand justified and the use of blocked, capital and underlined words provides a more learner friendly impression. In other ways, the book is representative of the typical deficiencies identified in virtually all UdSU publications. While a proper list of contents with the relevant page references is also provided, there is once again no bibliography. Similarly, there is no acknowledgement that the method used is adapted from the Milashevich Method.

The same areas of grammar and syntax are covered in the same order as in the first textbook. About half of the exercises from Reshetnikova and Korneva (1994) are retained while the remainder are new ones. The predominant task is multiple choice. For example, a TL sentence is shown containing a L1 word. The task is to choose the correct answer from the four possibilities offered. A further key characteristic of the new tasks is the law-related material used in the exercises (Appendix 8). There is also a series of business letters which use a substantial amount of current law-related vocabulary. This is an example of how the methodological approach has been further refined. A change in the presentation of grammatical material occurs only once throughout the entire book. Otherwise the details listed earlier for Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994) remain valid. In the section on modal verbs, Table 18 has been introduced as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>can</td>
<td>could</td>
<td>will be able to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may</td>
<td>might</td>
<td>will be allowed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>must</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be to</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>have to</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table is incomplete in four ways. There is no mention of (1) 'is able to' or 'was able to', nor even 'shall be able to' and (2) 'is allowed to' or 'was allowed to', nor 'shall be
allowed to'. (3) The location of 'might' as the past form of 'may' is incorrect. (4) Nothing has been offered in the past or future of 'must' or 'have to'. Such elementary flaws can and should be avoided. Their presence merely serves to highlight the gaps in the version of the Milashevich Method which they have created.

3.5.8 Discussion

As this is the most current version of the UdSU variant of the Milashevich Method in print, it is necessary at this point to present the methodological issues which require comment from a Western perspective. In particular a summative critical analysis of the Milashevich Method is required. The four points listed below fulfil the requirements of this task:

(1) Teachers in the Faculty of Law at UdSU have claimed that students who know little English can, after grasping the Milashevich principles, understand the structure of any English sentence and therefore with the aid of a dictionary work out its meaning. There has been no empirical evidence or qualitative research carried out internally in the FLSP to support these claims. Given the past and current situation at UdSU it has proved impossible for Western researchers to put the methodology to the test. The unsubstantiated claims made by the authors of the UdSU variant are typically made in Russian education but rejected in the West. However, what is evident from classroom observation, is that the process of labelling arrows requires a substantial amount of mental agility. Students seem to be able to grasp the functions of the arrows as an aid to translating into Russian, but the process is painfully slow. On average, over half of the students observed in those classes using Reshetnikova and Korneva (1994) struggled with the labelling and subsequent interlanguage which the teachers insisted on using. Therefore the claims made are not substantiated by observations made in the language classroom.
(2) The Milashevich Method only appeals to the cognitive domain of the learner and not the affective or the psychomotor domains. Even within the cognitive domain, due to the non-interactive nature of the method, there is no learner use of the TL but rather of a restrictive interlanguage. In motivational terms, this can have a negative effect on the uncommitted learner. In theory the students are there to learn ESP but in reality they are focusing on minutiae of grammar which they may fail to understand the reasons for learning.

(3) Milashevich's use of the parallelogram for understanding verb forms in English is similar to the English speaker's approach to learning the Russian system of perfective and imperfective verbs. British grammar books of Russian, for instance, use the descriptions habitual actions (Milashevich's diagonal line) and repeated actions (Milashevich's horizontal line). The key difference occurs in the detail given to a perfective verb in Russian, where the following three criteria must be fulfilled in order to render a verb perfective:

(i) there must be only one action.
(ii) the action must take place at one time.
(iii) the action must be completed.

If these three criteria are not fulfilled, the verb is imperfective. However this degree of specification is not provided in Milashevich's parallelogram. In fact, the supposition in the Milashevich Method is that just as all mathematical formulae are truly applicable in all cases, so too do these linguistic formulae offer an infallible coding system, which when applied, will always give the correct answer. Milashevich (1991) and Reshetnikova and Korneva (1994 and 1996) offer an incomplete approach to the analysis of verbs by using the parallelogram. There are many verb forms missing from the main parallelogram model shown below. Among the verb forms missing from the
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parallelogram and therefore not dealt with by the Milashevich Method are the following:

(i) does write  
(ii) did write  
(iii) used to write  
(iv) used to be written  
(v) would write  
(vi) would be written  
(vii) is going to write  
(viii) is going to be written  
(ix) does / did not write  
(x) Oil will not mix with water  
(xi) Be that as it may

| (i) does write | Active Present Emphatic |
| (ii) did write | Active Past Emphatic |
| (iii) used to write | Active Past Continuous |
| (iv) used to be written | Passive Past Continuous |
| (v) would write | Active Past Continuous |
| (vi) would be written | Passive Past Continuous |
| (vii) is going to write | Active Immediate Future |
| (viii) is going to be written | Passive Immediate Future |
| (ix) does / did not write | Negative answer |
| (x) Oil will not mix with water | Present Factual |
| (xi) Be that as it may | Subjunctive Present |

As the Milashevich parallelogram is not comprehensive, it not only fails to meet the Russian criteria of depth and perfectionism but also it misinforms the learner of the correct usage of TL verb forms. Most noticeably, (v) would write is not just Active Future in the Past but also carries the second connotation of a habitual action in the past, which equates to the Active Passive Continuous. The parallelogram fails to deal with this issue.

(4) Until the later part of all three books, the learner is not confronted with a text but rather with isolated words where the task is to identify the function of word collocations and seemingly nothing more. There is a sudden transition from a kind of 'gibberish' interlanguage to a rather technical one without any clear provision of a staggered transition from the former to the latter. Therefore there are insufficient learning supports to assist in the transition phase.
3.5.9 Conclusion to Section 3.5

Evidently, the Milashevich Method is in a state of constant evolution and refinement at UdSU. Consequently, the findings noted in Section 3.5 are an interim comment on the development of the method thus far at UdSU. The above analysis leads to the following conclusions:

(1) There is clear evidence of current and past active research in EFL teaching in the Faculty of Law at UdSU. This process is an organic one which involves team work, dissemination of teaching theories and the adoption and extension of EFL theories from outside Udmurtia. The most striking example of an evolution of the method from Milashevich (1991) to Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994) can be seen in the substantially different sequence of the material. The former builds back from analysing the whole sentence to dealing with the individual elements within the sentence. By contrast, Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994) builds up from the individual elements within the sentence to create a system for breaking down the syntax of an entire sentence. This sequence allows for a more natural approach to language learning. From a Western perspective, Milashevich (1991) is a less learner-friendly book as the student is confronted from the outset with the whole system.

(2) Ziozenkova and Milashevich (1992) from St. Petersburg confirms that the teachers at UdSU are carrying out similar work to that carried out by other tertiary level institutions in Russia. However, there are risks with such a non-regulated system. There is no routine system for sharing findings or vetting the academic merits of the Milashevich Method, or in fact any method. There are definite flaws in the Milashevich Method and yet teachers at UdSU are disseminating it to their students as if it were flawless.

(3) The Milashevich Method appears to work with most verbs and most tenses but importantly, not with all verbs and not with all tenses. In this sense the methodology is fundamentally flawed. If the remaining outstanding verb forms cannot be made to fit into the parallelogram, the Milashevich Method may have to be confined to the role of a
method whose purpose is for tense recognition only (for translation purposes from English to Russian). When one takes into account the level of FLSP students in the UdSU context, it may provide a good general rule for beginners and lower-intermediate learners who require primarily good reading skills but only if it is presented as such. However, the Milashevich Method is definitely not appropriate for intermediate learners and upwards as it teaches an incomplete set of verb forms which is insufficient for learners at a higher level.

One final comment worth adding is that the Milashevich Method gives the impression that language is a kind of artificial construct which can be controlled and manipulated to a predictable degree. However, any written or spoken sentence is an organic structure which is developed in the writer's or speaker's head before or during the act of writing or speaking. This contrast with the Milashevich Method lends support to the view that the latter does not view language as a means to an end (i.e. communication) but as an end in itself, where it conversely manipulates the meaning of the sentence.
3.6 Conclusion to Chapter Three

Western and Russian approaches to the generation of FL methodologies share much of the same history and have covered many of the same subject areas over the last century. At the same time, distinct characteristics in the nature of how those methodologies are reached, have evolved in different ways. Each tradition has focused on the needs of the environment in which it exists. The Western approach to language learning requires hard, scientific data in order for a methodology to be accepted as valid. With so many different research centres scattered throughout the Western world, new methodologies have to withstand close scrutiny and testing before new claims are generally accepted. The Western researcher requires the same firm data when dealing with Russian educational methods. However, the lack of hard scientific data and the use of pseudo-technical terminology often cause a negative reaction. In Eastern Europe, the same reaction does not occur and prestigious institutions such as Moscow State University work comfortably with such methodological terms. The long standing Russian educational tradition was to gather a group of experts within a specific field and to let them promulgate their concepts through dissemination to the rest of the country. Since the early 1990’s the political break-up of centralisation has left teachers working outside of Moscow and St. Petersburg in a kind of methodological vacuum. Where once they were trained from Moscow they are now left to establish their own way forward in post Communist Russia. Simultaneously the appearance of individual methodological variants at lesser known tertiary level institutions has grown. This is where the UdSU variants in the Intensive Method and the Milashevich Method fit into the general picture of the development of FL methodologies throughout the Russian Federation. There are advantages and disadvantages connected to the new reality. On the positive side, some teachers at UdSU have been forced to challenge their own beliefs about how to teach ESP in the modern world. This has led them to start the process of adapting teaching methodologies for the specific needs of their students. This must be seen as progress. On the negative side, too
few of the teachers at UdSU are involved in this process of change. Most seem contented to teach as they have always taught or simply do not know how to move away from their present position. A weakness exists where teachers attempt to introduce their own methodologies which have not been subjected to true academic scrutiny. In this chapter the evidence gathered from teachers at UdSU supports this opinion and the exposure of the true state of the current situation at the FLSP should open up the Faculty in a way which can only help it. By challenging the ideas and procedures contained in the UdSU variants, Western academics can provide the rigor which is at present missing in UdSU's academic environment.

In intercultural terms, this should not be a case of the West dictating to UdSU teachers what, how and why they should teach. Rather it should be a co-operative project from which both sets of participants should gain through collaboration. A prototype of how such an engagement can function already exists in the form of Suggestopedia. It originates from Bulgaria and has variants scattered throughout the world, with the Intensive Method in Russia and Schuster's SALT and Dhority's ACT in the West. It is a goal of this research that the findings contained throughout should provoke more discussion in the fields of applied linguistics and education and lead to increased co-operation between Russian and Western academics.
CHAPTER FOUR - METHODOLOGY

4.1 Choice of Fieldwork Methodology and Data Collection Procedures

The fieldwork for this research was conducted during the period September 1995 to September 1998. During the T-JEP-10054-95 project, I made four separate trips to UdSU to assist in the following TEMPUS work: (1) teaching and lecturing on aspects of British civilisation, (2) leading the design of the new First Year syllabuses based on Western and Russian textbooks and (3) reviewing the progress of syllabuses after the first year of implementation. The length of the shortest trip was ten days and the longest stay was one month. In total a period of three months was spent on location at UdSU. In addition, in June 1998, a trip was made to the State Technical University in St. Petersburg to attend a TEMPUS conference on the lessons learnt from the TEMPUS projects which were being completed concurrently to T-JEP-10054-95.

The role of the researcher has been varied. At times this has ranged from being a passive observer both in the classroom and at faculty meetings to taking an active role in interviews. The research draws on naturalistic observations (including lesson observations and the recording of a limited number of oral examinations), interviewing (primarily teachers but also some students) and collecting existing information (including UdSU teaching and assessment materials and where possible assessment results, background information about Udmurtia, Izhevsk, UdSU and the FLSP, TEMPUS reports in the public domain and UdSU's recent response to the TEMPUS inspired syllabus design programme) and elicitation techniques (in the form of two questionnaires for students and one questionnaire for teachers). More details about the specific tools used are listed below in separate sections. At each stage the process for data collection is also explained. As the choice of fieldwork methodology and the data collection procedure are so intricately related to each other, it was decided that it would
be impossible to separate the details away from the methodology without leading to undue repetition of relevant details in a separate section following that of fieldwork methodology. However, there is a separate section on the data analysis procedure used which provides details about the various statistical tools employed throughout. The individual research tools used during the data collection period include the following:

4.2 Naturalistic Observations

4.2.1 Lesson Observation

In the classroom, details about the oral interaction among students and also among students and their teachers have been noted. Data was recorded exclusively through notetaking. Being allowed to observe lessons at all was a major triumph because there was insufficient trust among the teachers at UdSU to let their lessons be recorded on audio or video cassette and given the early stage in the development of understanding between teachers from Russia and the West the issue was not pressed. In any case, the practice would have been disapproved by the University authorities (This experience was not just limited to this issue. On frequent occasions, certain investigative research activities were not permitted or not possible at a given time.).

Johnson's (1992, p. 203) Classroom Observation Instrument has been studied for this section of the research and elements of the approach have been adopted for use during lesson observations. The three key elements of note taking are; (1) the highly structured section, including classroom composition, use of staff with students, how the students have been grouped, the type of instruction and the language used in the classroom; (2) the semi-structured section, including interactions between staff and students, how time is distributed between activities and how the class progresses; (3) the open-ended section which allows for a qualitative description of the classroom activities and atmosphere. Only a small number of teachers were prepared to let a native TL speaker observe their
lessons. In total, 38 lessons involving nine teachers and fourteen different teaching
groups were viewed over the three year period. The key observations from this element
of research are interspersed throughout the thesis when they serve as a relevant point of
comparison or support for other findings.

4.2.2 Recording of Oral Examinations
The use of tape recorders was permitted by the University during three oral examinations
only. As I was not permitted to witness an oral examination in person, this was the best
compromise given the situation on the ground at that time. It is acknowledged that the
presence of the tape recorder may have shaped the nature of the oral examination created
by the teacher and that it may also have inhibited the students in answering their
questions. However, given the circumstances, it is accepted as representative of at least
some teachers' practices during oral examinations. The recorded materials have been
analysed using the criteria defined in Appendix 17, the details of which will not be
repeated here. The five distinct stages of the oral examination have been analysed
individually as follows: (1) the opening exchanges which set the scene for the oral, (2)
the text read aloud by the candidate, (3) the short series of questions and answers
between the teacher-examiner and the candidate, (4) the short oral presentation by the
candidate on a previously prepared topic, and (5) the short series of questions and
answers between the teacher-examiner and the candidate. A sixth phase exists in the
form of a short discussion between the two teacher-examiners and while it is not
analysed in the same manner as the other five sections are, it helps reveal how the
assessment mark is reached.

For the five stages of the oral examination, the total number of words spoken by the
candidate and the teacher-examiner have been counted, both per turn and in total. The
figures allow for a statistical comparison to be made between the length of each section
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of the oral in two ways. First the totals for the candidates' monologue sections (2 and 4) can be calculated and compared to their totals in the dialogue sections (1, 3 and 5). Second the total words spoken by the teacher-examiner can be compared to the total number of words spoken by the candidates in the dialogue sections (2 and 4). The nature of the exchanges in each oral examination are characterised in order to analyse the nature of discourse. The different move types and act types are calculated and compared to the results found in the other two examinations to yield quantitative results.

One further aspect of the oral examinations which has been analysed is the verb distribution. Given the high level of importance attached to verb forms in UdSU's publications, the type and number of verb forms spoken by the candidates have been counted in tabular form. The collated results allow for a direct comparison between the evidence gained about verbs in other areas of this research: (a) the verbs used in a sample section of both the Intensive Method book Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) and the UdSU variant book of the method, Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) as detailed in Chapter Six.

4.3 Interviewing

This has taken place constantly throughout the three years of information gathering at UdSU and involves primarily interviews with the FLSP teachers. The topics cover a range of issues. The topics in the opening year of data collection were of a general nature as I attempted to understand the structures of the FLSP and the University. In time the questions became more specifically focused on fewer topics and at times a series of interviews were thematically linked as a path of more detailed information was traced. Electronic mail has been used weekly during the entire period of research to keep in contact with several UdSU teachers. This has proved invaluable in checking some of the details from the data collected and seeking clarification of any new issues as they arose.
from my research, as well as remaining in touch with ongoing events on the ground at the University.

Focusing specifically on the interviews carried out, different strategies have been employed in drawing up an interview guide at different stages of the research and range from a highly structured interview to an unstructured one. During the first visit in July 1996, I employed the unstructured interview but was guided by a series of general aims. Given that there were no officially recorded details about how the FLSP was then structured or what general strategies guided the teaching of the FLSP teachers, and given also that there was also a reluctance to shed too much light on the workings of the FLSP, I had to probe teachers in interviews for facts in order to try to build up a picture of the practices of the Faculty. During the second, third and fourth visits, the nature of the interviews changed as a better understanding and a greater degree of trust had built up between the teachers and myself. This allowed for an ever increasing degree of specificity in terms of the questions asked. As there was less access to the students, the same pattern did not come into existence. Their population is a transient one and it proved impossible to talk to the same students on each research trip. Finally, notes were taken during the course of all interviews. After each interview was completed, I went over the notes and any gaps in the detail were filled in immediately.

Over the three years of data collection, 94 formal interviews were held. Of the 46 teachers in the English section, ten were interviewed once only. Seventeen were interviewed twice and eleven were interviewed on three occasions. Six were never available for interview at any time. Of the nineteen teachers in the German section, eight were interviewed once. A further four were interviewed twice. Four teachers in the newly created French section were interviewed once together in April 1997. In all the above
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interviews, the language of conversation was selected according to the one taught by the teachers concerned (i.e. in English, German and French).

The format of the interviews varied from one to one interviews to group interviews with those teachers who worked together in the same host faculty. Often I had very little control over the composition of which teachers would be present in which group as senior members of the FLSP took charge of organising the arrangements for interview. The location of the interviews varied according to the availability of rooms within the University. The longest sustained period of interviewing lasted two full weeks in July 1997 when 34 teachers from the English section of the FLSP were interviewed in groups and individually with each interview lasting approximately one hour. The focus of these interviews was to ascertain what progress had been achieved over the three years of the TEMPUS project and to ascertain the nature of issues which still needed to be addressed.

4.4 Collecting Existing Information

Data collection took place before, during and after my four visits to UdSU. As mentioned in section 4.3, contact with teachers in the FLSP has been maintained during the writing-up period of this research which has proved invaluable in writing about the most recent developments at UdSU in the aftermath of TEMPUS. There are six main areas under which existing material has been gathered. These areas are (1) teaching materials, (2) samples of test data, (3) assessment data from some teachers within the FLSP including the Preparatory books for the Entrance Examination, (4) information about the learners and teachers and their community, (5) TEMPUS documentation, and (6) UdSU’s recent response to the TEMPUS inspired syllabus design programme. As this material was voluminous, the process of data collation started at the beginning of the research project and lasted up until publication of this work. During trips to UdSU, working copies of material on UdSU and the FLSP were given to a total of fourteen FLSP teachers to read.
and comment on. Their feedback proved invaluable in ensuring that a true account of the empirical background to this research, as detailed in Chapter Two, has been achieved.

4.4.1 Teaching Materials Evaluation

A large representative sample of textbooks is examined with a taxonomy designed for the project and with a view to determining the implied teaching methodology. These materials were already in the public domain and therefore deserve close investigation. The breakdown is 36 Udmurt State University EFL publications, 13 EFL textbooks published at Novisibirsk State Technical University, 38 other EFL textbooks published throughout the Russian Federation, 31 Czech textbooks and other miscellaneous textbooks published in other language teaching cultures. The UdSU materials are divided into subjects and book types (for example texts or dialogues) to assist with categorisation for analysis. The additional materials from Novisibirsk State Technical University have been used to provide greater breadth and provide points of comparison with UdSU's books when appropriate. The Czech corpus acts as an external point of comparison for Russia with another Slavonic-speaking country which has also benefited from TEMPUS funding and assistance.

The 'textbook taxonomy' is a naturalistic longitudinal study of the learning process which is apparent from an analysis of the materials themselves. The teaching methodology can be deduced from a study of these materials. Any teaching materials are designed to follow a certain approach to language learning. They seek to form and then direct the linguistic behaviour of the learner in order to produce the intended outcomes of the educational process.

In education many statements are made about the stated curriculum and the implied or hidden curriculum. At UdSU, up until first contacts with TEMPUS, there were no
statements of aims or syllabuses formally conceived in writing. The aim of this taxonomy is to define the character of the adopted educational model, defining the latter from the evidence provided by the earliest books and then tracing its evolution over the period in question, highlighting any changes in approach up to and including the effects of Western influence through the European Union’s TEMPUS Pre-JEP (1994-1995) and JEP (1995-1998) projects. The period of textbooks, covered by the research extends from 1980 to 1998 and is inclusive. The adopted longitudinal approach offers qualitative findings which cover a period of almost twenty years in the history of ESP teaching at UdSU.

This textbook taxonomy is wide in its scope and deep in its analysis. The material is viewed both as an entity and also according to subjects and methodology type. Where a subject area within the FLSP has not produced any in-house material, only an explanatory reference is made to the material used. The specific objectives of this section are to answer the following questions:

(1) What educational purposes or objectives do the textbooks have, either implicit or explicit?
(2) What learning experiences are offered by the textbooks to bring about these educational purposes?
(3) How are these learning experiences organised and how effective is this organisation?

The taxonomy is conceived as an informative document for Western educationalists who are unfamiliar with UdSU materials. It draws on the experiences of Western and Russian research and reflects the key aspects of methodologies developed in the field of textbook analysis, learning taxonomies, curriculum development, formal assessment and second and foreign language learning theories. Simultaneously, the work also draws on Russian
educational and psychological theories which are an inherent part of the educational system at UdSU, as explained in Chapter Three.

4.4.2 Samples of Test Data

Only a small amount of progress test material was made available by three teachers. The other FLSP teachers were reluctant to show their materials. In total, eight tests were collected. A reading copy is included in Appendix 19. Of these tests, two are for First Year and two for Second Year groups. The remaining four are for Third Year students. The nature of each exercise has been identified in order to ascertain what proportion of the whole each type of exercise occupies. Clearly there is not enough material from which to draw firm conclusions. However, the evidence collected serves a role in the triangulation process of providing extra support for other findings elsewhere in the thesis.

4.4.3 Assessment Data from Teachers Within the FLSP

There was great reluctance among most teachers at UdSU and primarily among the leadership of the FLSP to reveal the results awarded at the end of each academic year. There was sufficient evidence to confirm that the results had been centrally collated but they were not made available to me. The results obtained for the purposes of this research came from four young teachers with whom I had been able to establish a good working relationship over a two year period. In total, the summative results for 187 First Year students (in the faculties of Philosophy and Sociology, Public Relations and Psychology) were obtained for the academic year 1997. In addition, the breakdown of results for seventeen individual students in the Faculty of Philosophy and Sociology were also given by one teacher. The two different types of evidence provide both breadth and depth to this section. They can be used for triangulation with the findings of the three sample oral examinations and their awarded marks, thus strengthening the overall findings.
4.4.4 **Information about the Learners and Teachers and Their Community**

There is a very limited amount of detail available in the West about Udmurtia. Mostly, detail is limited to a few lines or pages. Over the three years of the data collection period, a substantial amount of material from different sources has been gathered. These include official Udmurt government statistics made available through a teacher at UdSU, reference books on the Soviet Union and Russia, University documentation, interviews with teachers and students and of course personal experience gained after spending over three months living in Izhevsk during a three year period. More recently, UdSU has established its own website which has proved useful for checking any recent developments at the university. The information provided in Chapter Two forms the backdrop to this book by presenting detail about the situation on the ground at UdSU. These findings proved invaluable in Chapter Three in constructing the critical evaluation of the theoretical approaches. This evaluation provides the framework for qualitative and quantitative results in Chapters Six and Seven.

4.4.5 **TEMPUS Documentation**

Documentation on the principles behind TEMPUS exist in abundance and can be found on the Internet. Through my work with The Manchester Metropolitan University I have had access and made written contributions to reports prepared by MMU for TEMPUS dating from the start of the project through to its completion. I have also read the TEMPUS evaluation on the project T-JEP-10051-95 and therefore have been able to compare the findings made by TEMPUS with the views held by the authorities and teachers at UdSU and also by those Western academics who spent time working at UdSU.
4.4.6 UdSU's Recent Response to Syllabus Design

Through TEMPUS, I organised the production and completion of a First Year General English Syllabus to be employed at UdSU for 2,000 students. The Second and Third Year Syllabuses were subsequently produced independently by Russian staff. A tangential aspect of my research has been to analyse to what extent the Western approach to syllabus design has been accepted and implemented by the Russian teaching staff. The contents of the syllabuses are not analysed within the research (clearly my close involvement in the production prevents this), but the independent Russian development and application of the syllabuses throws light on how Russian teachers perceive in practice the fusion of both Western materials and Western approaches to syllabus design in a Russian context. The main objectives of this section are:

1. To analyse the extent to which the First Year General English Syllabus was adopted by the FLSP and to evaluate the extent to which the syllabus has evolved in practice since its inception during a period without any Western input or influence.

2. To ascertain and evaluate the nature of the new EFL Syllabuses for Specific Purposes which were designed independently by the teachers at UdSU, based on the original model.

3. To identify the approach to assessment and review the level of success so far achieved.

4. To evaluate the extent to which the teachers at UdSU have been influenced professionally by the new curricular innovations with which they have been working.

In Chapter Eight, a recent up-date on the current situation is presented and the methodological possibilities which lie ahead for UdSU in this area are explored in further detail.
Elicitation techniques help the researcher to ascertain key characteristics of the attitudes, opinions, perceptions and intentions of teachers and students both in groups or individually. Three questionnaires were distributed: (1) a teacher perception questionnaire, (2) a student perception questionnaire, and (3) a student attitudinal questionnaire. As the focus of the research question is ESP teaching at UdSU and in particular whether there is quality in the EFL teaching in the FLSP, the framework for these three questionnaires was established in the early stages of the research project. The perceptions of FLSP teachers about the strategies which they use in the classroom (Questionnaire 1) are compared with their students' perceptions of what they experience in the classroom (Questionnaire 2). While the teachers indicate how frequently they use each of the listed strategies, the students comment on the degree to which they like or dislike the same. A comparison of the two sets of results indicates whether the FLSP teachers are delivering a product which the FLSP students like or not. Where there is a high correlation, this infers that the teachers are delivering a good standard of teaching in UdSU terms. Where there is a low correlation, the reverse is true. The findings of the student attitudinal questionnaire (Questionnaire 3) provide a different but related outcome. The questionnaire seeks to establish in an indirect manner (unlike Questionnaire 2) whether the students have a positive or negative general attitude to English as a foreign language. In fact it attempts to categorise the nature of the students' attitudes and seeks to ascertain if there is any connection between learner experience and learner attitude to TL learning at UdSU. Finally the data obtained from Questionnaire 3 are analysed statistically with the data from the other two questionnaires in order to ascertain whether and to what degree (1) the teaching matches the likes of the learners and (2) the teaching has an effect on the learners' attitudes towards the TL.
4.5.1 Teacher Perception Questionnaire (Q1)

There were 22 respondents to Questionnaire 1 (hereafter known as Q1), representing over half of the EFL teaching population. The questionnaire was distributed at the start of a seminar about Western teaching strategies. Attendance at the seminar was optional for all teachers, but everyone who attended the seminar completed the questionnaire. Nevertheless, a broad cross section of the teachers did complete the form, ranging from the ages of early twenties through to late fifties. The clear majority of respondents were younger teachers (i.e. under thirty-five years old) which is reflective of the FLSP teaching pool. Consequently, it can be hypothesised that the findings given in Chapter Seven are broadly representative of the teaching styles experienced by the students within the English Section of the FLSP.

Classroom observation and teacher interviews had already been carried out during the first year of the research and these helped to shape the nature of Questionnaire 1. There were three main objectives behind its construction:

(1) To identify the principal teaching strategies employed by the FLSP teaching population at UdSU as perceived by the teachers.

(2) To observe if there were strong similarities or differences in style among the various teachers.

(3) To compare and contrast these findings where appropriate with those gathered through classroom observations, teacher interviews and the textbook taxonomy.

The questionnaire had two distinct sections to it which were distributed separately: There was a list of (i) 35 different teaching techniques for the classroom and (ii) seven different homework tasks. As teachers were required to select a letter which matched the frequency with which they perceived to use a technique, it was felt that the total length of thirty-five entries was acceptable for the purposes of the questionnaire format. Care was
taken in the formulation of the exact wording of each question which involved carrying out trials on the questionnaire with a teaching group at the University of West Bohemia in the Czech Republic. It was felt that the findings of the questionnaire could have been affected if the trial had been carried out on the UdSU teaching population itself. The results of the trial led to no changes in the nature of the questions, nor in their ordering, but word changes were carried out to ensure clarity.

The criteria for the selection of questions had to be limiting as the list of teaching techniques could not be a fully comprehensive one, but rather one which reflected already the nature of teaching at UdSU. From previous lesson observations and the analysis of in-house publications (See the results obtained from the taxonomy in Chapter Five), many characteristics of the UdSU staff members' teaching were already evident. All four key skills, namely speaking, reading, listening and writing were represented as well as some multi-skilled activities. The questions reflect both Russian and Western approaches to FL teaching. The questions related to the distinct skills were listed in groups as much as possible to enable the teachers to record differences in teaching that skill.

The breakdown into skills serves as a way of collating the data into sub-groups. Reference has been made to Second Language Acquisition theories to acknowledge, where possible, all skills involved in an activity. The section on multi-skilled activities confirms this. The speaking/listening activities range from repeating words aloud after the teacher to full dialogues, both of which appear in the early stage of FL acquisition. This evolves through to teacher-controlled short structured conversations and on to the non-teacher-controlled acting out conversations in front of the class. The other subsections follow a similar pattern. It must also be noted that where an activity is multi-skilled, it is present in the subsections of both skills for statistical balance.
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The closed question format was selected to oblige the teachers to make a clear decision about their teaching methodologies. A previous questionnaire distributed on the first visit to UdSU used open questions which provided much useful background information. However, it was felt that too many questions were left unanswered by teachers. Reasons for this outcome include (i) because they did not understand certain questions, or perhaps more accurately, (ii) because they did not want to answer them. Care was taken to offer a limited number of answers which reflected the range of possible ones. For each question, the teachers had to choose a letter from the following: A- every lesson, B- 2/3 times per week, C- once a week, D- once a month, E- once a year and F- never

The letter value system was employed to remove any sense of numerical value, though the results collected were to be given a point value ranging between 0 and 5 where the lowest score equated to F and the highest to A. This facilitated the process of working out a mean score for each of the 42 categories (grouped as 35 classroom activities and 7 homework activities) which in turn created a rank order of the most and least commonly used teaching strategies. The point system also meant that an individual teacher's score could be compared with the strategies employed by colleagues. The F value means that a technique has never been used and is thus given a zero value. As the total number of teaching hours varies from one host faculty to another and even from year to year within one faculty, I decided that the B descriptor '2-3 times per week' would cover all such variations.

It is conceded that the ability to rely on all answers given by the teachers as honest ones will always remain questionable because of the nature of the self-report approach. In the UdSU context, the issue is further complicated for several reasons: (i) due to a system where the desire to be seen to do the right thing is prevalent, some teachers may choose to answer according to what they perceive that the researcher wants to read: (ii) there is a
strong tendency to conceal the true nature of how the individual teacher actually teaches
due to feelings of insecurity or inadequacy. To counter these problems, anonymity was
guaranteed so that the teachers would be encouraged to answer more openly.
Furthermore, no prior notice of the questionnaire was given. It was felt that this would
encourage more spontaneous and therefore less inhibited responses. It should be noted
that all teachers are referred to using a letter from the range A to V when comments are
made. This was to ensure anonymity.

4.5.2 Student Perception Questionnaire (Q2)
The second stage of the quantitative research focuses on the FLSP students' perceptions
of their learning experience, using the same range of teaching and learning experiences.
The aims of Questionnaire 2 (hereafter known as Q2) are:
(1) To identify the key teaching strategies of UdSU teachers' methodologies as perceived
by UdSU students who learn ESP and to define the nature of the learning experience
delivered in UdSU classrooms from a student perspective.
(2) To create learner perception profiles.

The 92 respondents surveyed comprise 51 first and 41 second year students. They come
from thirteen different classes and have nine different teachers, who in turn completed
the teacher questionnaire. The range of students and faculties is limited by the
willingness of teachers to allow their students to participate in the questionnaire. While
the restrictions prevent an all Faculty analysis of student perceptions, the findings of this
research are representative of the three faculties listed in Table 19 below. The
distribution of faculty origin is as follows:
Next, Table 20 shows that there are 71 women and 21 men in the survey. The distribution reflects the student numbers in the three 'host' faculties but is not representative of all faculties. While numbers cannot be compared directly, it can be observed if there is an equal proportional distribution between the sexes. It must be pointed out that the distribution of ages is not directly related to the year of study. There are examples of a 17-year old student being in the same first year group as a 21-year old. Therefore, this aspect does not form part of the analysis. The distribution of the students' gender and age ranges is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before completing the questionnaire, the students were asked to note down which countries they had visited outside Russia. Only eleven (12%) have ever been abroad. Of these eleven, only four have visited an English speaking country, in all cases the United Kingdom. The list of other countries visited (with the number of students in brackets) is Poland (three), Bulgaria (two), Germany (two), Ukraine (two), Finland (one), France (one), Hungary (one), Italy (one), Luxembourg (one), Turkey (one), United Arab Emirates (one) and Yugoslavia (one). These findings appear representative of the entire student population. Therefore it can be said that there is an extremely limited first-hand
knowledge of foreign culture within the student population at UdSU. These figures confirm the statements made in Chapter Two about (i) the complete isolation of UdSU in Izhevsk and Udmurtia at large and (ii) the effects which the geographical, political and economic realities of both have on the students.

The student questionnaire contains the same lists of 42 statements as in the teacher questionnaire. The use of letters remains the same also but this time they represent the expressions of opinions: strongly agree (A), agree (B), uncertain (C), disagree (D), strongly disagree (E) and not done in class (F). The same numerical scale is used to provide statistics of a non-parametric nature. These responses were awarded points on a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 being equal in value to 'A' or 'like a lot' and 1 equal in value to 'E' or 'dislike a lot'. The F response was awarded a zero value because the student would not have been in a position to give a value judgement on something which he had never experienced.

A similar rigor was established for the completion of the questionnaires as was employed in Questionnaire 1. This included a trial questionnaire at the University of West Bohemia, a closed question format and an anonymous questionnaire return. Upon completion of the questionnaires, the individual scores between 0 and 5 were transferred into a database. The statistics have been analysed in tabular form to yield the following results: (1) The mode, mean and median score for each question. (2) A rank order table of the most and least popular classroom activities among the students. (3) An internal analysis of preferences within each of the seven categories. (4) The overall ranking of individual student responses. (5) Learner profiles of the students at UdSU, both of a general and a specifically individual nature were established. Utilising the original database, the total, mean, mode and median scores of each student have been calculated.
for the seven sections. The findings were then ranked within each section and overall. (6)

An investigation of any differences in attitude between male and female students.

4.5.3 Student Attitudinal Questionnaire (Q3)

It is not the aim of this research to seek answers to all questions on motivation but to engage an area which can contribute to the overall understanding of the teaching and learning situation at UdSU. However, in order to contextualise the issue of motivation, it is essential to provide a detailed overview of the non-quantifiable issues of motivation which affect teaching and learning at UdSU.

There have been many attempts in the field of Western applied linguistics to characterise 'motivation' but none of these definitions are wholly appropriate to describe motivation in a Russian context. Russia itself has a long tradition in this field and provides a crucial point of comparison for Western perceptions. References to the latter have been built into the section below. In the case of UdSU, the task is further complicated by the nature of the learning establishment, the teachers and students and the isolated geographical location of Izhevsk and Udmurtia itself.

Motivation is defined as the reason or reasons one has for acting or behaving in a particular way; the needs or wants that inspire individual motivation (which can be of both a positive or negative nature); the general desire or willingness of someone to do something. There are two key overarching themes, namely: (1) the causes for motivation which a learner brings into the classroom (i.e. internal sources) and (2) the motivation which he has during the class (i.e. external sources). McDonough (1986) frequently uses the term 'causes of motivation' and others talk of the 'sources of motivation'. However, in the Russian context, this description is not precise enough. At UdSU the sources of motivation are intertwined between the internal and external factors of motivation.
affecting the student both outside and inside the classroom. Some of these aspects are observable and therefore do not require further analysis through the form of a questionnaire while others do. The following analysis and definition of different types of motivation elucidate the topic.

(1) Factors from Outside the Classroom Brought in by the Learner
(a) Maslow's (1954) Theory of Basic Human Needs
Maslow's approach is now nearly forty years old, but in part because of its age provides categories which are appropriate for examining UdSU. He begins with the lower needs before progression to the upper needs, which lead to self-actualisation and therefore achievement. The five steps given below have been adapted for the Russian and specifically UdSU contexts in order to identify whether the lives of the UdSU students fulfil the Maslow criteria.

(i) Physical Comfort
Maslow expects that students have decent accommodation and can afford to buy sufficient food. At UdSU, the University refectory is adequate and provides relatively good quality food. However, some students lack the finances to buy basic provisions. Students at UdSU continue to live four to a room with little space and basic (in Western terms poor) sanitary hygiene. The state of teaching accommodation is often old and dilapidated. The state of University toilets is at the worst level which may be encountered anywhere.

(ii) Safety and Shelter
Maslow expects that Izhevsk has its social problems like other Russian cities. While violence is on the increase, living there remains relatively safe.
(iii) Love and Belonging
Maslow expects that there is a great sense of communal spirit which is more lacking in the West.

(iv) Self-esteem
Maslow expects that there is substantial prestige attached by families and society at large when pupils progress to university. This is most notable in the way in which the students dress for all examinations. During the lessons, however, the teaching approach is teacher-centred which does not promote independence. There is now a divergence between the younger and older teachers at UdSU. The latter are more traditional and less likely to change their approach to teaching while the former are more flexible and able to offer a greater variety of teaching which includes a greater degree of independent learning. Student self-esteem can flourish when given room to do so but the Faculty's teaching strategies do not really take this into account.

(v) Self-actualisation
According to Maslow (1954), the teacher needs to be enthusiastic and supportive by encouraging projects and plans and to promote optimism by being positive about the future. At UdSU this can and does happen on an individual basis between the teacher and student but there is no institutionalised approach. Unfortunately, the present economic conditions in Russia and future prospects for current UdSU students are not good. This reality is difficult for the students to ignore.

(b) Integrative
This is when the student wishes to identify with another ethnolinguistic group. This process can be graded in steps from meeting TL speakers in one's own country, through to living and working in the TL country. At UdSU, as Russia descends further into social
and economic disorder, there will be learners who wish to leave Russia and work abroad but the opportunities are restricted. Prior to Glasnost, contact of any nature was entirely lacking in Russia due to the government's centralised ideological control (Ter-Minasova, 1996, p. 10). In the case of students from Udmurtia, the isolated geographical location and the political reality that the Republic was closed to foreigners emphasise yet further the students' low level of knowledge of TL culture in attempting to: (1) understand, (2) accept and (3) integrate with it. Until recently, UdSU students have had virtually no opportunity to meet foreigners or travel outside Russia. Many have never met a foreigner. The student perception questionnaire reveals that by 1997 over one third of UdSU students were still to meet a foreigner for the first time. Prior to 1994, the same could be said of almost all teachers except those that were ideologically sound and therefore allowed to visit target language countries. Even today, over one third of the staff have not been to the West.

(c) Instrumental

This occurs when the learner is motivated to learn the L2 for utilitarian purposes such as furthering a career, improving social status, meeting an educational requirement, travelling or using the Internet. In theories of andragogy (teaching adults), external factors such as promotion increase motivation while internal motivating factors such as self-esteem and increased job satisfaction provoke the same. The fact that some students now have access to authentic TL texts through the Internet means that they have instant and up-to-date information about the TL countries. In the field of business and commerce, English has become the international language for all nationalities. Therefore it is imperative that the UdSU students can communicate properly in English.
(2) Factors from Within the Classroom

(1) Situational Motivation

This involves the language learning which takes place. It is hypothesised that language learners living in the TL culture often experience high motivation while the classroom learner experiences low motivation. In the context of UdSU, all language learning activity takes place in a classroom and motivation must therefore be lower than the former type of FL learning. The Intensive Method is one teaching technique employed to combat this lack of authenticity. The suspension of reality and the notion of learner infantilisation are crucial in this process.

(2) Task Motivation

This concerns the effects of individual language learning tasks on the learner and is more easily influenced by the teacher. Ter Minasova (1996) characterises the Russian approach to FL teaching in three ways: (1) It contains depth, thoroughness and perfection whereby the student is given a deep thorough knowledge of vocabulary and grammar regardless of his level or orientation. (2) Foreign language teaching is a mass system in which the individual's needs are neglected for the sake of the entire group's. (3) The approach has a solid theoretical basis which provides all the answers for the teacher in the different areas of study (Ter-Minasova, 1996, p. 12). The findings from the comparative study on teachers' teaching strategies and the students' perceptions of those strategies reveals that there is a correlation between the two.

The long-standing Russian tradition of overloading students with hours of classwork and homework leads to a situation in which the vast majority are unable to organise their own work properly. These demands are often unrealistic and therefore the student becomes more selective in what he chooses to complete or even which classes to attend. At
examination times this leads often to last-minute cramming (‘shturmovshchina’) or to cheating.

The issue of task motivation is analysed under the following headings:

(a) Teacher
This concerns the personality and drive which a teacher shows in the classroom to motivate the students. UdSU has many dedicated teachers but there is no positive incentive or negative sanction for effective or ineffective everyday teaching from the University authorities. Consequently, there is little external motivation to perform well or improve one's own teaching performance. The teacher, however, may have the internal motivation to do a good job for himself and/or for the sake of his students. In the days of Communism and to a great extent currently at UdSU, promotion is achieved not by what the teacher has achieved but by whom he knows. Furthermore, there is a dearth of male teachers in the FLSP due to the low salaries. This creates a female-dominated teaching population which gives an imbalance to the learning experience to students, especially to male students who have few male role models in FL learning.

(b) Other Students
The sense of the group ethos in still influential in Russian post-Communist society. Students do not want to let down the group. Consequently, there is a willingness to help weaker members of the group. This can go as far as helping a fellow student in an examination. Cheating in written examinations is endemic in Russian academic institutions and UdSU is no exception. Avis (1990, p. 94) quotes Russian research on cheating at tertiary level to be at a staggering 73% of the student population.
(c) Physical Environment

Learning can be enhanced when the learning environment is suitable. This has been recognised in Russian pedagogy and is best represented by the Intensive Method which accords great importance to comfort and relaxation. There are however financial constraints on most institutions. UdSU is no exception in this regard which means that the complete Intensive Method environment is not offered to students. Isolated examples of a proper Intensive Method classroom can be found elsewhere in Udmurtia, for example at Glazov State Pedagogical Institute.

(d) Previous Learning Experience

The students have seven years of English already, which obviously affects their attitude in class. This goes back as far as the beginning of the students' first encounter with the TL. Douglas Brown's (1980) acculturation model is relevant here. He identifies four key stages in the relationship with a TL which are: (1) excitement and euphoria about learning a new language, (2) the culture shock which sets in when the learner realises that it is not so easy, (3) culture stress and recovery set in as the learner battles to overcome any difficulties and finally (4) full recovery when the learner is at ease with the language (Douglas-Brown, 1980, pp. 158-159). UdSU learners should have passed beyond stage two. They should be spread across levels three and four.

(e) Social Environment

A student will find a foreign language motivating if his peers are also interested in the language. Feelings of uncertainty and dissatisfaction (also known as anomie) can spread as fast as a sense of relaxation and enjoyment. Often it is due to stronger personalities within the group who try to dominate or control the atmosphere. Any teaching strategy must deal with this scenario and ensure equally that the quieter student also has an opportunity to learn.
(f) Language Class Source Material
The nature of the material used in class can both encourage and dishearten the learner. Until glasnost, the teachers and students did not have access to any current material about the target culture. Greater exposure to Western society and culture makes the job of finding relevant yet interesting material for classroom teaching all the more difficult as the materials used must compete to keep the interest of the students amid other student influences.

(3) Need-Achievement
Need achievement is produced by the desire to succeed or at least to avoid failure. The minimum standard required varies from one educational system to the next. In Russia, the students must obtain a pass score. Essentially, this is all that really matters for students of ESP because FL courses do not form the main part of their studies. There is little chance of a student failing an examination. In fact, as there is a global pass or fail system with only a range of 1 to 5 used for all levels of ability, it is wiser for a student not to perform to the best of his ability in case he is shifted into a more advanced class where he might perform worse and ultimately achieve a lower score. Instead, it is better not to perform at one's best throughout the year and then just to put in enough effort to score a respectable grade (most frequently a 5 or a 4). Avis (1990, p. 94) writes of the three-part psychology or 'psikhologiia troika' (the why-get-more-than-just-satisfactory-marks syndrome) and links this to a widespread cynicism among Russian students about the value of academic study. The same comment applies to UdSU.

(4) Aspiration
The level of difficulty of a task which a person would elect to perform, can be chosen on the basis of previous failure or success at similar tasks. The theory posits the notion that the individual will wish to attempt the most difficult tasks which he can do in order to
reach a higher level of attainment. In the UdSU system which, in theory, emphasises structural accuracy and penalises all mistakes made, learners will opt to perform at levels well below their true ability level so that they may succeed. Within this context, success may breed motivation but is more likely to breed apathy and boredom. Aspiration theory suggests generally low motivation within an UdSU context.

(5) Attribution

Skehen (1989) identifies four factors which can be attributed to motivation. They are:

(a) The Ability of the Learner and (b) The Difficulty of the Task

Both of these are constant factors which cannot be affected by the individual. Students who think that learner ability is the cause of success have low motivation as they believe that there is nothing which they can do to change the situation. The students ability to tackle a difficult task is dependant on the same. Both notions would have had little impact on Soviet philosophy as Soviet meant 'excellent' and the philosophy emphasised the ability of all to succeed. The central planning aspect of the Soviet era also meant that students were being presented with materials which they could achieve. This research observes to what degree both factors influence students at UdSU in the post-Soviet era.

(c) The Learner's Effort

Students who believe that their own efforts can help them succeed, are motivated. This is born out in discussions with UdSU students. However, they place more emphasis on an ability to understand and use General English.

(d) Luck

This is relevant in many education systems through the practice of superstitious routines prior to sitting an examination or even during it. The range of possibilities includes a specific morning routine, praying and carrying mascots or a lucky charm. Skehan views this as a further cause of motivation because the student is in effect motivated to try and influence his luck. In the process he might just learn some language. At UdSU, the
students can influence events more directly when they draw a card from the range offered by the teacher-examiner and this card determines which area the student will be examined on. To this end, mascots are frequently used by students at examinations.

Objectives of Q3

The objectives of this section have been set within a framework of statistical tests to analyse objectively whether the findings fall within accepted statistical boundaries. The objectives incorporate:

(1) Identifying the key attitudes for motivation of UdSU students in learning English as a Foreign Language by creating learner profiles through a process of self-reporting. Are the findings an example of 'set' (i.e. a short-term instantaneous orientation) or evidence of a proper attitude (i.e. a permanent outlook)?

(2) Assessing if their learning experiences have any effect on these attitudes.

(3) Observing general comparisons and contrasts between male and female students.

The list of questions was compiled after research revealed two issues: (1) Little previous literature exists on similar projects and (2) after preliminary visits to UdSU to establish what would be feasible, given the Russian reality and in particular the realities of the system at UdSU. The questionnaire takes into account all relevant literature in the related field. The questionnaire format presented to the students is similar to that used by Clement and Kruidenier (1983). The latter was aimed at a school population in England and Wales and uses a simple style of questioning which focuses on finding answers to a limited number of questions by asking the same or related questions in another way. This allows for confirmation that the student has understood the key questions and also that he is consistent in his reply. The repetition of similar questions allows the researcher to refer to Gardner and Lambert's (1972, p. 15) motivation intensity scale which proves a
useful tool in establishing which students have a strong persistent motivational intensity and those with few or no signs of interest.

The questionnaire has four distinct subsections of differing length containing 38 related statements. The latter are spread at random throughout the questionnaire. The four subsections are: (1) the usefulness of English to the students at UdSU, (2) how much enjoyment the students at UdSU experience in learning English, (3) what difficulties the students at UdSU have with the language, and (4) what contact the students at UdSU have with English native speakers or other English speakers. At the time of compiling the questionnaire, it was felt that it would have been wrong to create four equally proportioned sections. First, such an action would have been an artificial exercise and second, it would not have taken into account the full requirements of such a questionnaire for the situation at UdSU. Furthermore, some sections covered a wider spectrum than others, when subdivided, e.g. Usefulness and Contact with a Foreign Community with four and five subsections respectively. Once analysed individually, the four subsections allow for a further degree of analysis in the form of an internal comparison between the four subsections. The four subsections are divided into further subdivisions and allow for further scrutiny of the UdSU students' attitudes under further headings given below. Note that those statements marked thus * require a low score on the Likert-type scale as they were written in the negative form on the original questionnaire when distributed.

(1) Usefulness
(a) How useful will English be after university to them?
3 I do not want to learn any more English after I leave university. *
11 English will be useful to me after I leave university.
13 I would like to get a job where I could use my English.
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23 I do not need English for what I want to do after my studies. *
35 English is no use to me as I do not want to go to an English speaking country. *

(b) How relevant is learning English to them at present?
2 There are many more important things to learn at university other than English. *
10 I learn useful things in my language classes.
12 Learning English is a waste of time for me. *

(c) How useful are foreign languages in general to them?
14 I would like to be able to speak several foreign languages.
15 I am not interested in learning foreign languages. *

(d) How does their family react to the news that they are learning English as non-specialists?
4 I think my family is pleased that I am learning English.

(2) Enjoyment
(a) Do they have a positive attitude to learning English?
1 English is one of my favourite lessons.
18 I like English classes most of the time.
22 I like learning new words.
33 English lessons are usually boring. *

(b) Does their ability in English affect their attitude?
9 I do not like English because I am no good at it. *
28 I enjoy English because it seems easy.
(3) Difficulty

(a) Do they have a general perception that English is easy or difficult?

6 English is one of the easiest lessons in my course.
16 I am better at English than I am at other subjects.
21 English is too difficult to understand well. *
24 English is easy if you try.

(b) Do they have a negative perception of themselves as learners?

31 I am not good at English. *
34 I am quite good at English.

(c) How do they find learning English?

8 I find English more difficult than other subjects in my course. *
26 I find it hard to remember words in English when I speak. *

(4) Contact with the Foreign Community

(a) What do they think about contact with native speakers of English?

19 It is a good idea for Russian students to have an English speaking penpal.
25 I never get a chance to practise my English outside of class. *
32 I would like to meet some English speakers.
38 I would be interested in meeting up with English speaking students during their visits here.

(b) What perceptions do they have of living in an English speaking country?

7 I would like to live in an English speaking country.
36 I think it would feel strange staying in an English speaking country. *
37 I would like to live and work in an English speaking country.
(c) What attitudes do they have about visiting Great Britain?
5 I would like to go to Great Britain one day.
17 I am not interested in going to Great Britain. *

(d) What attitudes do they have about visiting the United States of America?
20 I am not interested in going to the United States. *
27 I would like to go to the United States.

(e) What attitudes do they have about visiting any country in the West?
29 I am not interested in learning about other countries. *
30 I do not think that I will ever visit the West. *

When compiling the questions for Q3, the intention was to retain a balance between positive and negative statements towards a particular factor. In some cases, there is a certain amount of duplication using a different form of expression which should help to elucidate the attitude of the individual student still further (see Statements 21 and 24) and reduce the possibility of misleading results. Students may not necessarily respond consistently to these questions but may modify their view slightly. An attempt has been made to keep the language relatively simple by using straightforward expressions in the hope that the students should not encounter any difficulties of comprehension. As a result, students should have been able to answer more naturally. Where possible, statements with which the students can identify in a UdSU context have been included (See Statements 19 and 30). A trial application of the questionnaire was made at the University of West Bohemia in the Czech Republic prior to this sample.

This questionnaire contains a list of 38 statements next to each of which was a Likert-type scale which goes from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree', using a letter code
system. The students were asked to select the letter for the response which most appropriately reflected their own view. In each case the following set of codes was employed: A (Strongly agree), B (Agree), C (Uncertain), D (Disagree) and E (Strongly disagree). A numerical scale was used to help calculate numerically the responses given by the students. These responses were awarded points on a scale from 1 to 5 with 5 being equal in value to 'A' or 'strongly agree' and 1 equal in value to 'E' or 'strongly disagree'. However, due to the goal of trying to create a balance between positive and negative statements, where a statement was negative then a 5 would be awarded for a letter 'E' or 'strongly disagree' and 1 for an 'A' or 'strongly agree'. The statements marked thus * in the four sections above would therefore carry the reverse value of those which remain unmarked, with a 'C' retaining the constant value of 3. The sole reason for this was to facilitate analysis, as all scores could then be counted positively in points terms. Upon completion of the questionnaires, the individual scores between 1 and 5 were transferred onto the questionnaire sheets returned by the students before being transferred onto a database for all sheets completed.

4.6 The Importance of Case Study and Triangulation in this Research

Elements of research in the field of Case Study have proved useful for imposing greater structure on this research. A combination of an interventionist methodology which has been used to discover the cause and effect relationship between factors and a hermeneutic methodology which concerns iteration, analysis, critique and then reanalysis, has been employed. Johnson's (1992, p. 83) five key methodological issues concerning Case Study have helped to formulate the adopted approach. They are:

(1) The initial problem formulation which arises from a knowledge gap in research. Since the introduction of TEMPUS in the Russian Federation, it has become evident that there is a dearth of knowledge about Russian EFL teaching methodologies in the West. The unit of analysis in this research is specifically the teaching methodologies and their
variants employed at the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes at UdSU. A by-product of this Case Study research is the tangential information obtained about specific teachers and students. This holistic study of the teaching situation at UdSU in its naturally occurring environment can reap rich detail for other researchers in the field because such work has not been carried out on a TEMPUS-funded faculty in a Russian 'country' university.

(2) The boundaries of the Case Study have to be determined.

In order to fully understand the complexities of the unit of analysis, a series of connections between the different factors involved and the relationships which each factor has to the whole must be systematically uncovered. This has been achieved with the following result. The original scope of the research was much broader at the start but incorporated all the areas covered in this work, including a more substantial comparative element between the institutions of Novisibirsk State Technical University in Russia and the University of West Bohemia in the Czech Republic. From the outset, it was intended to focus on both the teaching and learning at UdSU but it proved difficult to obtain reliable data on the learning outcomes of the UdSU students, due to bureaucratic difficulties during the period of data collection. As enough material had been obtained about the teaching aspect of the research by the time the latter had become apparent, the decision was taken to reduce the breadth of the research in favour of more specific and reliable information. Due to the sheer quantity of data gathered, it was decided to relegate the material on Novisibirsk State Technical University and the University of West Bohemia to a role of much lesser importance but to retain some of the early findings for comparative and contrastive work on the findings of the UdSU data.

(3) The aim is to construct the methodological framework by which the Case Study will be bound through the collection of evidence of empirical and theoretical data.

Of particular value is the American multimethod framework of Second Language Acquisition research which allows for both a longitudinal qualitative and a cross-
sectional quantitative approach. One key strength of the multimethod approach is that it allows for classroom processes to be clarified further by contextual conditions. The importance of ethnographic work in this research cannot be overemphasised because the unique nature of the UdSU environment has a profound effect on teaching and learning in the FLSP. Where appropriate, the evidence gathered from multiple sources can be used for Triangulation which will serve to remove research bias and help validate similar findings. Within the UdSU context, this is of prime importance because of the extremely difficult circumstances under which the research has, at times, been carried out. Diagram 18 below presents the overall structure of the Triangulation which takes place throughout the research. Due to the difficulties encountered during data collection, validation of each key finding is required from at least two other sources in order to confirm the original finding. There are three key areas from which information is drawn. They are empirical evidence, analytical evidence and theoretical evidence. The latter also incorporates the area of how theory is put into practice at UdSU. Within each of the three areas triangulation occurs again. The empirical evidence elucidates the background of UdSU and the FLSP as well as its teachers and students. The theoretical evidence draws on the three strands of Western, Eastern European and Russian methodologies. The Russian methodologies subdivide into Kitaigorodskaya's Intensive Method, the Milashevich Method and a general survey of methodology contained in Russian textbooks. Shadowing these three elements are UdSU's variants of each. These three UdSU variants offer a further triangle of information which can be compared to the general Russian trends. Attached to the theoretical strand is the issue of assessment at UdSU. There are four key elements to UdSU's approach. They are the Entrance Examination, the Placement Test, progress tests and the end of year oral examination. The third major area contains the analytical conclusions which can be drawn from the three questionnaires which offer quantitative findings. The first of these is the teacher perception questionnaire on the strategies which the FLSP teachers use in the classroom.
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The second questionnaire involves the same teaching activities on which the students
must express a degree of like or dislike. The final questionnaire seeks to ascertain what
effect EFL teaching at UdSU has had on FLSP students through an attitudinal
questionnaire.

An example of how triangulation works in practice can be described as follows: the
lesson observation of teachers has revealed specific teacher approaches and subsequently
the appropriateness of the methodologies used by individual teachers. The results of this
are compared to the teachers' perceptions of what they think goes on in their own
classrooms through the use of questionnaires.

As Triangulation occurs constantly throughout this research, it would be cumbersome to
indicate all forms of Triangulation through the written medium. Instead, Diagram 18
below shows the series of smaller and larger triangles which are frequently
interconnected in a solid framework because the findings in one area are always
supported by findings from another related area of research.
(4) The analysis of the data through qualitative and quantitative means.

Data Analysis Procedure

Three different statistical tools have been used to test the validity of key qualitative and quantitative findings in this research. The tests used are non-parametric because they do not meet the conditions for the parametric z- or t-tests. These are the Mann-Whitney U-test, the Spearman's Coefficient of rank correlation and the Chi-Square test.

The Mann-Whitney U-test

This test assumes an ordinal level of measurement and is based on the rankings of scores from two independent sets of data by two independent populations. When the two sets are ranked together, they should provide a random distribution according to the null hypothesis. The significance level is calculated at the 5% level and the test is non-directional.

The Mann-Whitney U-test is used in Chapter Seven to test if the distribution of results between the four subsections of Q3 is random. By using this tool, it is possible to identify if, and to what extent, the four motivational factors (enjoyment of the TL, usefulness of the TL, contact with TL speakers and the difficulty experienced by the learners in learning the TL) are interrelated in terms of how they influence the FLSP students' motivation to learn.

The Spearman's Coefficient of Rank Correlation

Instead of using the variables of two sets of results, we can rank them in order of size, using the ordinal numbers 1, 2, 3 etc. A correlation coefficient can be determined on the basis of these ranks to determine the extent to which the two sets of results are correlated.
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The Spearman's Coefficient of rank correlation proved most appropriate in Chapter Seven for Questionnaires 1 and 2. It is evident that the level of correlation cannot be measured in units with equal intervals in the true statistical sense. Consequently, little importance can be attached to the magnitudes of the differences between the different ratings. However, the view is held that the difference in rank can be taken into account for the purposes of identifying any given difference in rank sums under the null hypothesis that the samples were drawn from one single population. For this purpose, the mean for all 22 teacher and all 92 student responses to each of the statements and questions is calculated and ranked from the highest down. Q1 and Q2 are based on the same set of responses and therefore the individual subsections are ranked separately. Next, the two subsections' results are analysed using Spearman's Rank Coefficient Correlation in order to assess if there is any correlation (either positive or negative) between the two sets of ranks.

The Chi-Square Test

The chi-square test allows for a comparison between the observed frequencies in this research and those which are to be expected on the basis of some theoretical model or hypothesis about the distribution of relevant characteristics. In all cases, the null hypothesis is that there is no difference in distribution between observed and expected frequencies.

The chi-square test proved most useful in analysing the qualitative results obtained in Chapters Five and Six. The most frequently used application is to test whether two characteristics are independent, or associated in such a way that the high frequencies of one factor are coupled with the high frequencies of another. In Chapter Five, the degree of association in word frequency data obtained from corpuses of UdSU and Czech textbooks is analysed using chi-square and in the distribution of verb forms (active and
passive voices) in the texts of UdSU books. The factors observed in Chapter Six using this tool include the frequency in appearance of references to the second person singular in questions and specific references to TL and LI culture in UdSU's Entrance Examination Preparatory books.

(5) Communicating the details obtained in the report on the findings.

The reader must always remember that the results obtained in this research have been gathered under very challenging conditions. Consequently the use of the statistical tools, mentioned in (4), is not always appropriate in this research. They have been used where they have been deemed to be most relevant and helpful in interpreting the results obtained in Chapters Five, Six and Seven. Major difficulties have had to be overcome which include the following. First, there is little official documentation on paper to confirm the strategies of the Faculty. During interviews contradictory information is offered. Often each teacher provides a completely different perspective. Second, due to the unique history of the USSR and more recently of Russia, there was, and to a certain degree, still remains a degree of distrust and therefore reluctance on behalf of UdSU teachers and authorities to reveal exactly how their system works or to state fully what they believe or teach in the classroom. In some cases, there may even be a fear of saying the wrong thing or even of revealing a lack of knowledge about specific issues.

4.7 Conclusion to Chapter Four

This research has taken full account of the key theoretical strands of existing research knowledge, fieldwork and data collection procedures. It has its distinctiveness in applying these strands to the precise field of language teaching and learning at university level within Russia. No directly equivalent published research exists, though it is accepted that there is research in progress in related areas. The research has its methodological foundation in an extensive body of previous and current work, and is
broadly comparable to other work which is taking place, while being in all respects an
original contribution to knowledge. It is distinctive, precisely defined and reaches
specific conclusions.

This research has been carried out under very unique and often challenging
circumstances. It has been extremely difficult at times to obtain reliable information for
research purposes. However, the role of the researcher is to unravel the strands of a
research topic by presenting the facts as objectively as possible and show the
interconnections between the different factors involved. While gaps in our knowledge
still exist, more is still known in the West about Russian educational theories than about
educational practices. The different strands used for Triangulation of the findings
obtained about UdSU teaching methodologies may not all be relevant or appropriate for
other researchers investigating the teaching practices at other Russian universities.
However, researchers may learn some lessons about how to approach their own topic by
referring to the methodology described in this chapter, when beginning their work, and
by reading the findings of this methodological investigation in the next three chapters
(Chapters Five, Six and Seven).
CHAPTER FIVE - ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

5.1 Taxonomy

A key part of this research has been to ascertain the nature of past and present teaching practices in the FLSP at UdSU. One key way of achieving this goal is to carry out a detailed analysis of books printed at UdSU. This is best achieved by analysing the books chronologically as it reveals whether any changes in the approach of constructing these materials has occurred over time. It is imperative that this framework be set in place before the qualitative and quantitative findings are given in Chapters Six and Seven because facts contained in this chapter are of significance to those findings.

It is important at this stage to clarify exactly what is meant by 'method textbooks' in Izhevsk and throughout Russia. Also known as 'scriptum' books in Eastern Europe, these books are sets of a teacher's lesson materials which are printed but not published by the Udmurt University Press and which are characterised by their poor presentational quality. The paper is of low quality and the front and back covers are ordinary pages in the book. Apart from one exception, the paper size of the UdSU books is 15 cm wide and 20 cm long. When opened out the book is slightly smaller than an A4 sheet.

Table 21 below shows that there are 36 UdSU ESP books (see Appendix 4 for analytical summative comments about each individual book) included in this survey. They were gathered during four separate research trips and are representative of the material which was produced at UdSU between the period 1980 to 1998. They represent a virtually comprehensive survey of books in use in the FLSP between these dates. The books are described in the subtitles as 'method textbooks' and come either from the FLSP (founded in 1994) or from the pre-existing Department of Romance and Germanic Philology. Table 23 also shows that the spread of books across different year groups (17 out of a
possible 19 entries) and the different subject specialities (seven in total) is thin. Over a
19 year spread, the average production rate is just over two books per year. While it is
conceded that some publications could not be traced, it is clear that the total of 36 comes
close to the maximum total of books produced. Where none is available for use in
individual host faculties, the FLSP teachers use material produced elsewhere in Russia.

Table 21
Table Showing the Spread of Method Books Obtained from the FLSP at UdSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>English Books</th>
<th>German Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that a total of four German books have been found for the same period but only two
have been analysed for the purposes of this research. They are the Entrance Examination
Preparatory books, printed in 1994 and 1995 respectively.
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Table 22 reveals that teachers working in seven host faculties rely exclusively on textbooks produced elsewhere in Russia as their sole source of teaching material. However, the total amount of such books is extremely low.

Table 22
Table Showing the Distribution of UdSU Publications and Non-UdSU Publications Which are Used by Teachers of the FLSP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>UdSU Publication</th>
<th>Other Russian Material Used at UdSU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art and design</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology and Chemistry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrance Examination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language and Linguistics</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical and Biotechnology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Gas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Training</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology and Pedagogics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other faculties not mentioned in Table 22 are included below in Table 23. They do not have any in-house publications for their subject area. Those faculties for which books published elsewhere in Russia have been found (with the number of books for that speciality in brackets) include: Art and Design (1), Public Relations (2), Geography (2), Oil and Gas (1), Medical and Biotechnology (1), Sport (1) and Biology and Chemistry (1).
Analysis of the information contained in Tables 21, 22 and 23 leads to three clear conclusions. First, very few books have been produced at UdSU per ESP teacher. This is surprising given that the books are really only sets of lesson materials. In fact only a core of teachers in eight faculties (plus those who produce Entrance Examination Preparatory books) have been significantly involved in this work. Of these eight faculty groups, only the teachers of the Faculties of Language and Literature and Law can be described as 'prolific' (in UdSU terms) producers of EFL materials. Similar statistics would be extremely poor for a department of a comparable size at any Western university. In the pre-TEMPUS era, therefore, the vast majority of teachers at UdSU have not been active in academic research or in the production of teaching materials. Second, the lack of new up-to-date materials for each specific faculty suggests that the same materials have been used for a substantial period of time. In some cases, this means that the same books have been in service at UdSU for as long as twenty years. Third, only a few subject-specific books have been imported from other educational establishments elsewhere in Russia, primarily from Moscow, but even many of these are dated. The amount of materials available at UdSU remains extremely low for a university environment.
5.2 General Characteristics of UdSU Books

Before interpreting Tables 24 and 25 below, it is important to remember that all UdSU books have been given a number by which they are identified in the subsequent analysis for ease of reference. These numbers correspond to the notes on each book which are detailed in Appendix 4. There are several reasons for this. First, not every book has a given title and an author. Second, many of the titles are in Russian and are long. It was felt that the use of numbers would serve as a more efficient system when listing books which fall into a specific category. The same book numbers are also retained in Appendix 4 where comments on various issues within each book can be found. The criteria by which each book was given a number were as follows: first the books are grouped according to faculty starting with the largest and finishing with the smallest: second, the books are sub-divided according to the educational method used: third they are then ranked according to date, starting with the oldest date of publication. A summative comment on the findings of Tables 24 and 25 follows immediately afterwards.
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Table 24
Table Showing the Faculty, Student Group, Educational Method, Date of Publication, the Dominant Target Language, the Presence of an Index and Bibliography in UdSU in-house Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book No.</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Student Group</th>
<th>Educational Method</th>
<th>Date Pub</th>
<th>Dominant TL</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Bibliography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Home Reading</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Home Reading</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Home Reading</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Stylistics</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stylistics</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stylistics</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>Role play</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>Role play</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>Rhymes/Songs</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>UK/US</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>Literature specialists</td>
<td>Independent work</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Lang. &amp; Lit.</td>
<td>Literature specialists</td>
<td>Independent work</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>Grammar Mashevich Method</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>UK/US</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1+</td>
<td>Grammar Mashevich Method</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>UK/US</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intensive Role play</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>UK/US</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading Comp and Translation</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>UK/US</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading Comp and Translation</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>UK/US</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Law</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Role play</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading Comp and Translation</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>Correspondance</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading Comp and Translation</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Philology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Philology</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reading Comp and Translation</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Philology</td>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>Phonetics</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading Comp and Translation</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reading Comp and Translation</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>New Entrants</td>
<td>Reading and Listening Comp</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>New Entrants</td>
<td>Reading and Listening Comp</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Pedagogics</td>
<td>senior</td>
<td>Reading Material</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Reading Comprehension</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>UK/US</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 25
Table Showing the Distribution of Pages Throughout Each UdSU Publication Divided by the Total Number of Pages, the Introduction, Target Language Text, Target Language Questions and Answers, L1 Questions and Answers, Grammar and Vocabulary

Note the meaning of the following abbreviations: The letter R in the Introduction column indicates that the introduction text is in Russian; TL refers to Target Language; Q&A-TL stands for Reading Comprehension Questions and Answers are required in the Target Language; Q&A-LI stands for Reading Comprehension Questions and Answers are required in the Mother Language.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book No.</th>
<th>Total pages</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>TL Text</th>
<th>Q&amp;A - TL</th>
<th>Q&amp;A - L1</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>25-</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.25R</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0.5R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.25R</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2R</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5R</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>3R</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.5R</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1R</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The figures contained in Tables 24 and 25 can be summarised into ten points for the purposes of clarity as follows:

(1) There are thirteen categories of books produced at UdSU with a degree of methodological overlap between four faculties. Law, History, Economics, Philology and general discipline books follow the same format, with reading comprehension and translation work in the same book. Language and Literature and Law are the only two faculties which produce role play books. The Faculty of Law extends its practice to include Intensive Method role play work (see Chapter Three for further details).

(2) There are types of books which are unique to one faculty. Language and Literature produces books on home reading, stylistics, rhymes and songs and independent work: Law produces books using the Milashevich and Intensive Methods: History has books based solely on grammar and Philology has produced one book on phonetics.

(3) Home reading and role play books are reserved for students after their first year of study and more often in their third and fourth years. Reading comprehension and translation books are used throughout all student groups. Beyond this, no further conclusions can be drawn.

(4) Within each host faculty, there are long gaps of inaction when no books are produced. The single books in Pedagogics and Mathematics and the absence of books in the remaining faculties reveal that there is no strong history of book production in the majority of UdSU faculties. There are only five faculties which show a degree of consistency. The Faculty of Language and Literature is the best example and has produced a regular but thin range of books in 1980 (1), 1982 (1), 1983 (2), 1984 (1), 1987 (1), 1988 (2), 1989 (1), 1990 (1), 1991 (1) and 1993 (1). The similar but less
productive history is also seen in the Faculties of Law, History, Economics and Philology.

(5) In 29 of the 36 books (80%), the dominant TL is British English. This finding is in keeping with the long-held Russian traditional preference for the latter. In the remaining seven books, there is a combination of British and American English. The culture of a particular text tends to dictate this selection. There is no mention of this issue in any of the notes for teachers or students which reveals a lack of clarity on this issue.

(6) There is no set format for the layout of a book at UdSU. For example, 21 books (58%) do not contain an index which lists the contents of the book. In the remaining 15 (42%), there is an index generally at the back but often containing no more than the title of the reading texts.

(7) The term bibliography can be used in only the most liberal of senses when referring to UdSU. One book, (Book 22) contains what can be described in Western terms as a bibliography, but even here there are inconsistencies. There are thirteen others which provide either the name of the original author or newspaper while the remaining 22 (61%) books have no bibliographical details as all.

(8) A typical line on a page contains 5-6 words and 25-27 lines are on each page single spaced. This gives a minimum and maximum range of 125-162 words per side. Book length ranges from 18 up to 116 pages with the average book length being 48 pages, which, when the above range of words per side is used in calculation, gives an average range of 6000-8000 words per book. A substantial number of pages in each book contain exercises and the above calculation takes this fact into account. In overview, the length
of UdSU books is similar to those published elsewhere in Russia, most notably, Vladivostock, St. Petersburg and Novosibirsk.

(9) 31 books (86%) contain some sort of introduction which serves as an orientation for students. Often these are no more than 100-200 words in total and are always in Russian. The remaining five books (14%) have no introductory guidance at all.

(10) There is a huge variation in the number of pages of TL text, ranging from none to 63. In many books there is a disproportionate number of pages of language exercises which at times outnumber the former. The apparent purpose of the exercises seems to be the maximisation of study time in relation to the minimum usage of paper. Clearly economic realities in Izhevsk would support this interpretation. In addition, there appears to be no pre-planned thinking regarding the inclusion of grammar tables and vocabulary lists.

The spread of language tasks in UdSU's teaching books is wide and varied (some might say 'inconsistent'), as can be seen below in Table 26. No particular task is specific to all books. In total there are 49 different teaching strategies listed in Table 26. Eighteen (37%) appear in only one single book. A further five (10%) appear only twice while another eight types of task (16%) can be found in three books. Among the eighteen tasks to be found in only one book, five of those books contain only one sample of that exercise. The remaining thirteen books in this section contain between two and eight examples of the relevant task. When the totals for the three tasks ranked bottom in terms of frequency of appearance are added together, they constitute 31 of the total of 50 tasks devised for teaching within the UdSU corpus. This is calculated to a staggering 62% of the total number of tasks noted in the UdSU corpus.
At the other end of the spectrum, the most frequently chosen task (answering comprehension questions) is limited to at least one appearance in only fourteen of the 36 books (39%) in the entire taxonomy. The second most frequent task (oral summary) appears in just eleven books (31%) while three activities share third place (translate phrases from English to Russian, translate phrases from Russian to English and verb exercises on tenses) with ten appearances each (27%) out of the corpus of 36 books. The fourteen books which share the same task contain a total of 45 exercises based on this task. When calculated to give an average appearance in each book, the figure is just over three appearances per book. Like the findings in the previous paragraph, this figure is extremely low. When the totals for the three tasks ranked at the top in terms of frequency of appearance are added together, they constitute five of the total of 50 tasks devised for teaching within the UdSU corpus. This is calculated at a poor 10% of the total number of tasks. This figure of 10% for the top three more frequently used tasks is very low when compared directly to the 62% total achieved by the three least frequently used tasks.
### Table 26

**Rank Order of Occurrences of Specific Tasks in UdSU Publications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Appearances in Books</th>
<th>Total Appearances of Task</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Answer comprehension questions - free expression</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Oral summary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Translate Eng - Rus - phrase</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Translate Rus. to Eng - phrases</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Verb exercise - tenses</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Fill in the blanks - prepositions</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Translate Rus. to Eng - words</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Translate Eng to Rus - text</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lexical analysis</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Verb exercise - voice</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Make up questions to a text</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Write down plan of text</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Verb exercises</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Write a text</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Transcribe words &amp; explain the rules of reading</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Verb exercise - mood</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Translate Eng to Rus - words</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Fill in the blanks - adverbs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Fill in the blanks - verbs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Discussion work</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Verb exercise - participies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Fill in the blanks - articles</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Translate Rus. to Eng - text</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Fill in the blanks - words</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Find antonyms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Find synonyms</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Answer comprehension questions - copy from text</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Verb exercise - modeis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Making notes - listening</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Replace Russian words in TL with suitable TL equivalents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Role play - creative</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Construct sentences using specific vocabulary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Monosyllable vocabulary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Identify the stressed syllable in words</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Identifying / recognising phrases</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Summarise - writing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Dictionary work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Dramatisé a dialogue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Explain meanings of words</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Memorise dialogue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Word association exercise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Close exercise - listening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Exercise on possessive adjectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Expressing disagreement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Fill in the blanks - connectives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Seminar work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Sequencing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Paraphrasing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Written summary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The findings in Table 26 do not provide a positive representation of the tasks contained in UdSU's books. The predominant characteristics of even the most preferred tasks are low on Bloom's cognitive scale at point (iii) which focuses on knowledge of specific facts. Equally, they are low on the scale of Galperin's Mental Acts because the tasks involve performance of the TL and not the individual learner's manipulation or alteration of the TL. These tasks include reading comprehension and translation work. The grammar exercises also fall into this category. These exercises merely require the student to find the same sentence in the text as in the question in order to find the missing verb or preposition. The latter follow the chronological order of the text which makes it even easier for the student to complete them. The more varied and cognitively demanding tasks are either low down in the ranking or not in existence at all in any of books.

5.3 Word Frequency Analysis

The term 'word frequency' is an established linguistic term but I have seen no examples of its use in a case study of a specific university's own printed materials. Therefore the work in this section is of a unique nature. Just how many words are required by a TL learner depends on the level of knowledge needed by the learner which in turn is dependent on the learner's required linguistic purposes. Some learners may also require more linguistic knowledge and ability in a specific skill, be that speaking, listening, reading, writing or a combination thereof. Gethin and Gunnemark (1996) elucidate this and other salient points which have been used as a basis for the comparative element of the research findings in this section. They state that a greater range of vocabulary is used in written language than in the spoken form. As the research is concerned with the texts in UdSU method books, the percentages of written vocabulary are presented only in Table 27 below (NB All figures are cumulative):
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Table 27
Table Showing the Percentage of Written Vocabulary by the Different Numbers of Most Common Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of most common words</th>
<th>Total percentage of written vocabulary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,500 - 2,000</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 4,000</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8000</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A varying amount of vocabulary is required for different reading needs. The first 400-500 words (including 150 phrases) are required for basic linguistic survival. Between 800-1,000 words (including 300 phrases), the learner has enough for survival reading but requires a dictionary even when reading simple texts. Between 1,500-2,000 words (with more than 300 phrases) the learner has acquired a passive central reading vocabulary (also known as the European Basic Reading Vocabulary). A learner is able to read fluently newspapers and non-fiction between the range of 3,000-4,000 words (known as the non-fiction point). By circa 8,000 words, the learner has reached the threshold for a complete communication system for the average European. At this point, all types of literature are accessible, and the learner can communicator freely in the spoken and written domains.

The word frequency values come from Hofland and Johansson (1982). They are calculated across many different text types and the frequency value listed refers to appearance per million words. A further list contains the top 8,000 most frequently used words in the English language across all text types in rank order. Words qualify for this list when they fulfil a set of criteria which includes a minimum of ten appearances per
million words and distributed across at least five different text samples. It is from this list that the following thresholds were drawn and applied to the frequency values found.

Table 28
Table Showing the Thresholds of the Most Frequently Used Words in the English Language per Million Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank of Word</th>
<th>Frequency of Appearance per Million Words</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 585</td>
<td>169+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586 - 975</td>
<td>106 - 168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976 - 1560</td>
<td>67 - 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561 - 1950</td>
<td>53 - 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951 - 2535</td>
<td>41 - 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2536 - 2925</td>
<td>35 - 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2926 - 3510</td>
<td>27 - 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3511 - 4095</td>
<td>22 - 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4096 - 4485</td>
<td>20 - 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4486 - 5070</td>
<td>17 - 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5071 - 5460</td>
<td>15 - 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5461 - 6045</td>
<td>13 - 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6046 - 6435</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6436 - 7020</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7021 - 7476</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the purposes of this investigation, different words were noted from the texts in eleven UdSU publications. Each publication was treated as a separate entity and therefore frequently used words such as 'the', 'and', 'is' have entries in each book's word list. Where a word appeared twice, this was not counted after the first noting. In terms of a word and its derivatives, only those words which had a similar stem or semantic function had the frequency for both entries counted (e.g. develop and developed, geography and geographical). Otherwise, the words were counted separately.

Explicit textbook evidence of pre-planning and pre-selection of words is non-existent in all UdSU publications, as in the corpus of Russian textbooks analysed. Reference to word frequency is found in only one Czech publication (Day to Day). In the Preface, the author, Curry (1990a), makes reference to the importance of the 4,000 word threshold
and acknowledges that 25% of the words included may fall above that mark (mainly practical every day words required for living in the TL country). Curry indicates a methodology behind his choices by justifying this as vocabulary building, which is the predominant function of the book with its short texts and activities. The tasks are specific and Curry states that the main range of words falls between 2,000-3,000 words.

In the material selected for analysis in Tables 29 and 30 below, there is a general representation of many topic areas in both the UdSU and Czech sections. Both UK and US English-based materials are present. Eleven UdSU books form the corpus of material totalling 636 words. Ten textbooks form the Czech corpus of 620 words which were drawn from a similarly wide range of topics. Tables 29 and 30 are presented below and are followed by summative comments on the key findings contained in both tables.

Table 29
Table Showing the Word Frequency of Words used in UdSU Materials

\textit{NB <1 equals less than 1}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within the Rank Range</th>
<th>Total words</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 855</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>865 - 975</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976 - 1560</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561 - 1950</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951 - 2535</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2536 - 2925</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2926 - 3510</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3511 - 4095</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4096 - 4485</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4486 - 5070</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5071 - 6460</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6461 - 6045</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6046 - 6435</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6436 - 7020</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7021 - 7478</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;7477</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 30
Table Comparing the Word Frequencies of UdSU and Czech Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within the Rank Range</th>
<th>UdSU %</th>
<th>Czech %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 585</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>586 - 975</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>976 - 1560</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561 - 1950</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951 - 2535</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2536 - 2925</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2926 - 3510</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3511 - 4095</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4096 - 4485</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4486 - 5070</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5071 - 5460</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5461 - 6045</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6046 - 6435</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6436 - 7020</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7021 - 7476</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7477+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three key findings from Tables 29 and 30 which can be explained as follows:

(1) Table 30 shows that there is more usage of the top 500 words in the UdSU textbooks with 64% compared to 62% in the Czech textbooks. However the difference of 2% is insignificant and therefore the UdSU and Czech books show an equivalent use of the top 500 words. The pattern is reversed for the next 500 words as the percentage in the Czech publications is 9% compared to 7% in the UdSU publications. Again, the degree of difference is minimal. Thus, of the first 1,000 most frequently used words in the English language, the UdSU publications use 70%, which is exactly the same total for the Czech usage of the same. Statistical analysis of these two entries using the chi-square test suggests that any similarities between the two corpus over the range of the 1,000 most frequently used words are only superficial. The chi-square test gives a result of 0.00002. Therefore the null hypothesis that there is no association between the two sets of values cannot be rejected. In fact, the low chi-square value indicates that there is no significant association between the two, even at the 20% level. The results obtained for both
corpuses are broadly comparable to a controlled sample test of the word frequency of
texts written by L1 writers in their native L1.

(2) The spread of less frequently used words falls gradually as expected with lesser used
words. However within the lower threshold of frequency, UdSU texts use 93% of the
most frequently used 7476 words, compared to the Czech total of 95%. Gethin and
Gunnemark's (1996) frequency-ranked threshold of the 8,000 most frequently used words
in written vocabulary equates to 99% of the written vocabulary in the English language.
Both the UdSU and Czech corpus materials fall well below that figure. There are several
possible explanations for this. First, the material in the textbooks is aimed primarily at
language learners for specific purposes. In this case, there is justification for teaching
words which fall outside the 8,000 'literature point'. However, there is another line of
argument which suggests that a greater focus on the 8,000 most frequently used words
can provide the learner with the appropriate tools in order to deal with any unfamiliar
words encountered. This argument would be nullified if the learners had already
encountered these other words prior to starting an ESP course, but evidently this is not
the case.

(3) The main finding in Table 30 cannot be shown through statistics but is buried in the
7% of UdSU and the 5% of Czech words which fall outside the 7476 word threshold.
There is a distinct difference in the types of words from each corpus. In the Czech
Textbook A, the American term 'vacation' is used and in Textbook B geographical place
names around Britain are used (e.g. Scilly, Hebrides, Orkney etcetera). In both cases it is
easily understood why these words have been used; they are specific yet useful words to
know in a TL cultural context. To a certain extent the same applies to UdSU's Book 5
(Charring Cross), Book 8 (Ottawa, Toronto), Book 10 (cloakroom, billboard, box-office)
and Book 11 (Nile). The UdSU corpus also contains many examples of words (Greco-
Roman, Paleolithic, Neolithic, inflectional, agglutinative and agronomists) which are subject specific. However, evidence noted through classroom observations indicates that ESP students often have a lack of basic vocabulary in reading activities. Therefore the wisdom of teaching such specific vocabulary when more useful general vocabulary is not yet known by the learners is questionable.

In drawing a conclusion about the findings in this section on word frequency in the UdSU corpus, it can be said that the distribution of frequency is very similar to that of the control group (i.e. the Czech corpus). There is statistical evidence to support this observation. Any differences which occur within the first 8,000 most frequently used words are of limited significance. The only main difference is evident in the type of words taught which fall outside the 8,000 threshold. The UdSU corpus shows a preference for more unusual words which are highly subject specific. While this practice complies with the specific aims of ESP teaching, the logic behind it must be questioned when the FLSP students have not met all the words within the 8,000 frequency range.

5.4 Hyphenation
This section contains only the findings of the analysis carried out. Consequently, materials on the accepted criteria for correct hyphenation when dealing with word splitting, the method of the investigation and comparative findings with other corpus material are supplied in Appendix 5. Hyphenation grew in significance during the course of the taxonomic investigation because of the vast number of examples of incorrect usage. While presentation of texts in books has obviously been less important in the Russian environment and most definitely at UdSU, it is not acceptable just to blame the lack of proper equipment. The issues highlighted in this section could have been avoided.
At UdSU there is no consistency in the issue of hyphenation. At times, words are split in the wrong place i.e. mid-syllabic (travell -/ing instead of travel -/ing); proper names (Shake -/speare) and place names (Birming -/ham) are also split. There are occasions when hyphenation could have been avoided altogether (provin -/ce and literatu -/re would have fitted. In the line above each of the examples noted previously, three more letter spaces were used.). This provides strong evidence of an inconsistent approach.

Among the whole Russian corpus of books, there is frequent hyphenation, all of which is not correctly used. While UdSU books are by no means the most prolific exponents of hyphenation, a lesson can be learnt from the Czech corpus which uses both text justification and avoids word splitting totally. Similarly, while there is evidence that Western books also use word splitting (see the statistics for UK and French material in Appendix 5), the incorrect use of hyphenation has been avoided. The danger for UdSU learners is that they may imitate what they are taught. As so much of the hyphenation is incorrect, there is a danger that the practice might lead learners at the FLSP to use hyphenation incorrectly. Similarly, TL learners might learn to pronounce words wrongly because they have learnt a wrong syllable split.

5.5 Sources of the Teaching Material

While accepting that Western traditions for sourcing material used in a textbook have a different character to those in Russia, the most striking aspect of UdSU's textbooks is the frequent lack of bibliographical details. In fact, this issue has caused great difficulty at times throughout this research as it has sometimes proved extremely difficult to trace the origin of the material in some UdSU publications. There is substantial evidence to support this statement. It is at UdSU (and most definitely throughout the whole of Russia) a tradition to reproduce books from the West and other Russian educational establishments, regardless of the issue of copyright. Two obvious examples are
Developing Skills by Alexander (1969) published by Longman and Grammar Practice Activities by Ur (1991), published by Cambridge University Press, both of which have been copied and reprinted by UdSU. These books are sold to the students for private study or use in classes. In the case of Ur (1991), a mistake was made in selection but went unnoticed until long after many copies were sold (at which point nothing was done to resolve the issue). The sub-title to the book states that it is 'A practical guide for Teachers'. As the sub-title suggests, the book is actually a guidance book for teachers, offering suggestions and material for use when teaching certain points of grammar. It is not at all suitable as a student grammar book. There are also plenty of examples of this type of (what we in the West call) copyright infringement of Russian books. In particular, this occurs when UdSU has in-house publications for the students of a specific host faculty.

Another act of which UdSU may possibly be suspected, concerns the recent practice concerning the reproduction of Western or Russian materials which have had their place of publication changed to Izhevsk. On the streets of Izhevsk, it is possible to buy books such as Streamline English by Hartley and Viney (1990), published by Oxford University Press. The same book has been reproduced with Izhevsk as the place of publication in 1994 by a Russian publisher in the city.

While the issue of publication concerning Hartley and Viney (1990) is easy to identify, this is most definitely not the case with Russian produced material. In such a vast and often secretive country, it is impossible to trace the origins and sources of other books. There is no system of centrally-held titles which can be consulted. By way of example of how language material spreads in Russia, I cite the Milashevich Method, which originates from Vladivostok. During the period of research for this thesis, four books on this topic were found: Vladivostock (1991), Izhevsk (1994 and 1996) which are based on
English as the TL, and Saint Petersburg (1992) which is based on German. The Milashevich Method is also known in Moscow and in Latvia and presumably elsewhere in the former USSR. The difficulty of ascertaining key details about Milashevich himself is enormous. For example, it took more than two years to find out Milashevich's first name, as nobody at UdSU could remember it. The Internet could not provide bibliographic details through web searches or even through the website of the Far Eastern State University in Vladivostock. The arrival of the method at UdSU occurred when Milashevich visited the University once and spoke to a group of teachers. He left a copy of the book which was copied and used by teachers in the Faculty of Law until they produced their own more detailed version in 1994 (revised again in 1996). As has already been stated in Chapter Three, there are still flaws within the method as it exists at present. The German variant of the method contains similar problems, including grammatical inaccuracies. Clearly, there is sufficient evidence to support the opinion that it is impossible for the researcher to be completely sure of any findings made during taxonomic research. Nevertheless, the information offered here should allow future researchers to comprehend faster the complexities of taxonomy work in Russia at an earlier stage.

Within the group of textbooks which have incorporated a bibliography, there is great disparity between them in the way the bibliographical details have been noted. Some like Books 7, 10, 15, 20, 21, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35 and 36 give no sources at all, while others like Books 6, 8, 10, 13, 14, 23, 33 and 34 give incomplete and inconsistent references. Books 18 and 30 are unique in that they do not give references for the TL texts but do so for the L1 articles. Examples for Book 18 include editions of Izvestiya dated 25, 26 and 27 April 1990 respectively. Book 30 deals with philology and has exclusively Russian theoretical references.
None of the UdSU books contains a bibliography listed at the back in the Western tradition. Book 9 comes closest to a Western-styled bibliography, with the following details listed (NB the details are reproduced exactly as they appear in the book itself and include inaccuracies from the original):

- Dorothy Grant Hennings, Smiles Nods and Pauses. Activities to increase children’s communication skills, Citation Press, New York, 1974.
- Teaching the Language Arts, Brandon University, Manitoba, Mount Royal College, Calgary, Alberta, C 46
- Lillian M. Logan and Virgil G. Logan, Creative Communication.

There are several presentational issues which arise from the above. First, the list has key bibliographical information missing, such as the author, the publisher and the date of publication. Second, the convention of the appearance of the author’s surname before the first name or initials is not consistent although entries one and four adhere to this pattern. Third, the book has a publication date of 1984 but the most recent reference is 1974. This is a common characteristic of UdSU publications and is due to the dearth of up-to-date TL sources. The then on-going political isolation of Russia and the still relevant geographical and cultural isolation of cities such as Izhevsk can explain how such anomalies can occur.

5.6 Culture of the Teaching Material
The importance of culture is relevant because the FLSP claims that it teaches ESP within a TL framework. The material in this section seeks to challenge that assertion by establishing the boundaries of the TL’s past and current influence. Textbook 36 on mathematics has no references to culture as it uses technical vocabulary. It can therefore be left out of this analysis. Others such as those in the field of pedagogics (Book 35) and
philology (Books 28, 29 and 30) also fall outside the remit of this sub-section as the material is non-relevant to current perceptions of TL culture.

The traditional practice of studying 'our country' and 'abroad' is much in evidence in this taxonomy. A minority of textbooks, like Book 26, focus exclusively on L1 culture (i.e. the economics of agriculture in the USSR). Such a style is culturally non-integrative and of no value on a macro-social level, though the Faculty of Economics does not use that style exclusively. Book 25 focuses on the economics of British agriculture. While both these textbooks were published in 1985, the material on the United Kingdom does not reflect real life for farmers in the UK in 1985. Such comments as 'The worst off among these farmers live in extreme poverty' (Konyakhina, 1985a, pp. 15-16) must be placed in context of Western standards of living as compared to those experienced in Russia. The texts frequently offer out-of-date facts which do not contribute to the TL learner's understanding of modern Britain. Instead, they create a distorted and dated impression. One text deals with the farming period 1955 through to 1966 and describes how income rose over a period by five percent while food prices on farms rose by thirty-three percent (Konyakhina, 1985a, p. 19). In the same article, the Soviet concept for organising industry and agriculture is brought over into the TL culture (see words in italics):

> Even today, no farmer can prepare a *five year, still less a ten year plan*, for developing an enterprise and be reasonably certain of an established market for his produce during that period.

At no stage is there any reference to the EEC or the Common Agricultural Policy. Where TL sources are quoted, these are often old and thus factually inaccurate at the time of publication. Book 17, for example, mentions the 1960 census in America but the book was published twenty-two years later in 1982. Hence the evidence from the above examples indicates that lexis and grammar are considered more important than culturally
and economically up-to-date content. Again, there is little benefit offered to the student on a macro-social level. Furthermore, on an intercultural level, the material is misleading as it offers the student an inaccurate and out-dated perception of life in the TL country. It is difficult to direct criticism at the individuals who produced these books because the true facts, which would reveal exactly how these materials came together in this form, are impossible to ascertain due to the time lapse since publication. Nevertheless, it must be stated that the implicit and explicit authorial view is often negative.

There is a strong tendency to use material which can be perceived as political propaganda terms. One such example comes from Korneva and Reshetnikova (1982, pp. 22-23):

In Alabama the voter must take an 'anti-Communist oath' and fill in a questionnaire to the satisfaction of the registers. As a result of this millions of people are deprived the right to vote.

There is an exaggeration of the facts in the above extract. While it may be true about the anti-Communist oath, the use of the word 'millions' is difficult to justify. Book 10, for example, uses many Russian sourced TL material from the author Alexander Pumpyansky to compensate. However, all references come from the same edition of New Times, 25 June 1988. This finding complies well with the image of the external observer looking in on the TL culture from the security of the L1 culture in which the learning takes place, regardless of how selective (or not) the material is.

A further example of the infiltration of material with a propaganda value is found in Book 19. It is produced by the Faculty of Law and relies heavily on the Morning Star (1996, no specific date given). Topics include (i) a jury preferring to convict a person on police evidence despite police lies and (ii) police unlawfully killing an 'innocent' victim. It is easy to understand how copies of the Morning Star could reach Izhevsk as opposed
to other British newspapers but its usage is clearly tinged with a left-wing political slant with ethnographic repercussions. If the only exposure to the TL learners is ideologically sound material, then the learners gain a one-sided, often inaccurate perception of the TL culture. The selection of a Western source which is critical of aspects of TL society at both a micro and macro-social level adds a sense of implied credence to the stated criticism (i.e. a kind of double-headed propaganda tool). The same analysis is also true of other books which use the Morning Star as a source, including Books 18 and 35.

In other books, the date of source material in relation to the presentation of the TL culture has less key impact, such as those on language and literature (Books 10, 11), phonetics, ancient history (Book 23) and mathematics (Book 36). The only point of concern is the modernity of the TL in use as this may be dated. In other subject areas, the modernity of the material should be considered essential, e.g. economics. Books 1, 2 and 3 are based on works of literature, including Wilde's *The Importance of Being Earnest* and Maugham's *The Painted Veil*. This is the only reference in each but it is unclear to which edition (if any) they are referring. Books 4 and 5 on stylistics give the source book from which the text is taken and for which the teacher has then supplied the tasks. Book 4 offers a list of critical reading to supplement the material provided. Interestingly, all of these references are L1 sources, most of which are written in the L1 although about one fifth are written in the TL.

The overall impression gained in this section is that UdSU teachers have merely used the material which they had available to them. There has been no consistent method employed to collate material into a coherent collection of teaching materials. Instead, the corpus gives the strong impression that the books have been compiled haphazardly. This could explain even the inclusion of what has been labelled as propaganda material by this taxonomic survey.
5.7 Analysis of the Grammar Supplied in UdSU Books

In Chapter Three we learnt about some FLSP's teachers' preference for the teaching of grammar through the Milashevich Method and in Chapter Seven we will read about the importance of assessing knowledge of grammar forms in continual assessment tests. It is therefore clear that grammar holds a very important position in the FLSP's teaching strategies. No taxonomic survey would be complete without an analysis of the role of grammar in the UdSU corpus.

The most striking fact noted is that only eleven textbooks (31% of the entire corpus) contain some form of grammar presented in a grammar section at the back of the book. The contents are predominantly in tabular form. Apart from Books 13 and 14 which are focused on the Milashevich Method and Book 22 which may be regarded as a kind of grammar manual, the choice of what to include in the grammar section appears to be arbitrary. There are no consistent criteria applied as to when these tables are included, whether that be the work of a particular teacher or faculty or for a specific year group. Nor is there any apparent difference in the choice of texts or tasks between those books which contain a grammar section and those which do not.

Those teachers producing textbooks at UdSU do not adopt an approach to the teaching of grammatical structures which sequences the material according to increasing difficulty. The following list contains all the tables of grammar printed in UdSU publications (with the number of appearances in individual books listed in brackets): modals (4), the usage of the verb 'to be' in the past, present, future, questions and negatives (4), adjectives, comparatives and superlatives (3), basic syntax including normal and inverted word order (3), passive verbs (3), active verbs (3), phonetic sounds (3), subject and object
pronouns including possessive adjectives (3), attribute and adverbial modifier of time (1), different forms and functions of words ending in -ing (1) and complex predicate and adverbial modifier of response and the use of 'to' (1).

By contrast, the numbers of the same group of textbooks which contain specific grammar exercises (and the number thereof) are as follows: tenses (10), modals (6), prepositions (9), voice (6), mood (5), adverbs (4), articles (3), participles (3) and possessive adjectives (1). On closer inspection, there is only minor correlation between the two sets of findings. This implies that the choice of language exercise has nothing to do with the inclusion of grammar tables in the back of the books concerned.

A similar fact is noted when the selection of verb forms within the texts of the same set of books is viewed in comparison with the contents of the verb tables (see Table 31 below). The active present simple is by far the most common verb form holding 65% of all verb appearances, followed by the passive present simple with 18%. Together, the two verb forms total 83% of all verbs in the texts of those books which contain verb tables in their grammar sections. It is difficult for researchers in the FL field to understand the logic which lies behind the selection of texts and why the entire verb tables have been included when the texts contain so few different verb forms. Clearly, there is evidence of poor methodological thought and implementation.
Chapter Five

Table 31
The Distribution of Verb Forms in UdSU Publications which Contain Verb Tables within the Grammar Section

*NB <1 equals less than 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Total Appearances</th>
<th>Overall %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Present Simple</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Present Continuous</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Present Perfect</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Present Perfect Continuous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Present Emphatic</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Past Simple</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Past Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Past Perfect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Past Perfect Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Past Emphatic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Future Simple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Future Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Future Perfect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Future Perfect Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Future in the Past Simple</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Future in the Past Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Future in the Past Perfect</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Future in the Past Perfect Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Present Simple</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Present Continuous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Present Perfect</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Past Simple</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Past Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Past Perfect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Future Simple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Future Perfect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Future in the Past Simple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Future in the Past Perfect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | **568** | **100%**

The same is also true and is in fact more striking in the choice of textbooks in which the focus is on modal verbs in Table 32 below. Of the two books (Books 21 and 25) which contain both the modal verb tables and exercises, there are only 22 modal verb forms to be found in the sentences of all texts combined in an estimated total of 3,675 words. This provides a ratio of one modal verb per 167 words. By contrast, several other textbooks
which do not focus on modal verbs have a lower ratio and therefore a greater frequency of modals. Once again, it is difficult to comprehend the logic in the decisions made by those teachers when choosing texts and compiling grammar tables.

Table 32
The Distribution of Verb Forms in UdSU Publications (Books 21 & 25) which Contain Modal Verb Tables within the Grammar Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Can</th>
<th>Must</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Should</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Simple</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future in the Past Simple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above material on verbs forms is based exclusively on reading texts. For comparative purposes to ascertain whether there are any perceived differences between Russian produced material in text form or in dialogue (polylogue) form, we return briefly to the verb distributions in the Intensive Method books analysed in Chapter Three. The individual verb forms in Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) and Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) have been counted and then totalled to give a percentage of their usage throughout the entire polylogue. The results for Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992) are presented below in Table 33 and will be followed by summative comments on the main findings. The same process is then repeated for Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) in Table 34 which is followed by similar summative comments. Finally, the results from Tables 33 and 34 are compared directly to the findings in Table 31.
Table 33
Table Showing the Distribution of Verbs in Unit 6 of Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Part I</th>
<th>Part II</th>
<th>Part III</th>
<th>Part IV</th>
<th>Part V</th>
<th>Part VI</th>
<th>Part VII</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Simple</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Continuous</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Perfect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Perfect Continuous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Emphatic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Simple</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Continuous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Perfect Continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Emphatic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Simple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Continuous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Perfect Continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future in the Past Simple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future in the Past Continuous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future in the Past Perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future in the Past Perfect Continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Subjunctive Simple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Present Simple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Future Simple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 33, it is clear that there is an uneven but varied distribution of verb forms. In total eighteen different verb forms are used in the polylogue. However, only 1% of the all verbs is in the passive voice with 94% of verbs in the active voice. Given the nature of oral discourse, it is not surprising that 5% of all verb forms are in the imperative form. Of all the verbs in the active voice, there is a high concentration of appearance of only a few specific forms. The present simple is the most dominant of all, appearing 46% of the time. The next six most frequently used forms fall short of this figure, even when combined (future simple (10%) past simple (9%), present continuous (7%), present perfect (6%), future in the past simple (6%) and imperatives (5%)) at 43%. Only four
verb forms in the active voice do not appear in the polylogue (past perfect continuous, future perfect, future perfect continuous and future in the past perfect continuous).

Table 34 shows the distribution of verbs in Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 4</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Part 6</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Simple</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Continuous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Perfect</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Perfect Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Emphatic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Simple</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Perfect</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Perfect Continuous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Simple</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Perfect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Perfect Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future in the Past Simple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future in the Past Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future in the Past Perfect</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future in the Past Perfect Continuous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used to be</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>used to be</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Present Simple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Past Simple</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive Future Simple</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 34 shows that there is less variation in the distribution of verb forms in Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989) than in Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992). In total thirteen different verb forms are used in the polylogue. There are more verb forms in the passive voice, totalling 6% of the all verbs is in the passive voice with 85% of verbs in the active voice. 8% of all verb forms are in the imperative form and 1% of the verbs use
the verb form 'used to'. Among the verbs in the active voice, the present simple remains the most dominant form, appearing 46% of the time. This is the exact same figure for Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992). The next six most frequently used forms (past simple (18%) present perfect (9%), imperatives (8%), passive past simple (5%), future simple (5%) and present emphatic (3%)) have a higher total than the active present simple at 48%. Nine verb forms in the active voice do not appear in the polylogue (present perfect continuous, past continuous, past perfect continuous, future continuous, future perfect, future perfect continuous, future in the past continuous, future in the past perfect and future in the past perfect continuous).

The statistical tool chi-square confirms that there is a close correlation between the verb form distributions of the active and passive voices in Tables 33 and 34 above. The null hypothesis is rejected because the calculated value is 7.33. This implies that there is a significant association between the two sets of results even at the 1% level. Given that they are both based on spoken discourse, this finding is not surprising. Similarly, when the total number of active and passive verb forms in Tables 32 and 33 are analysed in the same fashion, chi-square confirms that there is no significant difference between the two sets of results. The value obtained (40.07) is significant, even at the 0.1% level. The obvious conclusion to be drawn from this last statistic is that UdSU’s oral and written discourse materials use a similar range of verb forms. This is reflected in the same range of verb forms which appear in the small number of verb exercises throughout the corpus.

In conclusion, the choice of when to include a grammar section at the back of the book appears an arbitrary and erratic one. The Faculty of Literature and Language does not include any of these tables but Law, History, Economics and the Entrance Examinations books do. The same pages of grammar tables appear from First Year right through to Fourth Year without any sequenced gradation in the difficulty of the structures. Muckle's
list (1988, p. 155) of when the key aspects of grammar and syntax are introduced at secondary level confirm that previous central Soviet planning should have catered for the exact same areas of grammar for all prospective UdSU students. The conclusions to be drawn from this fact are that (i) the students entering UdSU have either not covered this content or (ii) they have not mastered it and in fact continue to struggle with the same aspects throughout their entire period of study at UdSU. The appearance of these same tables (although newly typed unlike all the previous ones which were merely the same tables photocopied over and over again) in the Abiturientu-96 book for entrance candidates confirms this. Among the material covered, there is clear evidence of simplification of material. Several verb forms are absent from the tables supplied at the back of the books when Muckle (1988, p. 155) suggests that these same forms should have been covered previously at school level.

5.8 Conclusion to Chapter Five

The evidence gathered in this chapter indicates that UdSU textbooks seek to develop processes which are verbal and written response based and which require a non-physical response. They attempt to bring the learner to the point where he produces a response which involves repetition and drill development in both the oral and written domains. The interaction between the learner and the material is not real but simulated. The general oral work is generated from the tasks included in the textbooks. Consequently, there is a limited element of discussion and problem solving. However, there is more focus in controlled role play but this forms only a minor part of the entire gamut of UdSU textbook production.

The above points lead to the conclusion that the implied syllabus derived from the textbooks is that of an analytic syllabus. This is the frequent syllabus type for ESP material based primarily on content. The educational objectives of this analytic syllabus
are blurred and therefore inadequately thought out. There is no obvious sequenced progression of grammatical structures within each individual textbook, still less when the corpus of material is analysed as a whole. This is supported by the results of the independent statistical tool chi-square. Analysis of the verb distributions in the UdSU corpus and the Intensive Method books analysed earlier in Chapter Three show that there is a high degree of association in the verb distribution. Lexical progression through the books is inevitable to some degree due to the new texts covered but the selection of the texts have no pre-conceived criteria. In part, this is due to the limited access of authentic or appropriate TL sources. In another sense however, criticism must be levelled at the insufficient spread of responsibility for textbook production within the Faculty. From 1980 to 1998, only 17 teachers have contributed to the work of the Faculty. This is only 37% of the 1998 total number of FLSP teachers (46 in total). Among this group, a smaller number can be described as 'prolific'. They include Korneva (9 books), Ivanova (8 books), Kuznetsova and Reshetnikova (7 books), Konyakina (5 books) and Mamushina, Dubrochova and Shishkina (3 books). Most of these teachers worked (and in some cases still do) in the same faculties of law, history and economics. The conclusion drawn is that teachers in the vast majority of faculties are not active in textbook production.

As dealt with in Chapter Three specific progress has been made in two key Russian methodologies. This has led to the development of an UdSU variant of both the Milashevich Method and the Intensive Method. Greater success has been achieved in the former, but in both cases the aims of each methodology have a limited role within the entire UdSU context. Nevertheless, their existence confirms that UdSU has a recent history of theoretical research into Russian ESP methodologies. However, there is no evidence that the developments in the FLSP's English Section have spread their influence to other tertiary institutions in Udmurtia, let alone in Russia.
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Recent improvements in access to authentic TL sources have resulted in the introduction of more TL focused teaching material which provides the UdSU learner with a more realistic exposure to TL culture and native speaker produced discourse. In earlier cases and most definitely for Book 36, the UdSU authors are only notional authors who have taken the material, had it retyped or even just photocopied it and then added their name on the front. This has happened to Book 36 but the original author's name has been retained. In all cases, except Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994 and 1996) and Alekseeva and Ivanova (1996) Ivanova and Kuznetsova (1998), presentation and layout of the texts, related tasks and grammar tables is of little or no importance. This more recently dated material marks a change in the process of UdSU-produced material which can be explained easily through the improvement in the availability of computers for word processing. In Chapter Six, other related issues concerning teaching and assessment are explored in further detail. The findings in this chapter serve to support the latter.
CHAPTER SIX- QUALITATIVE RESEARCH FINDINGS

Key aspects in the taxonomic of Chapter Five are referred to and in many cases support the findings in this longitudinal review of UdSU’s EFL teaching and assessment approaches. This chapter divides into two key areas. The first and main focus is UdSU’s approach to assessment which is characterised and analysed in its most recent form. The second area of particular interest concerns UdSU’s implementation of the First Year General English Syllabus and the subsequent development of the Second Year Syllabuses for ESP including an analysis of recent practices in assessment.

6.1 Analysis of UdSU’s Assessment Practice

At the start of this research it proved problematic to obtain sufficient information about all areas of assessment at UdSU. Through time however, the barriers preventing access to the required information dissipated and access to areas hitherto denied was granted. This has resulted in the following comprehensive overview of the system of assessment in the FLSP.

There are five distinct types of assessment at UdSU. The nature of the assessment is dependent on:

(1) The official academic stage which the student has reached. These stages are:
(a) The Entrance Examination.
(b) The Placement Test. Only the Faculties of Economics, Law, Public Relations and Psychology and Pedagogy can use placement tests to stream the students. Many FLSP teachers in the other host faculties have too few students in the year group to allow proper streaming or no autonomy to place the students as they want.
(c) The End of Year Oral Examination which takes place in the summer term of each academic year.
(d) The Final Exit Oral Examination which is not compulsory in every 'host' faculty served by the FLSP.

(2) The period of the academic year during which the assessment is to take place. This assessment is a series of progress tests or sub-tests which are set at different intervals by the individual teachers of a teaching group. Often, they are based on grammar, reading or writing tasks. They are of no value at the end of the academic year as the mark awarded for the Oral Examination dictates whether the student has passed or failed the course.

Each individual element of assessment is dealt with individually in the subsequent sections as they are listed in the points above. While access to all areas of assessment was granted, I did not have total freedom to obtain answers to all the questions which I wanted to ask. Consequently there are sections below which are more detailed than others. Given the circumstances under which this research was carried out, this is by far the most comprehensive attempt to analyse UdSU's approach to assessment.

6.1.1 Entrance Examination

UdSU's Entrance Examination takes place in July. Great prestige is attached to the event within the families of prospective students. At least one parent but often both arrive at the main University buildings with their son or daughter dressed in their best clothes. Entrance to the building is open to all on the ground floor but at the steps leading upstairs, between two and four soldiers stand on guard and permit further passage only to those students with an official University pass. Access to the corridors where examinations are in progress, is officially restricted to all teachers unless they are involved in the Entrance Examination. The system, however, is unclear because an individual can walk up to the soldiers and create a fuss and still gain access. At the same time, many teachers, including the Dean of the FLSP continue to claim that they cannot
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enter the Faculty rooms. They say that they do not have an official pass because they are not involved in the Entrance Examination process.

The examinations take place in all subject-specific faculties, including the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes. However, in contrast to all other faculties, not every student is examined by the FLSP as the Faculty offers only a complimentary element to the main subject in the subject-specific faculties. As a direct result of this fact, most teachers at the FLSP have no control over the quality or composition of the classes put together by the 'host' faculty. Only Economics, Law, Public Relations and Psychology and Pedagogy have the autonomy to test the English of their students. There are several reasons for this. (i) Greater emphasis is attached to the importance of foreign languages by these host faculties. (ii) The Deans in these faculties are progressive. (iii) These faculties are bigger and have the wealth to match their ambitions with the appropriate finances.

6.1.1.1 Entrance Examination Preparatory Books

As access to the Entrance Examination is prohibited by the University, it is impossible to analyse the characteristics of the examination. However, the Abiturientu books which prepare prospective students for the Entrance Examination have been analysed instead to provide some evidence of their nature. The FLSP does not have a published set of achievement levels which it expects prospective candidates to achieve in order to gain access to their courses. In fact, it is unlikely that the FLSP has any influence on the decisions of the host faculties when they come to decide which students they wish to admit to their own subject specific faculties. Instead, while the FLSP teachers do not like to admit the fact, all that they are doing, is gathering information about future students for possible streaming, where the host faculty permits it.
While UdSU's Entrance Examination Preparatory books are the Western researcher's only access to information concerning the examination, they have proved extremely useful for several reasons. First, they contain the linguistic and structural material which prospective UdSU students are 'expected' to know on entry to the FLSP. Second, they serve all non-language specialist students in all faculties and in this sense provide a balanced overview of all faculties' expectations. Third, a more detailed analysis of the texts and activities will reveal the principal characteristics of what FLSP teachers expect of their new students which can then be compared to the expectations of the FLSP teachers as analysed in the taxonomic survey in Chapter Five. The lexical and grammatical items covered in these books can also be compared and contrasted to the findings for all UdSU books in the same chapter. Finally, by specifically focusing on the four Abiturientu (translated as school leavers') books, it is possible to trace any progression in the development of the FLSP's methodological thinking between the dates of publication of each individual book.

The range of material for UdSU's Entrance Examinations is limited to four books. In the English section, nothing before 1996 is now available, whereas in German nothing after 1995 has been produced. In both cases, it is unclear whether any Entrance Examination Preparatory books existed prior to those which are now available. These books are produced 'en masse' by the Udmurt State University Press and are subsequently sold to prospective students who in 1998 paid 25 roubles for the English book and 20 roubles for the German equivalent (approximately £2.50 and £2.00 respectively, or around two days salary for a teacher). Many but not all students seek tuition from the teachers of the Faculty in order to help them prepare for the Entrance Examination. It is strongly rumoured that by paying for such tuition the student is ensuring that he will not fail.
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As the Entrance Examination involves an assessment of the oral abilities of the entrance candidate, this is reflected in the composition of the book. The exclusive use of text and nothing else for preparation and use in the Entrance Examination is restrictive for the candidate both in terms of freedom of response and how the performance will be marked. The format causes greater dependency on the material in front of the candidate. For the purposes of tracing the longitudinal development of the FLSP's holistic approach to the Entrance Examination, the German textbooks have been included before the analysis on the English textbooks in the following survey.

6.1.1.2 German Entrance Examination Preparatory Books

The manuals for the early 1990's are extremely thin in size. The 1994 German manual contains sixteen sides with under 20% of it in German. With only 736 TL words, the manual is of very limited TL support to the prospective entrant. The three pages of TL contain a literary text for translation and two further sides with general topics for discussion. The topics cover a mixture of L1 and TL related culture, including Outstanding German Personalities, German-speaking countries, Careers, School, Free-time, Holidays, School Subjects, Favourite Festival, Travelling and Where You Come From. Under each topic heading several questions are listed. The questions are related to the student but are worded in an impersonal manner, for example 'Hier berichten Sie über Ihre Familie, Ihre Freunde, Ihr Hobby.'

By 1995, the situation had progressed substantially in terms of length of material to 48 pages of TL text (containing 10,752 words) compared to fourteen in the L1. An acknowledgement of typing inaccuracies is made by including a two-sided loose-leaf page containing 30 typing errors. This is the only example of such a correction page found in any UdSU publication, English or German but not the only textbook for which such a correction sheet is required.
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From the list of topics contained in the 1994 manual, only five topics with specific questions remain: Outstanding German Personalities, German-speaking Countries, Careers, School, Free-time. Replacing the other questions are 24 texts which cover all the topics of the 1994 manual. Many of the texts are written in the first person singular and are often ethnographically TL centred from either a Russian or an Udmurtian perspective. In some cases the perspective is specifically that of a student from Izhevsk. The opening text of *Abiturientu*-95 (1995, p. 16.) is entitled 'Meine Schule' and begins:


From the format of the manual, it is clear that the student preparing for the Entrance Examination should read, understand and apply the texts to his or her own personal situation and background. This approach reflects the Russian tradition of focusing on the topic 'our country' as in the above example where the material is set in an Udmurtian context. It also presents the material in very idyllic language, such as in line 3 'with warmth and love I remember my teachers, my school years and school friends'. This choice of language is similar to the tone of Intensive Method polylogues.

6.1.1.3 English Entrance Examination Preparatory Books

Beyond these findings, the German manuals provide no further service in this analysis. Consequently, our attention shifts to the English manuals. Table 35 below displays information about the number of source references acknowledged in the preparatory books. It suggests that there is a shift in methodological thinking between the years 1996 and 1998. Where the 1996 version contained 24 L1 sources and 29 TL sources, the 1998 version shows a distinct drop in the emphasis of the use of L1 sources. There are fourteen Russian sources while TL sources remain steady at 25. However, statistical analysis
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using the chi-square test suggests that there is no association between these two sets of values. The calculated figure of 0.8 is well below the significance value even at 20%. Therefore there is no methodological change which has occurred in the thinking of the authors of the two books and the findings observed initially cannot be credited to any apparent shift.

Table 35
Table Showing the Sources of the Texts Contained in the Entrance Examination Books

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Abi-96</th>
<th>Abi-98</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Given</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to the German textbooks, the information obtained in Table 36, which follows, demonstrates that the two English manuals are much longer in terms of (i) number of pages and (ii) word length (between 25,000 and 26,000 words).

Table 36
Table Showing The Length of Target Language Material in Abiturientu Books at UdSU

NB The books are referred to using a combination of letters and numbers. The Letter indicates the TL (i.e. German or English) and the number refers to the date of publication.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Words Per Line</th>
<th>Word Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G95</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E96</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E98</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The English books contain a greater range of skill-based tasks than their German equivalents. Table 37 reveals that in Abituruentu-96 there are fifteen pages of grammar
and twelve pages of listening comprehension. In Abiturientu-98, there are ten pages of listening comprehension and just over seven pages of answers. The texts contained in both English manuals are of three distinct types: (i) narrative extracts from a literary source, (ii) factual texts about the TL culture or country (i.e. Great Britain or the United States of America) and (iii) an introduction in English on a topic related to Russia but presented in a simple and superficial manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Target Lang</th>
<th>Introduction</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>List. Comp.</th>
<th>Read. Comp.</th>
<th>Answers</th>
<th>Total Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G94</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G95</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E96</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E98</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The general overview of the Abiturientu books is now complete. In the following sections, the focus shifts to the results analysis of each of the FLSP's Abiturientu books for English. For each book details concerning task selection, the structuring and nature of questions including how learner centred the question wording is and the number of references to TL and L1 culture there are in the same range of questions.

6.1.1.3.1 Abiturientu-96

Abiturientu-96 contains 28 units, each of which has two individual texts related to one theme. In all the exercises, the emphasis is on basic analytical skills. The tasks are based predominantly on the knowledge of specifics and facts in the cognitive domain. Table 38 below shows that questions which start with 'what?' number 46% of the 171 questions asked in the book. The answers are easily found and require primarily a repetition of the relevant sentence. Later analysis in this chapter on UdSU's oral examination format confirm this practice. The remaining 55% of the questions continue to show a limited
variety in terms of style and the demands which they place on the learner by focusing on answers to be found easily within the text. By way of example, the second most popular form of question (25% of all questions) requires merely a yes or no answer. The third most popular question form at 12% asks the learner 'why'. The use of the remaining question words cannot be described as prolific ('when' is the fourth most frequently used question format at 6% while 'whose' and 'which' are joint last at 1% respectively). In all of the above question formats there is no room for what Bloom calls interpretation or elicitation or for what Galperin labels manipulation or alteration of speech acts. With no questions based on the second text in each unit, the average number of questions is low at 6.1 questions per unit. This is a low figure for tasks requiring only knowledge of specifics. It reveals a great under-exploitation of the material. The uniformity of task style remains throughout which shows an extremely limited range of task setting. The only other task specified is a complete translation of each text.
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Table 38
Distribution of Question Format Types in the Textbook Abiturientu-96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>what</th>
<th>who</th>
<th>yes/no</th>
<th>why</th>
<th>whose</th>
<th>where</th>
<th>when</th>
<th>how</th>
<th>which</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another major weakness in UdSU's approach to task setting for prospective students is highlighted in Table 39, namely that the engagement of the learner in TL assessment tasks is of secondary importance in the production of the questions. There is little attempt to engage the learner personally in the work or elicit his personal engagement by using words which address the learner directly. Only ten questions out of 171 (6%) contain either the word 'you' or 'your' in their formation. Only six of the 28 units (21%) contain these words. The learner is being trained to understand and respond to the TL in an impersonal format. This results in tasks which are low in both the cognitive and affective domains which in turn reduce the personal motivation of the learners in class.
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Table 39
Distribution of the Number of Questions Containing a Reference to 'You' or 'Your' in the Book Abiturientu-96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>No. of Qu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0 out of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0 out of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>4 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0 out of 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 10 out of 168

A third aspect in the analysis of Abiturientu-96 concerns the culture of the reading comprehension and translation texts. Results from Table 40 below show that ten texts (36%) contain reading comprehension questions set in a TL culture (be that UK, US based or a combination of both). However, sixteen texts out of 28 (57%) are of a general nature and could apply to Western or Russian societies. This follows the Russian tradition of not alienating the TL learner but ensuring that there is sufficient material which is familiar to the learner. Interestingly, there are only two texts (7%) with specific references in the questions to the homeland which is smaller than the number of texts
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with reference to either the United Kingdom or the United States. This contrasts with the traditional Russian approach of focusing on the homeland.

Table 40
The Number of References to the UK, USA, Russia and English in the Comprehension Questions in Abiturientu-96

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>USA</th>
<th>Russia</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In drawing a conclusion to the analysis of Abiturientu-96, it is within reason to believe that because UdSU publishes its own material for prospective students to prepare for the Entrance Examination, the selection of material and tasks set reflects the realities of what was happening in the Entrance Examination in the period just before and including 1996. Therefore the general characteristics of Abiturientu-96, as detailed in this section
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confirm that during the aforementioned period the FLSP's expectations of prospective students were basic. This is most notable in the limited and repetitive style of question forms which were employed. The questions were exclusively task based and required little or no learner engagement on a personal level and remain of low cognitive value. However, the selection of topics was more learner focused because it reflected the life experiences of the prospective student in the Udmurt environment who has little knowledge of the TL's current culture.

6.1.1.3.2 Abiturientu-98
Abiturientu-98 has been analysed in exactly the same manner as Abiturientu-96 to yield distinct differences in methodological approaches between the two books published within a two year period of each other. The most obvious feature is the clear methodological shift in emphasis between Abiturientu-96 and Abiturientu-98. First, the instruction to translate every text has disappeared. Second, Table 41 below shows that 76 out of 123 questions (62%) contain the word 'you' or 'your' in the 1998 edition compared to the 6% in the 1996 edition. Also, only two of the 23 units (9%) do not contain such references compared to the 78% of texts in Abiturientu-96. The low cognitive introductory question words (such as what, why, when, how etc.) have been replaced by a more learner engaging style. Statistical evidence supports the view that there is a high degree of association between the results of Tables 39 and 41. Using the chi-square test, the calculated value is 56.56. As this value is higher than the critical value at the 5% level, the null hypothesis that there is no correlation between the two can be rejected. In fact, the calculated figure is higher than the critical value at the 0.1% level which indicates a very high degree of association. Clearly, a major theoretical shift has occurred in the methodological thinking of the FLSP. The material is more learner focused.
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There are several consequences resulting from this change: (i) It increases motivation in the affective domain. (ii) The more varied forms of questions go beyond the level of comprehension in the field of intellectual abilities and structures, as defined by Bloom, rising to interpretation and extrapolation of information within the texts (e.g. Abiturientu-98, p. 32, Question 5). Consequently, the text becomes a springboard into a more personally engaging discussion on the topic of the text. This requires a synthesis of what has been read and a resulting formulation of the candidate's own ideas and opinions (e.g. p. 17, the student is asked whether there would be a need for an organisation like the Samaritans in Izhevsk.).

Table 41
Distribution of the Number of Questions Containing a Reference to 'You' or 'Your' in the Book Abiturientu-98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>No. of Qu.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 out of 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3 out of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6 out of 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1 out of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3 out of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>5 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0 out of 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0 out of 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3 out of 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3 out of 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3 out of 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>76 out of 123</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The third key feature of the analysis concerning the ethnographic character of Abiturientu-98 shows that in contrast to Abiturientu-96, it contains substantially more references to both TL and L1 cultures in the comprehension questions. Table 42 below shows that L1 references have increased the most from two in 1996 to 34 in 1998. The references to TL cultures have increased also but to a lesser degree. UK references have risen from a total of fifteen to twenty while references to the US rise by only three from seventeen to twenty. There are no references to the English language in 1996 but this figure rises to five in 1998. The combined TL references to the UK and USA total slightly more than the L1 references at 40 but the increase is a modest 25% compared to the 1600% increase in references to Russia.

When the results obtained from the combined TL references (UK and US) and the L1 references (Russia) for Abiturientu-96 and Abiturientu-98 are analysed using the statistical tool chi-square there is sufficient evidence of interaction between the numbers of TL and L1 references. The chi-square value (17.14) is higher than critical value at the 5% level (3.84) for one degree of freedom. There is evidently a close association between the totals of TL and L1 references because the calculated value is still higher than the critical value at the 0.1% value (10.83).
When the statistical evidence from Table 41 is analysed with the evidence gathered from Table 42, it is clear that a methodological shift has occurred in the FLSP’s expectations of prospective students. Between 1996 and 1998 there has been a definite shift from a low cognitive expectation to one of a higher level expected from the prospective candidate. This is reflected in the broader range of TL and L1 issues which demand more personal engagement but which at the same time remain faithful to the Russian FL tradition of studying both 'home' and 'abroad'. The range of skills tested by UdSU at the Entrance Examinations is no longer limited to reading skills but has broadened to include reading, speaking, listening and writing in a more personally relevant approach for the prospective students. These developments have been matched by an improvement in the
quality of UdSU textbook presentation. The use of word processing has allowed the authors to underline titles and subtitles and sequence the order of activities in a more learner friendly manner.

6.1.2 The Placement Test

Due to the restricted access to a limited number of materials, the findings obtained in this sections are of limited value on their own. However when they are viewed as part of a much wider picture for triangulation purposes, the findings enhance and support areas elsewhere in the thesis. Of the eleven sample questions from the Faculty of Economics, all are examples of an indirect system-referenced test and offer only a snap-shot of the candidate's linguistic ability in the TL. There are two distinct types:

(1) One of the eleven questions is placed in the context of a short paragraph where the candidate must read, understand and then choose the most appropriate answer from the four options available (a multiple choice question). The culture of the text is neither TL or L1 but international, namely about Japanese work practices. The topic reflects a relevant issue for the Faculty of Economics.

(2) Among the remaining ten questions, the exclusive purpose of the tasks is to test the candidate's knowledge of specific grammatical aspects. One question focuses on adjectives (the comparative and superlative forms), another on the definite and indefinite articles, six on verb forms (including past continuous, future in the past simple, past continuous and past emphatic as used in questions) and one question on quantifying words (some, any, many, much, little and a few). The topics of these ten multiple choice questions are of a general nature and are in no way specific to the Faculty of Economics nor TL or L1 cultures.

The nature of the grammatical content of these questions is limited but predictable and reflects the same concerns which run throughout the entire UdSU book taxonomy as
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noted in Chapter Five. This evidence can be interpreted in one of two ways: either (1) the students at the start of their ESP studies in the Faculty of Economics have difficulties with the areas of grammar listed above and then continue to struggle with the same grammar issues during the course of their university career, or (2) there is no practice of methodological progression through gradationally sequenced issues of TL grammar. The issues covered in this placement test for prospective First Year students in the FLSP are the same areas covered by the general taxonomic survey in Chapter Five on the books available from all of the FLSP's host faculties.

The instructions for the two different sections of question types are in the TL and not the L1. It is difficult to understand why they are not in the TL because the nature of the activity is clear for each question. It would cause no apparent difficulty if the TL were introduced to explain such assessment tasks instead of the L1. This is an example of how assessment material has not been brought into a TL environment. Such a shift occurred in the British education system in the mid 1990's with the introduction of TL usage for all task descriptions and all specific questions at GCSE level for all foreign languages. It has not proved to be a difficult transition for schools to make. Therefore it could be introduced easily at UdSU if the drive to insist on a more TL focused system of assessment was fully implemented.

6.1.3 The Oral Examination

Key elements of the UdSU oral examination format have already been analysed in the earlier section on the Entrance Examination. The characteristics noted earlier remain relevant for UdSU's end of year oral examination also. The evidence gathered shows that the oral examination deals with involved participation from candidates on topics which are more related to them than is evident in the case of writing tests. The type of language is heavily dependant on the situation in which it is being used. The following analysis of
the level and type of discourse, which takes place at UdSU comes from three oral examinations with candidates from the Second Year Public Relations course, provides a high degree of detail about the exact nature of what occurs at UdSU oral examinations. As no access to the Exit Oral Examination is possible, the findings in this section serve a dual function of characterising the nature of both end of year and end of course Oral Examinations.

6.1.3.1 Examination Format and Implied Methodology

In interviews, FLSP teachers state that the oral examination is meant to last 15-20 minutes in total. The internal evidence of the format of the three specimen orals does not sustain this claim as the specimen orals are much shorter. Consequently, it can be said that the FLSP's stated theory has not been practised by the teacher-examiner in the three assessed examinations. However, there is much qualitative validity in the work carried out in this section of research because it is the first time that UdSU oral examination practice has been described in such detail. The results of analytical work carried out reveal the following structural breakdown in the format of the oral examination:

(1) The candidate begins by reading a short passage of 80-100 words from a longer text which he has had 20-30 minutes beforehand to read and prepare for translation. In this opening section, the candidate is assessed for the ability to read English aloud with good clear pronunciation, intonation, fluency and a good understanding of the meaning of the text.

(2) Next, the candidate translates the same passage into Russian which he has read in part one of the examination. Here the focus is on the translation skills of the candidate and his ability to render an accurate version of the TL text in the L1.

(3) In the third section of the examination, the teacher-examiner asks four to five questions based on the same passage which the candidate has read (For the purposes of convenience, this section is referred to as Q&A1 in all subsequent sections). These
questions require factual answers only and can be found easily in the text. The candidate must only respond aloud with the appropriate part of the text. The skill being assessed here is the ability to follow a short series of previously unheard questions on the text, understand what is being asked and then to find the relevant section in the passage and read out the required answer. The length of answers offered by the three candidates ranges from three words to 31 for a single response. Each candidate does not have to elaborate on an answer or interpret the material. The teacher-examiner prefers shorter answers in this section as the assessment criteria focuses on the ability to answer the questions posed. As in part one of the examination, the assessment is based on the candidate's performance in the areas of pronunciation, fluency, intonation and understanding.

(4) The candidate speaks about a pre-selected topic. The topic is chosen by the candidate who is presented with a series of titles on pieces of paper. These sheets are faced downwards on a table and the candidate selects one of them. The candidate may write a plan of what he wants to say during the preparation time but is not permitted to bring any paper with him into the examination room. The topics are not new to the candidate as they have been covered during the course of the semester. The length of the presentation is circa 100 words and it lasts for under one minute. Here the candidate is being assessed on the ability to present information on a chosen topic which can involve expressing his own opinions though he does not necessarily have to do so. This is done without the aid of notes but rather from memory and revision done prior to the oral examination.

(5) The teacher-examiner asks the candidate approximately five questions which are related to the topic (For the purposes of convenience, this section is referred to as Q&A2 in all subsequent sections). The teacher may have prepared these questions in advance but this is not always the case. In the three samples analysed, the teacher had written out his questions in advance. Again, the element of unpredictability for the candidate exists
as he is being assessed on his ability to understand and respond to the short series of
questions, converse freely and be able to switch from one topic to another. In theory, the
teacher also expects longer answers in this section but based on the evidence found in the
analysed samples, only a simple level of response is required as answers do not
necessarily have to be given in the form of a full sentence.

(6) The final part of the oral examination involves the candidate listening to a three to
five minute dialogue in English which is played on a cassette recorder in the examination
room. After this, the candidate delivers a series of answers to written questions which
may be in the TL or L1. This section lasts a further five to seven minutes but does not
form part of the results section below because no examples of this type of activity were
supplied by UdSU. The section which follows offers a detailed analysis of results
concerning the UdSU oral examination. It analyses the examination statistically by
breaking down the individual parts of the oral thus yielding richer and more precise
results. These allow for internal comparisons between the different elements of the three
sample orals.

6.1.3.2 General Statistical Overview of the UdSU Oral Examination
The most striking feature of the three sample orals is the limited number of words
spoken by the candidates. Table 43 below shows that Candidate One speaks a total of
345 words while Candidate Two speaks 279 words and Candidate Three 250 words. The
sections entitled 'Text Reading' (Part 2 in Table 43) and 'Chosen Topic' (Part 4 in Table
43) are features of monologue, while the sections Question and Answer 1 (Part 3 in
Table 43) and Question and Answer 2 (Part 5 in Table 43) are features of dialogue. The
monologue parts contain a majority of the words with the section 'chosen topic' ranking
first out of five in all three sample oral examinations. The 'text reading' ranks second
twice and third once (in the case of Candidate One). Conversely, the dialogue sections
are ranked third and fourth in all cases except for the one occasion, in the case of Candidate 1, where Q&A1 ranks second.

Within the monologue parts, the highest total number of words spoken by all three candidates is in Part 4 (chosen topic) with 305 words (35%). The second highest total occurs in Part 2 (Text Reading) with 252 words (29%). In the dialogue sections, Part 3 (Q&A1) has the highest total of words spoken at 205 (23%), followed by Part 5 (Q&A2) with 104 words (12%) and Part 1 (Opening Exchange) with 8 words (1%). The mean number of words spoken in monologue form across the three oral examinations is 64% compared to the 36% for dialogue. In fact the percentage calculated for Part 3 alone is equal to the sum percentage total for the dialogue Parts 2 and 4. From this evidence, the observation can be made that monologue is of higher importance than dialogue in UdSU orals by a substantial margin and consequently more preferred as a tool of assessment. This finding suggests that there is a limited chance of assessing the candidate's ability in open speech.

Table 43
Table Showing the Breakdown of the Words Used by Three Candidates During Oral Examinations at UdSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 4</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Opening Exchange</td>
<td>Text Reading</td>
<td>Q&amp;A.1</td>
<td>Chosen Topic</td>
<td>Q&amp;A.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 44 elucidates some of the findings of Table 43 more clearly. In percentage terms, the two monologue parts total 58%, 63% and 72% of the total words uttered by Candidates One, Two and Three respectively while the dialogue parts total 42%, 37% and 28% for the same three candidates.

Table 44
Table Showing the Percentage of Words Spoken by the Candidates Throughout the Oral Examination which Can be Identified as 'Free Speech'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Total Words Spoken</th>
<th>Monologue Percentage</th>
<th>Dialogue</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in the next two sections focus individually on the monologue and dialogue sections. Table 45 below provides results of the dialogue section first. In the case of Candidate One, 282 words are spoken in Parts 2 and 4 by both participants in the dialogue but the table also reveals that the teacher-examiner uses 137 words (49%) compared to the candidate who uses 145 words (51%). In total, Candidate One only manages to say eight words more than the teacher-examiner. The format of these dialogue sections is inappropriately balanced because there is too much teacher interference which impedes and even intimidates the candidate. In an oral examination the teacher-examiner should give the candidate enough opportunity to show off his knowledge and ability in the L1. The evidence gathered about Candidate Two shows that the balance of the dialogue has moved towards the teacher-examiner with 143 words (58%) compared to the candidate's 103 words (42%). More surprisingly, Candidate Three only manages to speak 69 words (34%) compared to the teacher-examiner's 136 words (66%).
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Table 45
Table Showing the Percentage of Words Used by the Teacher-Examiner and the Candidates During Dialogues in Comparison with Each Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Dialogue-Teacher+Candidate</th>
<th>Teacher Total</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>Candidate Total</th>
<th>0%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The obvious conclusion to be drawn from the results in Table 45 is that the distribution of words in the UdSU oral examinations is a poor example of an assessment system which seeks to evaluate the TL performance of the candidates in dialogue form. The teacher-examiner dominates the conversation too much thus blocking the candidate from developing answers. In the analysis which follows this section, each of the examinations are analysed individually. The findings strengthen the observations and interpretations of the evidence gained from Table 45 thus far.

6.1.3.3 Analytical Results of the Monologue Sections

The two distinctive elements to the monologue, namely reading a text aloud and speaking about a topic have been timed. The results have been compared to the number of words spoken in each of the two sections by each candidate as shown in Table 43 above, thus giving the number of words per ten seconds. The result of this analysis has yielded the findings presented in Table 46 below.

Candidate One speaks faster than the other two candidates with a mean of 24.5 words per 10 seconds for both the text reading and chosen topic sections. Candidate Three speaks at a slower rate of 15 words per 10 seconds, while Candidate Two is the slowest speaker of all three, speaking at a rate of 15 words per 10 seconds. Generally, the candidates find it easier to speak faster when reading from a text. However, Candidate Two speaks faster
when communicating freely in the pre-selected topic section. In order to appreciate the speed of English when spoken by a Native speaker, sections of Radio 4 news (Radio 4 News, 9.00pm, Thursday 3 June 1999) were analysed in the same manner used to obtain the results for Table 46. The figure of 24.6 per 10 seconds is slower than Candidate One's pace when reading a text aloud. The same figure is only marginally ahead of Candidate Three's mean of 22 words per 10 seconds but well ahead of Candidate Two's 14 words per 10 second average. In percentage terms, the candidates have delivered on average monologues which are 72% of the speed of the native speaker. This difference, while expected to a certain degree, is still substantial.

Table 46
Table Showing the Length in Seconds of the Two Monologue Sections Produced by the Three Students Including the Mean Number of Words per 10 Seconds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Reading Time</th>
<th>No. of words</th>
<th>Mean per 10 secs</th>
<th>Speaking Time</th>
<th>No. of words</th>
<th>Mean per 10 secs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30 seconds</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>55 seconds</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>55 seconds</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60 seconds</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38 seconds</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>60 seconds</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41 seconds</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>58 seconds</td>
<td>101.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now that the overall analysis of the oral examinations is complete, each part of the oral examination is analysed individually below across all three sample orals in a consecutive manner. As Part I of the Oral Examination is so short it does not form part of the following analysis. Indeed so little is said in the opening exchange that it has no effect on the assessment outcome of the oral examination itself. The remaining four parts are scrutinised in detail below. First, Parts 2 and 4 are analysed as monologues. Then they are followed immediately by an investigation of the dialogue material in Parts 3 and 5.
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Candidate One - Reading the Text Aloud

The text below comes from the field of literature and the tenor is formal where the teacher-examiner is focusing on the performance level of the candidate. Although a monologue, the passage contains elements of dialogue. The candidate indicates this by raising his voice and using more intonation although he has a heavy Russian accent. The context of the passage is clearly American, although in the dialogue which follows in Part 3 the reference to a bus fare of 10 cents places the text in an historical context because the cost of the fare is not remotely current.

'Tm Martin Eden', Martin began a conversation, 'and I want my five dollars', was what he would have liked to say, but this was his first editor and under the circumstances he did not desire to scare him too abruptly. To his surprise, Mr. Ford leapt into the air with a 'You don't say so' and in the next moment with both hands was shaking Martin's hand. 'Can't say how glad I am to see you, Mr. Eden. I've often wondered what you were like'.

Candidate Two - Reading the Text Aloud

The text comes from the field of history and offers a retrospective view. It is an international type of topic and not specifically relevant to TL culture. The tenor is formal. The candidate has particular difficulty in pronouncing the word 'equipment'.

Any great undertaking whether it is an expedition like Columbus or for example a war needs three things. First it needs a courageous leader. The leader is the man with the idea, the man who will fight for his idea even if everyone else seems to be against him. Christopher Columbus was such a leader. Secondly, equipment is needed with products and inventions of other men. Without ships like the Santa Maria, the Pinta and the Nina, the journey was impossible.

Candidate Three - Reading the Text Aloud

This text comes from the field of history and therefore offers a similar retrospective view on Columbus to that described for Candidate Two above. Similarly, the passage is based
on a topic of an international nature and is not specifically relevant to the candidate's TL culture.

All the people of the palace came to the dock. They stood in silence and looked at the three ships that would soon sail away into the unknown. The weather on August 3rd 1492 was perfect. the sky was blue. A light breeze blew to the west. An old seaman whose sailing days had long been over looked up at the sky and sniffed the wind. He grunted and said: 'It's an ill wind. It'll blow them west straight into the arms of the demon.'

6.1.3.4 Analysis of the Pre-selected Topic

This section deals with the pre-selected topic section and attempts to analyse whether the candidate takes into account the presence of the listener in what is said. If no account of the listener is taken into account then the monologue can be described as monologic. However, if the latter is taken into account, then McCarthy and Carter's (1995, p. 16) term dialogic can be used.

There are few examples of reciprocity used by the candidates. This implies that they are not speaking to the teacher-examiner but at him. Candidate One uses the word 'you' three times, Candidate Two employs the term only twice but Candidate Three does not use the word at all. In all seven instances, the term 'you' is an impersonal one and is not directed at the teacher-examiner personally. There is also little reference to the first person singular. Only Candidate Two does so (one reference to 'I', 4 to 'me' and 1 to 'my'). Expressions of orientation such as 'so', 'as for me', 'because', 'if' and 'but' are used on seven occasion and not at all by Candidate Three. This reveals an impersonal and non-engaging style which is void of personal views (See monologues below):
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Note that all individual errors made by the three candidates have been transcribed exactly as they were spoken during the examinations and consequently the monologues include some errors of syntax and grammar.

Candidate One - Pre-selected Topic

Knowing foreign language is very important. There about three thousand languages in the world. It is impossible to learn all the languages so it's necessary to know English because it's an international language. It's spoken all over the world. The ability to use English needs regular practice. If you know English, you should practice it or you start forgetting it. Reading English books is a good way of making progress. Listening to the radio and tapes is an excellent opportunity too. It helps to understand British and American English. Regular listening improves the ability to understand other speakers. Writing is very important too. So there are different ways of keeping up English and improving it.

Candidate Two - Pre-selected Topic

Today people work hard. Women have many work to do in their house. They must to cook meals, keep the house and see the children. Many people believe it is important to plan daily round. If you plan the day carefully, you'll do more. Many famous people have a daily timetable. It helps them to achieve what they want. But some people say that timetables make life uninteresting. As for me, I'll always plan my week carefully. I can't waste time so my timetable help me. It helps me to have enough time for everything.

Candidate Three - Pre-selected Topic

Nature protection is one of the major problems today. It is everybody's concern. People continues to use nature as consumers. Man's activity has negative affect on the biosphere. Forests, animals and plants disappear due to pollution. Ecologist speak of air pollution, land pollution and water pollution. Litter or garbage is a great problem. It's ugly. It makes the city look ugly and spoils a view. Litter is a health problem too. Garbage brings animals which carry disease. In most places litter is against the law. The law punishes people who throw garbage on the streets.
6.1.3.5 Analysis of the Open Conversation Sections

Parts 3 and 5 involve a short series of questions and answers. Table 47 shows a further breakdown of the information contained in Tables 43 and 45. In both Part 3 and Part 5 of the oral examination, the teacher-examiner contributes more words to the dialogue (53% in Part 3 and 61% in Part 5 respectively) than the candidate (48% in Part 3 and 40% in Part 5 respectively). The overall proportions of dialogue sections are as follows:

Table 47
Table showing the Proportion of Words spoken by the Teacher and the Student in the Oral Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Words</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Words</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Words</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The effects which the results in Table 47 have on the nature of the oral examination are profound. First, the teacher-examiner is in complete control. Not only does he give the instructions to the candidate to move onto the next section of the examination, but he dominates the phases of dialogue. Consequently his actions serve to inhibit the candidate. The only occasion when this does not occur is during Part 3 with Candidate One who has a tendency to offer lengthier sentences than the other two candidates.

On several occasions, the teacher-examiner is abrupt to the point of being rude to a candidate. For example, he loses patience with the weaker of the three candidates (Candidate Two, Part 1 Turn 9, and Part 5, Turn 1). The candidate is dictated to throughout the entire examination and is offered little freedom to elaborate on any of the questions put to him.
As shown in the taxonomic survey in Chapter Five and earlier in Chapter Three in the section on the Milashevich Method, verbs are of great importance in the teaching strategies employed by FLSP teachers. However, by its very nature, the UdSU oral examination inhibits the candidate from communicating much in the TL and therefore the candidate has a limited opportunity to show his ability to use verbs properly and with ease in the TL. In Q&A1 (see Table 48 below) Candidate One stands out from the other two because he manages to answer questions mostly with full sentences which contain verbs. He produces 15 of the 29 verbs (52%) uttered by all candidates. Candidate Two manages only eight verbs (28%) and Candidate Three offers even less verbs with only six (21%). In all three cases, the number of verbs produced remains small. Furthermore, the distribution of verb forms has a very low base with only five different types. The past simple dominates with 18 appearances (62%), followed by the present simple with five (17%).

Table 48
Distribution of Verbs in Q&A 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Candidate 1</th>
<th>Candidate 2</th>
<th>Candidate 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Simple</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Simple</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Perfect Simple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Continuous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Emphatic (negative use)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of verbs produced in Q&A2 is even lower than the total for Q&A1. Table 49 below shows that only fourteen verbs are produced in total by all candidates. Candidate One produces the most verbs once again with six (43%), followed closely by Candidate Two with five (36%) and Candidate Three in last place again with three verbs (21%). There are six different forms of verbs used but the range is limited. Only the present simple appears more than twice with seven appearances (50%).
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Table 49
Distribution of Verbs in Q&A 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Candidate 1</th>
<th>Candidate 2</th>
<th>Candidate 3</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present Simple</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Perfect Simple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Perfect Continuous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present Emphatic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Simple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future In the Past Simple</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the results of Tables 48 and 49 are compared to those of Tables 33 (Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992)) and 34 (Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989)), which are Intensive Method polylogues written for spoken discourse, the findings are self-evident. Tables 48 and 49 show that the UdSU candidates use a restricted range of verb forms which is under one third of the number of forms used throughout the Intensive polylogues. This fact leads us to ask the question why the FLSP persists in teaching such a wide range of verb forms for usage in oral work when the FLSP has not trained its students to try and show a broader range of verb forms. The product delivered by the FLSP students does not match the breadth of input.

Specific Findings

**Dialogue Parts 3 and 5 for Candidate One**

**Part 3**

1 T Now answer some questions. Do you happen to know anything about Martin Eden?
2 S Yes certainly. He is the main character of the novel 'Martin Eden' by Jack London. I read this book in Russian.
3 T So you are lucky to have a passage from the book, aren't you?
4 S Yes I am.
5 T So why did Martin come to see Mr. Ford?
6 S Mr. Ford was the editor of a magazine. He had published one of Martin's stories but the editor didn't send him the money for it so Martin came to collect it.
7 T How did he greet Martin?
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8  S  Martin was very much surprised when Mr. Ford shook his hands and said that he was very happy to see him.

9  T  And who did Mr. Ford introduce Martin to?

10 S  He introduced him to his staff.

11 T  Can you think that Martin was in need of money?

12 S  Yes certainly. He borrowed ten cents to come to the office and he had no money to go back home.

13 T  Thank you. I have no more questions. Now speak on the topic.

Part 5

1  T  How long have you been learning English?

2  S  I've been learning English for five years.

3  T  And did you have any special training?

4  S  Yes, I had private lessons for over a year.

5  T  I see. Have you ever been abroad?

6  S  Unfortunately, not yet.

7  T  If you have a chance, where would you like to go?

8  S  I'd like to visit Australia and the United States of America.

9  T  And now the final question. Have you ever spoken to a native speaker?

10 S  No, I haven't but I'd like to.

11 T  Thank you. Now listen to the tape and tell us what it is about in Russian.

The number of words in Part 3 of Candidate One's oral examination is 167. The average number of words per turn is 12.8. The teacher-examiner used 65 words (39%) and the candidate 102 (61%). Given that this is an examination, the examiner's role is over-emphasised with almost 40% of the total words spoken. This can clearly be attributed to the questions presented by the teacher-examiner. The style of questions used promotes little or no discussion. Instead, the questions seek a yes or no type answer or focus on factual answers, such as when, why and what. This practice corroborates the evidence obtained earlier in this chapter from Table 38 on the Entrance Examination Preparatory book (Abiturientu-96). Such question structures do not promote longer, more engaging answers as promoted by the new version of the Entrance Examination Preparatory book (Abiturienti-98).
Chapter Six

Part 5 contains even fewer words. The average number of words per turn is less than in Part 3 at 8.9. Of concern is the fact that the teacher-examiner now delivers more of the dialogue with 61 words (62%) whereas the candidate says 37 words (38%). In an examination situation, the teacher is meant to say less than the candidate in order to let a proper assessment take place but the same style of questioning is used, as in Part 3.

The analysis of the nature of the discourse which occurs in the dialogue parts of the oral examination is shown in Table 50. It reveals that Part 3 has six exchanges and contains fourteen moves while Part 5 contains five exchanges and eleven moves. The two parts are characterised by an initial question and response with few follow-up questions. With the mean length of response 12.8 or 8.9, the conversation assumes a minimal nature. The candidate is there merely to respond to the questions raised by the teacher-examiner. Similarly, the teacher's role is not to interact with the candidate other than within a formal framework. The follow-ups play a lesser role in the exchange as there are only four of these. This suggests that the depth of the discourse is minimal and can only be superficial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move Types</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-ups (F1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-ups (F2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further analysis of the speech acts is contained in Table 51 which shows that there are eleven discrete acts carried out by the teacher-examiner in Part 3 and eight in Part 5. The teacher-examiner's style of questioning is basic. In Part 3, he begins the oral examination with a starter which is also a command (Turn 1: 'Now answer some questions'). This establishes from the outset that the teacher-examiner is in control of the conversation.
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There are no expanders following the initial question. There is one acknowledgement in response to the candidate's comment that he had read the book before (Turn 4: 'So you are lucky you have a passage from the book, aren't you?'). Part 3 is concluded with an expression of thanks (Turn 13). In Part 5 a similar pattern is followed. Here, the only starter occurs later on in the dialogue at Turn 9 ('And now the final question'). In both parts there are no examples of modality. The candidate does show an ability to practise topic continuation in the form of a pronoun (See Part 3, Turns 2 & 3, 9 & 10) but not always when he has a text in front of him (See Part 3, Turns 8 & 9). This point is not relevant in part five where the questions are all in the second person singular and he replies in the first person singular. The candidate mispronounces only one word ('leapt') but has no other errors for which he is penalised. There are some clear elements of a kind of natural interaction (e.g. Part 5, Turn 10 - 'but I'd like to'). However in terms of ethnomethodology, there is little evidence of a 'natural' speech pattern apart from perhaps the tenuous examples from the teacher-examiner (Part 5, Turns 3 and 5). These are responses to the candidate's Turns 2 and 3 respectively but the responses are short and lack personal engagement.

Table 51
The Distribution of Acts in Candidate One's Oral Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act Types</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elicitations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dialogue Parts 3 and 5 for Candidate Two

Part 3

1. T: Well, do you know who Columbus was?
2. S: Yes. He discovered America.
3. T: So. What does any great undertaking mean?
4. S: Leader, equipment...
5. T: (correcting pronunciation) equipment
7. T: Hmm. When did the idea of travelling around the world appear?
8. S: (Asks in Russian for the question to be repeated)
9. T: Hmm. When did the idea of travelling around the world appear? You can use the text. Find the answer in the text.
10. S: The idea of sailing with boat around the world had appeared almost a thousand years before Columbus.
11. T: Hmm. Good. Why did people go with Columbus? What were the reasons?
12. S: Some went because they love adventure. Some went only because even greater danger awaited them at home.
13. T: Hmm. One more question. What can you tell me about the Pinson's?
14. S: The Pinson's had been the leading sea faring family of palace for many generations. They were ship builders, navigators, merchants, seamen.
15. T: OK. You are expected to speak on planning the daily round. Right?
17. T: OK. Move on.

Part 5

1. T: Is that all?
2. S: Yes.
3. T: Do you always plan your day?
4. S: No. I don't always play (corrects himself) plan my day.
5. T: Why not?
6. S: Because it is difficult. when I plan it's not so.
7. T: Do any of your friends have their timetable?
8. S: Yes. My mother. He work, works in two works.
9. T: (corrects the candidate) she works, yeah?
10. S: (hesitating) Yes. She works.
11. T: What school did you finish?
12. S: School number 58.
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13  T  Hmm. And when did you leave school?
14  S  Two years ago.
15  T  Hmm. I see. Thank you. OK. Now listening comprehension. You can go to the tape recorder.

The number of words in Part 3 of Candidate Two's oral examination is 147. The average number of words per turn is 8.6. The teacher-examiner uses 83 words (56%) and the candidate 64 (44%). The role of the teacher-examiner here is even greater than the role he had in conversation with Candidate One. Part 5 contains 88 words. The average number of words per turn is less than in Part 3 at 5.8. The teacher-examiner delivers more of the dialogue with 50 words (56%) to the candidate's 38 words (43%). In both Part 3 and Part 5, it is the form of the questions which dictates the limited role for the candidate. The question structures promote show factual answers only.

Table 52 shows that Part 3 has five exchanges and contains fifteen moves while Part 5 contains seven exchanges and fifteen moves. The two parts are characterised by an initial question and response as with Candidate One. There are more follow-ups in Part 3 but the teacher-examiner uses these to chastise the candidate who is unable to find the answers quickly enough.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move Types</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-ups (F1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-ups (F2)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 53 indicates that there are fifteen discrete acts carried out by the teacher-examiner in Part 3 and eleven in Part 5. As with Candidate One, the teacher-examiner's style of questioning is basic. In Part 3, he begins the oral examination with a starter which is
negative in tone (Turn 1: 'Well, do you know who Columbus was?') which acts as an indicator of what is to come when he loses patience with the candidate (Turn 9: 'Find the answer in the text'). The teacher-examiner uses back channels in a manner which is both distant from the candidate and which sustains the continuing negative tone of irritation. The dialogue in Part 3 is concluded with a further sign of irritation in the tone of his voice (Turn 15: 'You are expected to speak on planning the daily round. Right?', and Turn 17: 'Move on'). In addition, the teacher-examiner also directs the candidate specifically. In Turn 9, he corrects him and in Turn 15 he states what he is expected to do.

A similar negative tone is adopted in the dialogue for Part 5. The teacher-examiner begins by asking in Turn 1 'Is that all?' in response to the candidate's monologue on a pre-selected topic. He corrects him again in Turn 9. There are some elements of a dialogic nature in this dialogue with references to 'you' but again they are limited in their scope. However, the candidate is unsure in the area of topicalisation. With the text in front of him, he uses the pronoun to replace the noun used in the question heard in Turns 1 & 2 (Part 3) but not in Turns 9 & 10, 11 & 12 or 13 & 14 (all Part 3). The candidate is merely reading from the text. The true nature of the candidate's difficulty with the TL is revealed in Part 5 of the dialogue in Q&A2. In Turns 4 to 6, he uses the pronoun 'he' instead of 'she' with reference to his mother. In Part 5, the length of the sentences contain 1, 8, 10, 9, 3, 4 and 3 words respectively which reveals that Candidate Two shows reluctance and insecurity about speaking English in coherent sentences. Not only does he correct himself (Turns 4 and 8) but he is also corrected by the teacher-examiner (Turn 9). The insecurity also leads him to ask for a question to be repeated but he asks for clarification in the L1 (Turn 8) and not the TL.
Table 53
The Distribution of Acts in Candidate Two’s Oral Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act Types</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elicitations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Correcting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Channel (Mmm)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding through difficulty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dialogue Parts 3 and 5 for Candidate Three

Part 3
1. T  Good. Now answer some questions. Why did all people of palace come to the dock?
2. S  They came to look at three ships.
3. T  Did the young men of palace want to go with Columbus?
4. S  No. They didn't.
5. T  How can you prove it?
6. S  They were hiding in the hills.
7. T  That's right. Was it easy finding crews for the journey?
8. S  No.
9. T  How do you know?
   S  (hesitates)
10. T  Find the right sentence in the text.
11. S  They had to empty the jail to find men for these ships.
12. T  All right. So the final question please. Why did the man have a knife hidden under his shirt?
13. S  He wanted to kill Columbus.
14. T  Well now what is your topic about?
15. S  So it's about nature protection.
16. T  Come on.

Part 5
1. T  Well then. Do you know any international organisations fighting for nature protection?
2. S  Green Peace.
3. T  And speaking about our Republic, do you think that everything is OK as far as ecology is concerned?
4. S  No. Too many plants so lot of horrible pollution.
5. T  Can you give any examples?
6. S  Rivers are dirty, euh. Sometimes we can't swim. A lot of smoke in the air.
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7  T  And what can be done about that?
8  S  Government must make laws.
9  T  Thank you. Now listening comprehension test.

The number of words in Part 3 of Candidate Three's oral examination is 118. The average number of words per turn is 7.3. The teacher-examiner uses 79 words (67%) and the candidate 39 (33%). These figures show that the role of the teacher-examiner in this examination is even greater than that in the previous two examples. Part 5 of the examination contains 77 words. The average number of words per turn is less than in Part 3 at 8.5. Again, the teacher-examiner delivers more of the dialogue with 48 words (62%) to the candidate's 29 words (38%).

Table 52 shows that Part 3 has six exchanges and contains twelve moves, as does Part 5. The two parts are characterised in the same way with the same number of initial questions (4) and responses (4). They also have the same number of follow-ups with two F1 and F2 types. The candidate's responses are all characterised by being extremely short (containing as little as one word).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Move Types</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-ups (F1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-ups (F2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moving on to the nature of the acts in the dialogue, Table 55 shows that there are seventeen in total. In Part 3, there are seven elicitation acts from the teacher-examiner but only short replies are offered by the candidate. The brevity of some of Candidate Three's responses gives cause for concern as there is little opportunity for the teacher-examiner to assess the level of performance of the candidate (see Part 3 Turn 8 or Part 5

281
Chapter Six

Turn 2). The teacher-examiner offers limited support in Part 3 Turn 10. The tone is not aggressive but supportive. Unlike Candidate Two, this candidate is able to substitute pronouns for nouns (see Part 3, Turns 1 & 2, 3 & 4, 12 & 13). In terms of ethnomethodology, there is a limited amount of evidence of natural communication between the two participants (see Part 3 Turns 3 & 4, 7 & 8). In Part 5 of the dialogue, the candidate becomes tentative and unsure of what to say. She answers in phrases rather than in sentences with the length of responses ranging in length between two and fourteen. Pronunciation is also a problem. The words 'affect', 'litter' and 'garbage' are virtually unrecognisable as English words and require multiple play backs on cassette before they are understood. Language errors include 'so lot of' and 'ecologist speak'.

Table 55
The Distribution of Acts in Candidate Two's Oral Examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Act Types</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elicitations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Command</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding through difficulty</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, the three sample oral examinations reveal a shallow depth and narrow range of assessment. The questions asked reflect the same format of questions contained in Abiturientu-96 and in most other UdSU books, as described in the taxonomic survey in Chapter Five. Their style and range are limited and low on Bloom's cognitive scale. In some cases, the questions are worded in such a way that the candidates merely take the relevant section of the passage and read it aloud in order to produce the answer.

The teacher-examiner is pedantic and attempts to control the nature of the dialogue sections as they develop by posing questions in a format which elicits a short factual type
of answer rather than longer more discursive answers. He does not try to put the
candidates at their ease and interrupts too early and too frequently. This conveys the
impression that he is expecting only short answers from the candidates. His tone conveys
a lack of empathy with the candidates and occasionally is abrupt, verging on rude. The
candidates are not keen to talk at length in the dialogue sections. They prefer to supply
short factual answers only. Sometimes their reply is merely one word. They rarely take
the initiative in responding to the teacher-examiner's questions and give the impression
that they feel that they have fulfilled the task set with their brief response.

6.1.3.6 Teacher Assessment

UdSU has no written documentation containing criteria for the assessment of
examination candidates. In practice, the end of year assessment is carried out by one
teacher-examiner. Sometimes two teachers may be present but the FLSP does not have a
consistent policy on this issue and is unable to supply more concrete facts. All teachers
use the same mark scale which contains the traditional Russian five mark boundaries.
UdSU teachers do not use the lowest of these marks because they say that it is not used at
most Russian universities. The marks and their translations are: 5 - отлично (Excellent),
4 - хорошо (Good), 3 - удовлетворительно (Satisfactory), 2 - неудовлетворительно
(Unsatisfactory / Fail), 1 - единица / кол (Total Fail). It is within this framework of
evidence that the material contained in this section should be viewed.

The most obvious impression gained from the three discussions between the teacher-
examiners is that there is little time given to the deliberation about the assessment mark
to be awarded to each candidate. The time taken to assess Candidate One's oral
examination is 20 seconds, for Candidate Two it is slightly longer at 40 seconds but the
length of time taken for Candidate Three is the shortest of all lasting only 15 seconds.
There is no evaluation of the quality of each candidate's performance in the four key
sections of the examination (See Table 56 in the following section for a sample of marks distribution in the FLSP). The final mark of a five (top mark) is awarded by impression marking, using no obvious agreed criteria. In the subsequent, sections the discussion between the two teacher-examiners is transcribed word for word and then analysed.

**Candidate One - Assessment Discussion**

1. Male Teacher
   - So what's your impression?
2. Female Teacher
   - It was a really good answer. Nearly perfect.
3. Male Teacher
   - Yes, his English is fluent enough and accurate. Answered all questions thoroughly and he's been successful in all required skills.
4. Female Teacher
   - Excellent mark?
5. Male Teacher
   - Hmm. Sure. I'd like to have a candidate like that in my group.

(20 Seconds)

In the assessment of Candidate One, in Turn 2, one teacher-examiner says: 'It was a really good answer. Nearly perfect' and then again in Turn 4: 'Excellent mark?' to which the response in Turn 5 is: 'Hmm. Sure. I'd like to have a candidate like that'. From a Western perspective, the answers given by Candidate One are so short and lacking in detail that it is difficult to understand how the teacher-examiners can arrive at such a conclusion and award the top score. The use of such terms as 'nearly perfect' and 'I'd like to have a candidate like that' are therefore ill chosen and should not be used with reference to such a superficial overview of the candidate's performance in the TL.
The discussion of Candidate Two reveals a further insight into the thinking employed by the two teachers. In Turns 2 and 3, the point is made that the candidate is not strong at grammar. They find two reasons why that should be: namely that he has not practised much for two years and that he is nervous (Turn 5). Furthermore they believe that his reading skill is not very good. However they still award Candidate Two the mark 'three' (satisfactory) which is a pass grade. When the analysis of Candidate Two's performance is viewed in the context of the teacher-examiners' comments, the Western observer must ask himself what would merit the score 'two'. There is so little evidence on which to base any proper assessment.
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Candidate Three - Assessment Discussion

1 Male Teacher What do you say?
2 Female Teacher I think good and accurate answer.
3 Male Teacher Very natural English with just a few unimportant mistakes.
4 Female Teacher But with a lack of fluency.
5 Male Teacher So?
6 Female Teacher Good mark, I guess.
7 Male Teacher Right.

(15 Seconds)

There is very little said about Candidate Three before the teacher-examiners award the score 'four' (good). The male teacher-examiner describes the performance as 'very natural English', but their decision is difficult to justify when the candidate's response to one question in Part 3 Turn 8 is the brief reply 'no', and in Part 3 Turn 10 the teacher directs the candidate with the words 'Find the right sentence in the passage' because the candidate is finding it difficult to find an answer to the question posed. In fact, the teacher's comment during the dialogue (Part 3 Turn 10) reveals the real expectation of the teacher-examiners, namely that the candidate must merely find the appropriate passage in the text and read out the sentence aloud in order to produce the correct answer.

In conclusion, the general impression of the teacher-examiners' assessment discussions gives cause for concern. There is no theoretical foundation to their methodology of assessment. In fact, there is evidence that the teacher-examiners have applied no assessment criteria at all. They fail to analyse properly even the limited evidence which the three oral examinations offer them. They reach their decisions through speaking about general impressions and not through focusing on specific examples of content contained within the messages communicated by the candidate. Neither do they pick out specific examples of grammar structures or appropriate language which indicate whether
the candidate can or cannot produce something correctly. The conclusion to be drawn from these sample examinations is that the FLSP exercises little quality control over assessment of FLSP students. Section 6.1.4, which follows, adds further support to the analysis that UdSU lacks a rigorous system of assessment.

6.1.4 Analysis of Marks Awarded by UdSU to FLSP Students
Evidence suggests strongly that there is little chance of a student failing an examination in English. From the 187 results obtained for the year 1997, only five First Year students (3%) failed obtaining the mark unsatisfactory (Given the evidence about the awarding of marks in the previous section, this fact is surprising). Excellent is the most frequently awarded mark, with 90 students (48%). Good is the next most popular with 64 (34%) followed by satisfactory with 28 students (15%). Overall, the mean score is 4.3 out of five and 82% of all candidates scored a four or five. There is little deviation from the mean score and due to the narrow range of assessment marks. Therefore the oral examination cannot be seen as a discriminating test. The evidence presented above about the awarding of marks in the three FLSP oral examinations corroborates this belief because the analysis carried out proves that there is no proper methodological application of any assessment criteria shown in the awarding of those grades.

Table 56 below shows that the marks awarded during the oral examination have four components to them. These areas include topic discussion, reading aloud, translation of a short text and a situational dialogue. Table 56 shows exactly how the aggregate of the four components dictates which overall mark is finally given to a candidate. Where a candidate has two marks of four and two marks of five, then the overall mark of five is awarded (see Candidate G for such an example). The same principle extends to other thresholds such as 3/4, although Table 56 contains no example of this particular variety.
Table 56
Table Showing the Distribution of Scores Obtained in Four Individual Areas by Students in the Philosophy and Sociology Faculty Oral Examinations and their Final Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
<th>Part 4</th>
<th>Part 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evidence from Table 56 suggests that either the candidates in the Philosophy and Sociology Faculty are very strong in the TL or that the assessment criteria have been applied too generously and are not discriminating enough. When this information is combined with the results of the analysis of the three oral examinations, it leads to the obvious conclusion that it is the second of these interpretations which applies. Consequently, the FLSP is awarding marks to candidates for an oral performance which is limited in scope and depth and which does not allow the candidate to develop answers at length. The nature of the assessment is thus superficial and of limited academic value. Strong candidates have no incentive to push themselves to improve their knowledge and performance of the TL because they are almost certainly guaranteed the top mark.
6.1.5 Progress Tests

The five progress tests obtained for analysis are all of a general nature and are therefore not subject specific. There are two tests for First, Second and Third Year levels. Reading copies of these progress tests are available in Appendix 19. 83% of all exercises are structuralist in nature, focusing on individual syntactical and grammatical elements within TL sentences. Within this domain, the results of such 'closed item' tests offer an objectivity which the oral assessment can never achieve. The remaining 17% of exercises are grammar-based translation tasks from the L1 into the TL only.

There is not enough source material available to hypothesise that the material is sequenced in such a manner that there is a gradual shift in the nature of the grammar being tested at each stage. However, there is evidence of overlap. The articles (both definite and indefinite) and quantities (such as 'some' and 'any') appear in First Year tests as well as in the placement tests discussed above. The articles, adjectives and tenses appear in both the First and Second Year tests. The fact that the tests are not subject specific undermines the UdSU claim that its staff teach ESP. These sample tests confirm that knowledge of individual grammatical and syntactical items are still more important than contextualised ESP.

6.1.6 Conclusion to Section 6.1

Based on the evidence gathered during the research period, it is clear that UdSU has methodological problems on two levels. First there are theoretical weaknesses inherent in the structures in place and second, the FLSP is failing to implement fully its own methodology. These areas are dealt with individually in more detail below:

(1) The FLSP's oral interview assessment is representative of the direct system-referenced test. However, the FLSP does not judge its students according to criterion
performance criteria. Therefore an examination performance does not guarantee that the criterion proficiency is to be expected. A firmer construct for validation is required because it is clear that the oral tests do not deliver objective scoring. Furthermore the FLSP's approach to a notional form of continual assessment through a series of progress tests is indicative of indirect system-referenced testing as opposed to a performance-reference test. The teacher seeks to obtain specific information about his students' ability to control certain structures, for example through multiple choice exercises. The main advantage of the 'closed item' type of grammatical test is that it offers an objectivity which the oral examination cannot give. This is particularly poignant for UdSU because of the lack of collectively applied criteria assessment in the end of year oral tests. However, the progress tests have a limited function, given that they are structuralist in nature and focus solely on individual grammatical and syntactical elements.

(2) In written tests, on-going related research at UdSU has found that cheating is endemic and that the design of the multiple choice questions does not assist in the battle against cheating. This appears to be relatively widespread in the former Eastern Europe where the group ethos is to help even the weakest member to pass the examination. An example is found at the University of West Bohemia's Summer School where cheating is the norm during the placement test. By contrast, The International College of Moscow State University (Department of Modern Languages) has introduced an anti-cheating policy in a bid to stop the hitherto endemic cheating among its students. Those in charge of the FLSP appear unwilling to recognise that they too share this problem. Until they recognise that it is widespread at UdSU, they will not be able to take practical steps to tackle the issue.

It must also be stated that the imposition of mixed-ability teaching groups by the FLSP's host faculties can only bring limited success in earlier levels of language learning.
However, at UdSU the gap between the top and bottom end of the ability range is huge, from those who are as good as their teachers (in some cases even better) to those who cannot construct a simple sentence correctly). Such is the system at UdSU that there is no incentive for any student to improve his linguistic performance. Ultimately, all students are assessed on the limited scale of 1-5 regardless of ability. It is easier therefore for an academically able student to remain in a lower ability group. The outcome of this choice means that he scores better than he would if he were to move up a class and have to compete against more able students. The reward for trying harder could therefore lead to a lower mark at the end of an academic year. Consequently, the risk is not worth taking and the quality of learning for that student is lower than it should be.

In conclusion, it is self-evident that the FLSP has failed to tackle the kernel problems which exist in the area of assessment. By failing to tackle the issues on a Faculty-wide basis, the FLSP has allowed an inconsistency of approach in both assessment task setting and marking to become established. So far, different problems have been perceived by individual teachers. There is no established forum for raising such problems which are shared by all teachers in each 'host' faculty. The solutions involve a Faculty-wide policy on assessment task setting and marking and an agreed series of band descriptors to help teachers give a more evenly distributed range of marks, especially in the end of year oral examinations.
6.2 Implementation of the First Year General English Syllabus

The analysis of UdSU's approach to assessment in the previous section offers breadth and depth to the understanding of the current situation in the FLSP. It has been structured in such a manner so that other researchers can learn from the material gathered thus far. The material analysed offers a sound basis on which other researchers can build in the future. In this section, the situation in more recent years in presented. Of particular relevance is how the FLSP has sought to incorporate elements of Western methodological approaches into its teaching and assessment policies. It must be acknowledged that TEMPUS stipulated that such developments should take place in order to receive full financial funding. Therefore the implementation of this syllabus development has come about through UdSU's obligation to TEMPUS. Nevertheless its existence merits close attention as it offers an insight into how Western methodological theories and practices have been received and in some cases implemented within the UdSU context. The following analysis can offer researchers an insight into the difficulties concerning the assimilation of Western concepts into the Russian context and suggest a future way forward. The first key date around which the analysis is framed is August 1997 which marks the period during which the first syllabus was drafted under the direction of TEMPUS. The second date is August 1998 at which time the success of implementation of the First Year General English Syllabus was reviewed and by which date the production of the Second Year syllabuses was complete within each host faculty section.

6.2.1 August 1997 - The Starting Point for Syllabus Design

There is no evidence of syllabus design at UdSU before 1997, except for three short documents produced by the FLSP teachers working in the Faculty of Public Relations (See Appendix 20). These documents are more like pages of content referring to the textbook to be used rather than those of a syllabus. They indicate only the number of
hours of study per week and the focus of the learning skills. There is a short bibliography but there are no notes on teaching methodology. Consequently they do not form part of the subsequent qualitative analysis on the generation of syllabus design at UdSU.

The concept of syllabus design was originally introduced by the TEMPUS project at its conception in 1994. One of the three key aims involved the restructuring of English and German courses at UdSU. The main focus of the project was the production of draft syllabuses for EFL and DaF (Deutsch als Fremdsprache) courses. Due to constraints, there was insufficient time to produce a wholly rounded syllabus. It was also felt at the time that a staged approach to the end product would yield more benefits as there would inevitably be a need for substantial changes to the syllabus which reflected the changing realities of UdSU.

As I was involved in the production of the English syllabus, there is no focus on the contents of the First Year General English syllabus in this research. However what is of concern is the period immediately following the establishment of that syllabus, in particular from August 1997 to July 1998. By tracing the implementation and evolution of the syllabus and the creation of any subsequent syllabuses during that period, it is possible to determine the nature of the UdSU response to outside (namely Western) educational influences and thus to characterise the manner in which these two strands of educational methodology have integrated with each other.

The original aim of the draft syllabus was to create a uniform direction within the Faculty in delivering a standard core of English for General Purposes to all First Year students on entering UdSU. The syllabus had to be flexible enough to cater for the needs of mixed ability teaching as imposed on the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes by all the other faculties. One key objective was to incorporate both Russian materials
and the new teaching materials imported from the West. The first draft came into existence after a series of meetings between myself and a group of eight UdSU teachers during which it was attempted to construct a model for the way forward. As a result of these meetings, an unsatisfactory but nevertheless exemplar model was adopted which allowed the teachers to begin to gather appropriate material and categorise its contents according to the criteria agreed upon. This included a topic-based three-tiered approach (Beginner, Intermediate and Advanced) to the syllabus to meet the varying degrees of ability within each year group of students. This would serve as the model which could be replicated for the creation of subsequent syllabuses during the academic year 1997/98. At this point, it must also be stated that there were severe restrictions imposed on the development of the draft syllabus. First, there were insufficient copies of any single textbook which meant that it was impossible for all teachers to follow the same course book at the same time in their teaching. Hence the need for a more flexible approach was paramount. This meant that a topic based-approach was better as teachers could use different textbooks to cover the same topics simultaneously. Second, the number of class hours varied radically from one subject to another (from two to ten hours per week). The syllabus had to have sufficient material to meet these varying requirements.

In addition, most UdSU teachers were not in a position to avail of the TEMPUS supplied facilities properly. There was (and still is) a serious problem with photocopying. Paper is too expensive in addition to the expenses of ink and toner. Thus the University could not afford to pay for the required amount of photocopying. More recently, some teachers have insisted that their students pay for the relevant section of the course books to be photocopied for their own use but this is not a long term solution.
6.2.2 July 1998 - The First Review of Syllabus Implementation at UdSU

In July, 1998 twenty-five members of staff at the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes were interviewed about their experiences and reactions to the implementation of the new First Year General English Syllabus. From the series of interviews, it became evident that the draft syllabus had been used by only approximately 40% of the teachers and among those, to varying degrees. Those teachers who had followed the syllabus completed between three and seven of the original twelve topics designated for the year. They claimed that it took longer to complete the topics than the two weeks allocated in the year planner. The teachers did not believe that keeping to the syllabus sequence or structure was important. In Psychology, for example, too much time was spent on unit one. Another teacher taught unit seven immediately after unit one. In Mathematics, only four units were completed (People, Future Plans, Lifestyles, Youth Culture). Most teachers felt that more time was needed to develop the syllabus. Of course there were some faculties which did not use the syllabus at all because their teachers felt that it did not meet any of their requirements. Most notably, older teachers were reticent about changing well established habits and continued to use primarily Soviet produced materials from other universities of the former USSR or UdSU in-house publications. Such inconsistencies within the FLSP existed because no attempt had been made by the Dean of the FLSP or the teachers in charge of the English section of the FLSP to ensure that the syllabus was being followed by all or even most of the staff, or that all teachers completed a set amount of core units of the syllabus. In fact, the Dean just required the teachers to get on with drawing up the Second Year Syllabus as TEMPUS insisted that UdSU do so.

In interviews, several new teachers felt that they had needed training or guidance on how to use the syllabus and the new Western materials but none was offered by the FLSP in TEMPUS's absence. Instead, they were left to survive as best they could on their own.
The Sport Faculty, for example, had only one young FLSP teacher, who found it very difficult to come into contact with other more senior and experienced staff. In Philosophy and Sociology, a young teacher was employed in September 1997 as a substitute for an ill teacher. The new teacher was told to complete the Second Year syllabus alone without any guidance about the purpose behind the task. It was also apparent that many teachers did not know what materials were actually available for their own subjects or how they might take Western material and adapt it for their own uses within a certain subject. The History Faculty is one such example. Two teachers required individual instructive sessions in order to grasp how to make use of texts.

A multitude of other complications existed in the FLSP. Among these was still a strong desire among teachers to teach ESP from as early an opportunity as possible. However, teachers within the same host faculty did not agree on which approach to follow. Other teachers were being treated poorly by their host faculties and were restricted in what they could achieve. The Dean of Psychology had taken the language classrooms from the language teachers at the end of the academic year 1997/98 and had not informed them where they would be able to teach from September or even where they could store the equipment required for language teaching, such as videos and cassette recorders. The Dean also insisted that these teachers teach Psychology in English and not English for Psychology, even though the FLSP teachers are linguists and have no qualifications in Psychology.

At the end of June 1998, teachers in Mathematics were informed that their number of contact hours with students would be reduced from four to three at the start of the new academic year. Evidently, the FLSP has very little say in what is happening to each teacher in host faculties. It is impossible to deliver a proper curriculum when the faculty has no direct control over the number of contact hours which can be changed at the whim.
of an individual dean in any faculty. However, there appears to be little desire within the FLSP to tackle this issue.

On a more positive note, among those teachers using the syllabus, many expressed that they found it beneficial to have a framework within which to work as it showed them how to set more realistic aims. One teacher in Public Relations found the syllabus a useful and worthwhile system which helped frame her approach to work. She expressed the desire to complete the list of topics chronologically. In the future, she planned to hold regular meetings at the end of each semester with her colleagues in order to review implementation of the syllabus and to plan future changes. However, this was the view of just one teacher and up until July 1998 she had not embarked upon this process. While some faculties did not adopt the syllabus, a few such as Public Relations did follow the agreed course structure. The teachers developed the syllabus further because they had to find sufficient material to teach the ten hours per week which their students required.

6.2.3 Development of the Second Year Syllabuses for ESP

It was envisaged by TEMPUS that the lessons learnt from the experience of constructing and implementing the First Year General English Syllabus would be the catalyst behind the FLSP’s desire to introduce a syllabus for second year students. Analysis shows that what has remained in the mindset of FLSP teachers in the development of the latter are key UdsU characteristics in the approach to delivering a curriculum. There is a strong desire to shift as quickly as possible to ESP. The following information on the syllabus for Second Year Business supports the above observation. The aim is to shift from 75% General English and 25% Specific English in semester one, to a 50% equal share for each in semester two, followed by a 75%-25% bias in favour of ESP in the third semester. Furthermore, there are many unsubstantiated aspirations expressed through statistics. In the objectives for Lower Intermediate for example, it states that texts can
include a number of unfamiliar words (1-2% per page); the percentage is 3-4% for Intermediate but this seems unrealistic as the texts selected come from Western sources and no evidence exists to indicate that texts have been checked to this degree.

UdSU adheres to the Russian preference for an overly positive and comprehensive approach to defining learning aims is evident. Under the heading of contents, there is a long list of situational functions but these do not match the lists in the individual units. The latter needs to be more discriminating with less overlapping as it means that a student could be taught the same topic, using the same materials in consecutive years by different teachers.

The boundaries between the three levels of learners are blurred by the appearance of the same material in both of the levels Beginner/Intermediate or Intermediate/Advanced. This is evident in the areas of content, activities and grammar with only four new areas added to the end of levels two and three. This implies that the criteria for material selection is flawed. Furthermore, there is no hard evidence to support the opinion that distinctions in the approach to teaching are being applied in practice. In reality, the embryonic syllabus from August 1997 should have been categorised further and a sequence of gradually more difficult lessons established for each unit.

Key developmental and implementation problems still exist at several levels. For example, the teachers were simply 'conscripted' into the work on syllabus design without any knowledge of what the concept of syllabus meant. The production of the syllabuses was seen merely as a task which had to be completed in order to please TEMPUS and was handed down by the Dean of the FLSP as extra unpaid work to specific individuals.
A worse situation was found in the Faculty of History. A new teacher started in August 1997 and was told for the first time on that day which classes and how many she would teach. She was given a textbook (published in 1977) and told to use it as the main book in the Second Year History classes. She had nobody supervising her or telling her when or how to assess. In January she was given the task of completing the Second Year Syllabus within one month on top of her normal teaching load and without any guidance. Naturally, her syllabus was based on the same 1977 publication with no material from the TEMPUS funded supplies being selected.

The draft approach of the First Year General English Syllabus was simply repeated (often badly) by all faculties as if it were the definitive model. There was clear evidence that no proper review had ever taken place on the latter and therefore no clear aims existed for the completion of the Second Year Syllabuses. Contrary to the statements made in the preamble of the new syllabus, no evidence has been gathered through questionnaires or discussions within the faculty to clarify what material works and what does not and whether the overall timetable for the syllabus needs to be adjusted.

This same pattern is repeated for all faculties except Mathematics. This syllabus is short but well ordered and therefore of use. This syllabus shows several signs of progressive methodology in syllabus design. For instance, the use of the internet is obligatory with one such class every two weeks. Some tests have also been created on the University computer network. The scheme was in place and ready to be applied from September 1998.
Assessment was only dealt with in a minor capacity when the original draft syllabus was constructed due to the time constraints imposed in August 1997. As indicated elsewhere in this research, there were inconsistencies between teachers when awarding marks. Frequently, this was due to a lack of agreed principles for application of the traditional mark system. What was suggested at the time were potential ways forward for the FLSP. The focus of this section is therefore the approach to assessment throughout the entire FLSP. The following information has been drawn through interviews and observations. A request was made for a copy of the results and examination papers for the academic year 1997-1998 but this was not met. Therefore the findings given below are based only on the evidence which was available.

There is no evidence of quality control in assessment at UdSU even though many teachers did learn about it while on mobilities in the West. While there is talk of double marking and external examination, there is no supporting evidence that this happens. Those in charge appear to do nothing to ensure standardisation in quality of teaching, marking or formal assessment. In July 1997, a proposal was put forward which retained the Russian grading system but which at the same time attempted to introduce norm-referencing by restricting the allocation of the top marks in order to give a more just range of marks. It was constructed in a basic manner in order to start debate on a hitherto undiscussed topic with the aim of encouraging a broader distribution of marks with the following descriptors:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Result</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - excellent</td>
<td>top 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - very good</td>
<td>next 30 - 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - quite good to good</td>
<td>pass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - poor</td>
<td>fail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - very poor</td>
<td>fail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time, the introduction of a band descriptor scale was suggested as a possible alternative or extra support for the above criteria. However, it is clear that neither of these proposals were ever adopted. There have been negative consequences as a result of the failure to tackle this issue. Procedure at UdSU oral examinations is such that the students are told immediately whether they have passed or failed with no second teacher-examiner present. One new teacher in the Faculty of Public Relations awarded the top mark of 5 to all his students. His colleagues did not do the same. However, as he had already informed the students at the end of the examination of their mark, the marks could not be adjusted. Consequently, his teaching group obtained much higher grades than the other teaching groups within the Faculty. This experience has led to a change in the Faculty of Public Relations' approach to oral examinations. Since September 1998, one senior teacher is meant to attend all oral examinations to ensure parity of assessment but there is insufficient evidence to confirm whether this practice has been adhered to completely.

Normally, it can be expected that a performance-related direct test gives a meaningful assessment performance of the candidate. Criterion-referencing can work if the range of expected outcomes is discussed and agreed upon in advance. However, where this does not occur naturally, steps must be taken to bring about immediate change. In UdSU it is more difficult to introduce criterion referencing. However, norm-referencing is more easily established and could serve as a short term solution to a long-existing problem.
huge discrepancy exists in the limited range of marks available to teachers and UdSU's refusal to use labels to indicate the level of proficiency achieved by students. Students are well aware of this and realise that it is wiser to perform below standard at the start of the year in order to be categorised with a lower level of ability. The reason for this is simple. In large faculties, where classes can run simultaneously and a student is good enough, he can be moved up into a better group. Under the present system it pays for a student to remain in a lower class and only work for the examination rather than move up to a higher class and end up scoring a lower mark. The following proposed criteria for assessment of accuracy levels in the Faculty of Public Relations confirm this last point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>80-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>70-80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>60-70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clearly easier for a student to be less accurate in Group C and score a higher mark than it would be to obtain the same mark in the more able Group A. Therefore there is no motivational incentive for the student to improve on his performance.

6.2.5 Conclusion to Section 6.2

UdSU is experiencing problems in the implementation of the First Year General English Syllabus and the creation of the Second Year ESP Syllabuses. The reasons include: (1) a lack of time to adjust to the new teaching environment in which the FLSP now finds itself post-TEMPUS, and (2) a lack of drive from those in charge to implement change. It is accepted that the teachers have already experienced substantial change during the four years of contact with the TEMPUS partner universities. They have been obliged to review their perceptions of how language learning occurs best. Older teachers now find
that what they have taught for over thirty years in some cases, is no longer relevant for the current environment. Many believe that they need time to consolidate what has been gained so far. However, it is not justifiable that the FLSP uses this fact for not wanting to implement further change at present. UdSU is in a competitive market in Izhevsk since the establishment of a new private fee-paying university. Already, several FLSP staff have started to work for the new university because the rate of pay is double the salary paid by UdSU. If the FLSP does not wish to lose its best and (often younger) teachers to wealthier and more forward-thinking competitors, then it must act to implement change now. If it fails to do so, more teachers will be forced to leave. The training and experience gained through contact with the TEMPUS partners will then be lost to other tertiary institutions. In time, UdSU could find its status as the main university in Izhevsk challenged because more students will attend other more forward-thinking universities. Once this happens, UdSU’s state funding will be reduced even further.

6.3 Conclusion to Chapter Six

There are several key findings which can be drawn from this longitudinal survey. It is evident that the influence of Russian educational methodologies remains strong but there is proof that the application of these theories is not always exploited to the full. With the arrival of TEMPUS, the dominance of Russian educational methodology is waning as access to Western teaching materials increases. The Western materials are being used with varying degrees of success and not always in the way in which the Western authors originally intended. Simultaneously, these materials are beginning to have an effect on the FLSP’s teachers' perceptions about EFL teaching. This began with the improvement in the presentation of UdSU produced material and has spread into greater use of a more varied range of teaching resources. These include the use of more TL focused texts, music, videos, listening cassettes or computer assisted language learning. The present
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situation is an evolving one which is an amalgam of both traditional Russian and increasing Western influences.

UdSU's role in the field of FL assessment methodology has an inherent contradiction. It is both (a) less progressive than its Western counterparts and some Russian universities and (b) more progressive than the feeder schools which supply UdSU with its students. Further specification of these two issues is given below:

(a) Measurement and judgement are essential features of a pattern of assessment but the adopted approach to the measurement of the oral assessment at UdSU is questionable. As there are no agreed criteria for the teachers, there is no objective format of assessment and inconsistencies occur. The judgement of the teacher-examiners is blurred. Therefore the latter are sources of unreliability. As the FLSP does not use either criterion-referencing or norm-referencing in its assessment, there is no proper quality control of assessment on-going. The validity of a test is dependent on the purposes for which it serves. It is intended to allow decisions to be taken either about the success of the course taught or the ability of the students who have been taught the course but not both simultaneously. The UdSU tests, in all their various manifestations, appear to achieve neither of these. The lack of desire to introduce norm-referencing as an intermittent solution for over-generous marking indicates a lack of willingness to really solve the long-standing problems with assessment. While norm-referencing is a crude and unsophisticated way of awarding grades, it is effective as it ensures a balanced distribution. It would be ideal for the present state of affairs in the FLSP at UdSU until a more appropriate methodological approach was developed.

(b) The issues facing the FLSP in assessment are not just an internal matter. They have much wider ramifications. In particular, the FLSP could influence the teaching and assessing methodologies of the many feeder schools to the University. Such a future role in the dissemination of new or up-dated methodologies beckons, if the FLSP chooses to
grasp the opportunity. As described earlier in this chapter, there is a degree of resistance within the FLSP to change, particularly among the older teaching population. This resistance may be presumed to be stronger, and due to the geographical spread of feeder schools, more disparate among secondary teachers who have had much less contact with the West, if any at all. The dichotomy facing the FLSP is aptly expressed by one of its teachers as follows in an E-mail (August 1999):

Those who take the Entrance Exam in English don't have anything against the structure as far as I know, but I also know that school teachers don't like the topics and say that they don't have such topics in their syllabus. Once I had such a discussion with the teachers, and listened to their complaints about topics, and said "You don't have them, then take. It's much better to discuss the problems of suicides for example (there is one topic- Samaritans and the same organisations in Russia.), or let's say to talk about the use of leisure than to study the biography of V. I. Ulyanov-Lenin, and to talk about October Socialist revolution.(all the old books are full of such rubbish).

The FLSP could hold the same pivotal role in the field of FL methodological developments for ESP in Udmurtia if those in charge were to take the initiative and consciously spread responsibility within the Faculty. In particular, younger teachers need to be brought into the decision making process if plans for the future evolution of the FLSP's teaching methodologies are to be realised. Only when the FLSP takes the decision to carry out a battery of trial testing and pilots new forms of teaching and assessing for its own purposes, will true progress be made.
CHAPTER SEVEN - QUANTITATIVE RESEARCH FINDINGS

The quantitative findings of this chapter both enhance the qualitative evidence gathered in Chapter Six and provide a different insight into the teaching methodologies at UdSU. The focus in this chapter is on the issues of perception and attitude. The analysis shows how the FLSP teachers perceive their own teaching given that the practical implementation of theoretical teaching methodologies is not always guaranteed. The results from Questionnaire 1 are analysed directly with the findings of the taxonomic survey in Chapter Five and also the qualitative findings on the FLSP's assessment methodology and practice, described in Chapter Six. The results obtained from the FLSP's students' perceptions of their teachers' lessons in Questionnaire 2 offer a further degree of comparison. As the key aim of this research is focused on the issue of whether there is quality in the ESP teaching at UdSU, it is essential that the students' perceptions of the practical implementation of teaching methodologies are noted and analysed. The third crucial component in this qualitative analysis is the direct or indirect effect which the FLSP teaching methodologies have had on the Faculty's students. The evidence gained from Questionnaire 3 enriches and strengthens the overall framework of evidence gathered about UdSU's ESP teaching.
7.1 Analysis and Discussion of Teacher Perception Questionnaire (Q1)

In the Table 57 below, the rank column indicates the order of most frequently used teaching techniques employed by the UdSU teachers, with the question number (Qu. No.) entry referring back to the task's original position on Questionnaire 1. The column entitled 'mean' constitutes the sum total of points awarded to each task as explained above, divided by the total number of respondents and then rounded off to the last two decimal places. Consequently, a score of 4 or more implies that a task is used almost every day by most teachers. A score of 3 or above indicates that a task is used at least weekly by the majority of teachers while a score of 2 or above suggests that an activity is introduced by the teacher at least once a month. A score between 1 and 2 reveals that these tasks are less favoured by the teaching staff and anything falling below the score of 1 means that a majority of teachers choose not to employ a certain teaching technique at all. This point system also permits us to compare each individual teacher's teaching profile with the 'average' teacher's profile as calculated below.
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Table 57

Rank Order of Most Favoured Classroom Tasks at UdSU

The abbreviations used below in the column headed ‘Skill’ represent Speaking (S), Listening (L), Reading (R), Writing (W), Grammar (GR), Learning (LR) and Translation (TR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Short structured conversations in English with a partner</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Listening to English on the tape recorder</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Answering questions on a text</td>
<td>R / W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Answering orally the teacher’s questions about a text</td>
<td>S / W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Translating from English to Russian</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Looking up words in a Russian/English English/Russian dictionary</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Completing grammar exercises</td>
<td>GR / W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translating from Russian to English</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Repeating words aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Learning lists of words</td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acting out conversations with a partner in front of the class</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Reading articles on their specialist topic</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Learning conversations</td>
<td>S / LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Copying from the board</td>
<td>R / W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Answering true or false questions on a text</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Learning facts about Great Britain/other English speaking countries</td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Making up a story</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Learning grammar rules</td>
<td>GR / LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Learning verbs</td>
<td>GR / LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Looking up the meaning of English words in an English dictionary</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Watching films in English</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chanting texts aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reading about Great Britain</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Listening to the teacher read a text aloud</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Reading about the United States</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reading English magazines</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Writing about what they did</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Writing about themselves</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reading about Russia in English</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Writing a letter</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Writing about anything to do with Russia</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chanting grammar rules after the teacher (in Russian)</td>
<td>GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Doing a project on an aspect of British life</td>
<td>R / W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Making a recording of students in English onto a cassette</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talking to a native speaker</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean scores for the tasks listed in Table 57 have the following rank order:

1. Translation (3.74),
2. Listening (2.97),
3. Learning (2.95),
4. Speaking (2.74),
5. Reading (2.58),
6. Grammar (2.57),
7. Writing (2.33).

The mode is the range of 3-4, the median falls within the range 2-3 and the mean is 2.63. Table 58 shows the distribution of these results in tabular form according to each individual skill. Where a task applies to two separate skill categories it has been counted twice. The same application of logic has been adhered to throughout all sections.

The most preferred skill is translation but it is followed closely by listening which occupies three of the four most favoured activities. Two of these are shared with speaking which implies that UdSU students are keen on spoken interaction in the TL. The least favoured skill is writing. It occupies five of the bottom nine skill-based tasks listed in Table 57. This evidence is further supported by the results in Table 58 which displays that translation, listening, learning and speaking are the more favoured skills whereas reading, grammar and writing are the least favoured skills. In the following sections, tasks in each individual skill are ranked according to preference for further analysis. The order in which the skills are analysed follows the rank order of Table 58 below.

Table 58
Table Showing the Distribution of Skill Rankings for Questionnaire 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>0 - 1</th>
<th>1 - 2</th>
<th>2 - 3</th>
<th>3 - 4</th>
<th>4 - 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7.1.1 Translation

Table 59 shows that for non-specialists, translation from the TL into the L1 (Q27) is a strongly favoured classroom activity with six teachers stating that they employ this activity in each lesson and another eleven doing so in virtually every class. What is surprising, are the twelve teachers (over half the teaching population surveyed) who make their students translate from the L1 to the TL (Q26) as frequently as the reverse. Six choose this strategy less frequently but two UdSU staff actually do this more. It is therefore true to say that the term 'translation' in the FLSP at UdSU means translation both ways. In 20 out of 22 cases, translation from the L1 to the TL forms a part of the weekly scheme of learning activities which indicates a strong preference for an analytical approach to language. The data concerning translation into the TL confirms that UdSU teachers follow the Russian educational traditions of focusing on syntactical, grammatical and morphological aspects of the TL. While passive recognition of the same aspects are of value in ESP learning, it is questionable whether they have as great an importance for active reproduction skills.

Table 59
Table Showing the Rank Order of Translation Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Translating from English to Russian</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translating from Russian to English</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.2 Listening

The greater range of listening material available to the staff can be attributed to the new materials supplied by TEMPUS. Hitherto, the department had no access to modern authentic listening materials. As a substitute, the teacher simply read the text or dialogue aloud. The lack of authenticity was further hindered by the linguistic ability of the teacher involved including pronunciation, intonation, speed, fluency and understanding.
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Given the increased availability of authentic TL texts, it is not surprising that the questionnaire analysis indicates a strong preference for cassette-based listening work among all 22 teachers every week. Having had a lack of not just authentic but any type of listening material, the teachers compensate to a certain degree for the lack of student access to native speakers (Q9). Despite the availability of cassettes, ten teachers still choose to read texts aloud at least once per week (Q11). This can be explained in many ways through lesson observation and interviews with teachers as follows: in some cases the teachers still choose to use material which they have used pre-TEMPUS because they find it more comfortable to do so. This is particularly the case with more established teachers who have developed their own teaching styles and prefer to continue using them where appropriate, as in the case with the Intensive Method.

Video work is infrequently used in the classroom. While every teacher indicates a minimum use of videos, it may appear that the teachers are using video work as an integrated aspect of their teaching strategy. 13 indicate that they do so on a weekly basis as part of an integral teaching strategy (Q10) but observations have revealed that video usage is restricted almost exclusively to the viewing of films which the students may choose to finish watching after class. From a student perspective the desire to watch films in the TL is understandable as most cannot have enough exposure to Western culture and entertainment. While this kind of TL exposure has a value in any language learning approach, it should not be allowed to dominate. There is a definite risk that this could become the sole form of TL teaching for some classes as there is no Faculty control of an individual teacher's classroom teaching.

The remaining four strategies (listed in Table 60 below), which involve listening, may be regarded as a by-product of the skill of speaking. They can be divided into two sets: (i) the short term memory focused act (Q4 and Q5) of repeating words and sentences after
the teacher (the latter of these is a strategy used in the Intensive Method for committing material to memory), and (ii) the interactive skill required to follow another speaker in the TL and respond logically. With such little opportunity to speak to a native speaker (Q1) - in many cases this has not yet happened - the students first learn to repeat and learn dialogues which they then reproduce in part or whole in 'open' dialogue (Q2 and Q7). This reflects the Russian theoretical notion of moving from conscious to unconscious mastery of the TL. At no stage, however, do the students have exposure to speech which equates to full native-speaker spontaneity of expression. Their first trip to an English speaking country or an international environment where English is the lingua franca would expose this gap. The only attempt at creating this kind of spontaneity occurs when the teacher asks the class questions about a text (Q6). However, the evidence from classroom observations and the taxonomy analysis in Chapter Five confirms that the questions asked by the teacher are merely those listed in the exercises in the UdSU books. This style of questioning follows an impersonal pattern which focuses on who, what, when, why and where. Since 1997, however, some older teachers and most of their younger colleagues have begun to develop a style of questioning which requires a more personal response from the students. For example, the student is asked to explain or give an opinion on an aspect of the article (See Table 38 in Chapter Six, concerning UdSU's Entrance Examination Preparatory book in 1996).

### Table 60
Table Showing the Rank Order of Listening Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Short structured conversations in English with a partner</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Listening to English on the tape recorder</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Answering orally the teacher's questions about a text</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Repeating words aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acting out conversations with a partner in front of the class</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Watching films in English</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chanting texts aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Listening to the teacher read a text aloud</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talking to a native speaker</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning opposes what Krashen refers to as acquisition. It involves an activation of the conscious side of the brain. While Russian theory rejects that its definition of conscious learning is not similar to Skinner's Behaviourist model, the evidence gleaned from Table 57 and classroom observations contradicts at least in part what the Russian theorists have stated. The UdSU students are simply taught to manipulate language in a way in which they are not able to make the language their own because these techniques do not provide them with the opportunity to generate language organically for personal communication.

Learning conversations (Q32), grammar rules (Q33) and verbs (Q30) are ranked 13th, 18th and 19th respectively in Table 61. All three represent a strong indication of the high value attributed to memory exercises. The chanting of texts (Q5) still remains a favourite technique for several teachers (as employed primarily in the Intensive Method). Two teachers (9%) use text-chanting everyday, a further five at least twice per week and three others once weekly. From this can be deduced that 45% of the population surveyed use the Intensive Method or at least elements of it on a weekly basis. Conversely, seven teachers (32%) do not use the technique at all. There is a clear divergence of style in the teachers' use of this strategy.

Rote learning still plays an important role in language learning at UdSU for verbs, word lists and grammar rules, with vocabulary learning being the most preferred of the latter. 19 teachers state that this element is used on a weekly basis. Only one teacher does not do so. The results in Table 61 clearly show that a substantial number of the teachers advocate rote learning as a crucial element in language learning. This point is further corroborated in the section concerning homework (See Table 67) where a high level of preference for vocabulary learning is shown. Eleven teachers give a vocabulary learning
homework after every lesson and a further ten do so at least once per week (Q36) and learning grammar also holds an important position in the weekly class cycle (Q37).

Table 61  
Table Showing the Rank Order of Learning Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Learning lists of words</td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Learning conversations</td>
<td>S / LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Learning facts about Great Britain/other English speaking countries</td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Learning grammar rules</td>
<td>GR / LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Learning verbs</td>
<td>GR / LR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.4 Speaking

Oral communication occupies three of the top ten ranks (Q2, Q6 and Q4) in Table 57. In the latter of these activities (Q4) there is little freedom to use language independently as the teacher makes the students recite words after him or answer questions orally. Short structured conversations (Q2) are the most popular of all tasks, with 21 teachers availing of the method weekly, but at UdSU the approach is teacher-centred. Any linguistic freedom gained is limited and therefore of negligible value. The same is true of oral comprehensions (Q6), though it remains a weekly choice for 86% of the teachers. In the quantitative findings of Chapter Six, it has been demonstrated that in UdSU oral examinations, the students are required merely to find and say aloud a sentence in the text which answers the question directly. There is no need to manipulate the structure of the sentence because the questions have been formulated so that the text already contains the exact wording of the answer required. It can be assumed here that this is the same practice.

Table 64 below illustrates that the more basic method of oral repetition plays a significant role in the teaching strategies used by some FLSP teachers. Repeating words aloud after the teacher is practised by 17 teachers on a weekly basis (Q4). 11 teachers do
so at least twice per week. The significance of these results is further enhanced when compared with the results on chanting texts aloud (Q5) and chanting grammar rules (Q8). The chanting of rules is done primarily in the L1. Ten teachers instruct their students to chant texts aloud every week as an integral part of their teaching strategy, with nine of them also using word repetition. Three of this same group also use chanting of grammar rules each week while nine never use chanting as a method. Such activities are memory based exercises and are being used in accordance with Russian educational theory which places emphasis on mnemonics as an integral element in FL learning. However, such tasks are not necessarily appropriate for teaching ESP. By implication, the teaching of ESP presupposes that the learner has already mastered the basics of the TL. UdSU's failure to reflect this assumption in its teaching methodology leads to two possible interpretations. Either (i) the materials used and teaching strategies employed by the teachers are inappropriate for the TL level of the students, or (ii) the TL level of the students is not good enough for other more difficult material. There is little evidence of authentic usage of TL at UdSU, as defined by Western specialists. In fact, the techniques used indicate that the level of linguistic challenge for students in oral skills is low. There is almost total teacher control with the only real sign of independence being the acting out of dialogues (Q7) which is done weekly by only ten teachers.

The remaining two tasks listed in Table 62 are peripheral to UdSU's teaching methodologies but their presence still merits a brief comment. Eleven teachers never allow their students to record dialogues onto cassette (Q3) and the remaining eleven do so only once or twice per year. Similarly, ten teachers have never had a native speaker in their class while the remaining twelve have only had this opportunity once in a year. Evidently access to foreign guests is limited to the few Western academics who visit as part of the TEMPUS project.
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Table 62
Table Showing the Rank Order of Speaking Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Short structured conversations in English with a partner</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Answering orally the teacher's questions about a text</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Repeating words aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acting out conversations with a partner in front of the class</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Learning conversations</td>
<td>S / LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chanting texts aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Making a recording of students in English onto a cassette</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talking to a native speaker</td>
<td>S / L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.5 Reading

Despite its slightly poorer overall ranking of sixth among all skills in Table 58, reading still occupies a substantial amount of teaching time. Table 63 contains a more varied range of activities available which reflects its relevance in the UdSU context, as shown in the taxonomy findings in Chapter Five. All 22 teachers indicate that reading comprehension is an activity which is done on a weekly basis. Eighteen (82%) do so more often than once per week (Q20).

Five teachers encourage their students to read English magazines and newspapers weekly (Q12). Sources used in the past were very limited. These may have included a single copy of a publication. At present, it remains difficult to acquire up-to-date TL resources but with greater opportunities to travel, more materials from a broader range of sources (including articles for ESP teaching) are reaching Izhevsk. The Internet is a useful source of material also but there has been only limited academic usage of it thus far. However, it is fair to state that the teachers are clearly giving their students more opportunities to read authentic TL publications than ever before.

The culture of this material is more international than specifically British or American as only five teachers indicate that texts based on British and American cultures are used
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each week (Q13 and Q14). With four teachers using information on GB and the USA equally, there are only two other teachers who use TL culture-based source material each week (9%). This represents a very small proportion of the total teaching work force. A total of five teachers only use such material once per year. By contrast, three teachers use more texts on Russia than on the TL culture while eight others indicate that they use reading material on Russia to an equal degree as they avail of texts based on TL culture. This had always been a tradition in the past as teachers had no access to up-to-date TL publications. The continuation of this practice is revealing because the pattern complies with the Russian tradition of removing one less complication for the TL learner in the early stages by avoiding material set in the TL culture which is alien to the TL learner. However, this should not be the case for university undergraduates studying a TL for specific purposes. Herein lies the dichotomy between what the UdSU teachers profess in conversation that they do and what they actually use as teaching strategies (as indicated in their responses to Questionnaire 1). Only two possible interpretations arise: either (i) they are teaching the wrong material or (ii) their students are of a lower ability than required to teach LSP English according to Western standards. The argument in favour of (ii) is further strengthened by the finding that only thirteen teachers use specialised texts with their students despite the title of their classes. (Q19) A further eight do so only on a monthly basis and one (Teacher U) states that she never chooses this activity. The same conclusion was reached in Chapter Six after analysing the Entrance Examination Preparatory Book, published by UdSU in 1996.

Copying work from the board (Q21) also appears to comply with the same pattern above. It is a preferred option for thirteen teachers. Normally, it is more a strategy for use at secondary level but the problems and expenses connected with photocopying make the use of the board a reliable and cheap method. Therefore no further interpretation can be made of this finding.
Sixteen teachers allow their students to use a bilingual dictionary in almost every class with twelve of the latter also making use of an English monolingual dictionary (Q17 and Q18). In most cases, students may have their own small bilingual dictionary. However, it is hypothesised that Q18 has been answered incorrectly by some teachers as no evidence of this practice has been noted during lesson observations. This may be an example of what was mentioned earlier: namely a desire to be seen to do the right thing. This fact does not undermine the validity of the other findings arising from this questionnaire. As a result of the multi-layered approach to this research, evidence from one source is only confirmed when found in at least two others.

Table 63
Table Showing the Rank Order of Reading Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Answering questions on a text</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Looking up words in a Russian/English/English/Russian dictionary</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Reading articles on their specialist topic</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Copying from the board</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Answering true or false questions on a text</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Looking up the meaning of English words in an English dictionary</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reading about Great Britain</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Reading about the United States</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reading English magazines</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reading about Russia in English</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Doing a project on an aspect of British life</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.6 Grammar

Grammar has a prominent role in the weekly teaching at the FLSP. The statistics contained in Table 64 disclose that most teachers focus on it as an individual skill several times each week. Primarily they use the technique of rote learning. In Q28, three teachers use grammar exercises each day. Eleven do so several times per week and a further five once per week. Only three teachers use grammar exercises once a month.
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There is an inconsistent overall picture of evidence about how grammar is taught in the FLSP. Teacher F, for example, indicates that she has a grammar based approach to teaching by choosing the letter category A for Q28, Q30 and Q33 respectively. At the other end of the spectrum, teacher B states that she never uses any of the four specified activities. Therefore her teaching style does not reflect the general approach of the Faculty at all. The laissez-faire attitude of those in charge of the FLSP means that such discrepancies have not been noted or dealt with.

Table 64
Table Showing the Rank Order of Grammar Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Completing grammar exercises</td>
<td>GR/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Learning grammar rules</td>
<td>GR/LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Learning verbs</td>
<td>GR/LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chanting grammar rules after the teacher (in Russian)</td>
<td>GR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.7 Writing

From Table 65 it is evident that the dominant skill between the lower ranks of 26 and 35 is writing. The majority of teachers give their students the chance to make up stories regularly with fifteen responses indicating a frequency of at least once per week (Q24). There is a strong contrast with letter writing (Q25). Five teachers never employ the strategy, another five do so once a year and nine only once per month. Only three teachers use letter writing weekly, two once per week and one in every lesson. Furthermore, students do not often get the opportunity to write on a personal level with only two respondents giving their students the chance to write about themselves (Q22) and four respondents allowing their students to write about what they did each week (Q23).

Six teachers never let their students write about Russia in class, with a further eight restricting that work to at most once per year, four once per month, one once per week
and two more than once per week. The latter is still more popular than any form of project work on TL culture (Q33). Eleven teachers have never explored this approach, a further four only introduce this to class once each year, but the remaining seven do so to some degree once per month.

Table 65
Table Showing the Rank Order of Writing Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Answering questions on a text</td>
<td>R / W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Completing grammar exercises</td>
<td>GR / W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Copying from the board</td>
<td>R / W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Making up a story</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Writing about what they did</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Writing about themselves</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Writing a letter</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Writing about anything to do with Russia</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Doing a project on an aspect of British life</td>
<td>R / W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.8 Multi-Skilled Activities

There is a stronger preference for multi-skilled activities with a mean of 2.95 as opposed to the mean of 2.58 for the remaining single-skilled activities (See Table 66). Tasks involving both speaking and listening are more popular than those involving just reading and writing with a mean of 3 as opposed to 2.71. Interestingly, the mean for reading and writing activities is still higher than that for any single skilled activities.
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Table 66
Table Showing the Rank Order of Multi-Skilled Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Short structured conversations in English with a partner</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Answering questions on a text</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Answering orally the teacher's questions about a text</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Completing grammar exercises</td>
<td>GR/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Repeating words aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acting out conversations with a partner in front of the class</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Learning conversations</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Copying from the board</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Learning grammar rules</td>
<td>GR/LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Learning verbs</td>
<td>GR/LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chanting texts aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Doing a project on an aspect of British life</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talking to a native speaker</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.1.9 Homework

The mean score from the activities listed in Table 67 is 3.03 with a median of 3.52. Homework is used to consolidate classwork activities at UdSU. There is a clear preference for the traditional Russian FL strategies of learning (Q36 and Q37), comprehension work (Q38) and translation (Q41). They all serve to consolidate the same work covered during teaching.

Table 67
Table Showing the Rank Order of Homework Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Learning vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Translating sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Answering questions from the textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Learning grammar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Revising for a test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Writing an essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Reading a magazine article</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.10 Analysis of Individual Teachers' Responses

Tables 68 and 69 show that there is clear evidence of a variation in the teaching styles at the FLSP. This ranges from teachers who use a wide variety of tasks to those who use less than half that range. There is a degree of polarisation within the UdSU teaching group. The majority of teachers use a similar range of tasks while a minority offer very little variation to their students. Among this group, Teacher V uses only short structured conversations (Q2) and listening to English on the cassette recorder every day (Q9). Teacher U uses dictionary work (Q17) and learning verbs (Q30) every day. Teacher T uses articles for specialist reading (Q19) each day but no other tasks are used each day.

An overview of the findings confirms that only one teacher (Teacher E) uses all 35 techniques at some stage during the academic year. Three teachers (C, G and H) use 34 of the tasks, two (A and D) use 33, four (F, J, O and T) use 32, three (B, I and J) use 31 and three (L, M and P) use 30 of the techniques. These sixteen teachers (73% of all teachers surveyed) are equal to or above the group mean of 30 tasks. This means that the remaining six (27%) all use less of these tasks than the mean of all of their colleagues. Teachers P and V (with 29 each), Teacher N (with 28) and Teacher R (with 27) just fall outside the mean which is within normal bounds. However, Teacher S (with 22) and Teacher U (with 18) use a much more limited range of tasks. There is no single activity which Teacher S employs each lesson, while Teacher U encourages students to use a dictionary (Q17) and to learn verbs (Q30) in every lesson.

There are six questions which have only one top score of five out of the entire teacher population. Three of those were chosen by one teacher alone, namely Teacher F (The other teachers who are alone in teaching a specific strategy every day are Teachers C, E and G respectively). In the four questions with two top scores only, Teacher F features again once. Teacher F clearly has an individual style of teaching, focusing on the skill of
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reading (Q13, Q14) of TL culture (reading about Great Britain and the United States) and working with grammar (Q33 and Q28). She also likes her students to learn lists of words (Q31) and verbs (Q30) as well as focusing on dictionary work (Q17 and Q18).

At the other end of the spectrum are Teachers P, S and U, who are the only three teachers who do not focus on TL culture: reading about Great Britain and the United States (Q13 and Q14) and learning facts about Great Britain and other English speaking countries (Q34). Both Teachers S and U are the only staff who do not use oral reading comprehension with their students (Q6). Teacher U does not get his students to repeat words aloud after her (Q4), nor allow the students to act out conversation in front of the class (Q7).

Table 68

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q5</th>
<th>Q6</th>
<th>Q7</th>
<th>Q8</th>
<th>Q9</th>
<th>Q10</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q12</th>
<th>Q13</th>
<th>Q14</th>
<th>Q15</th>
<th>Q16</th>
<th>Q17</th>
<th>Q18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>0 5 2 5 5 5 3 0 5 3 2 2 2 2 4 4 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1 5 1 5 4 5 4 3 5 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1 5 0 5 4 5 4 4 4 5 3 5 3 4 4 4 2 5 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0 5 2 5 4 5 4 0 5 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 4 4 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1 4 0 5 4 5 4 3 3 3 1 4 3 3 2 1 4 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>0 5 0 3 3 3 2 1 3 3 3 2 2 2 5 5 2 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>0 5 0 5 1 4 3 2 5 3 3 2 2 2 2 2 5 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>1 4 1 3 3 5 4 2 3 3 2 1 2 2 3 3 1 5 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1 4 2 2 0 3 3 0 5 3 2 2 3 3 1 5 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>1 4 1 4 0 3 4 2 5 2 3 2 1 2 1 1 5 4 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>1 5 4 0 5 5 2 0 3 2 2 3 2 2 3 0 2 5 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>0 4 0 3 2 3 4 4 0 5 3 3 2 2 4 3 2 3 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1 5 1 2 0 3 4 0 5 3 0 2 1 1 2 2 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>1 5 1 2 0 3 4 0 5 3 0 2 1 1 2 2 5 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>0 3 0 4 0 4 3 4 3 1 3 3 2 1 1 2 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>1 4 0 4 4 4 4 1 5 1 3 1 0 0 0 2 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>1 4 2 4 0 4 4 0 4 4 2 0 2 2 1 0 3 2 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>0 4 0 3 0 4 3 0 3 2 0 0 1 1 1 3 3 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>0 4 2 3 3 0 3 0 4 3 0 3 0 0 0 3 4 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>0 2 0 4 2 4 2 2 3 1 2 1 1 1 1 2 1 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>0 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 4 3 0 2 0 0 0 3 5 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>1 5 0 4 2 2 2 0 5 1 4 1 1 1 1 3 2 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

323
### Table 69
Table of Individual Teacher Scores (Part Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Q19</th>
<th>Q20</th>
<th>Q21</th>
<th>Q22</th>
<th>Q23</th>
<th>Q24</th>
<th>Q25</th>
<th>Q26</th>
<th>Q27</th>
<th>Q28</th>
<th>Q29</th>
<th>Q30</th>
<th>Q31</th>
<th>Q32</th>
<th>Q33</th>
<th>Q34</th>
<th>Q35</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.1.11 Conclusion to Section 7.1

There is substantial evidence in the above analysis to support the finding that elements of UdSU's teaching methodology are faithful to aspects of traditional Russian educational methods. Most notably, Galperin's Theory of Internalisation of Acts is evident in oral work but the focus is on performing with language in the UdSU books. There is less emphasis on the skills of manipulation and alteration of the TL. The high degree of focus on specifics such as grammar and rote learning reflect the Russian FL goal of conscious learning.

However, there is a clear dichotomy between the teaching strategies of individual teachers and the FLSP's declared aims of teaching English for Specific Purposes. Elements of LSP teaching, such as reading strategies, are used but only to a limited
extent and in parallel with other strategies which cater for a more basic student ability, such as repeating words aloud after the teacher and chanting material in class.

With so much priority given to conscious learning and the high preference for grammar and translation work, there is corroboration of the taxonomic findings in Chapter Five that UdSU's methodological approach to ESP is only a statement of intent and not a practical reality. There is no 'whole' Faculty approach for the teaching methodologies practised in the ESP classroom. While a similar distribution might be seen as eclectic by some, the realities of UdSU shed light on an inconsistent pattern of teaching which does not appear to achieve the level which it should. Since the advent of TEMPUS, there has been a greater focus on listening and speaking. This is due to the increased relevance of these skills in an era of increased travel opportunities and contact with TL speakers and other foreigners. Evidently, the current range of activities is under-developed as the teachers have not been able to react quickly enough to the changing face of EFL teaching. However, in time this deficit might be made up.

7.2 Analysis and Discussion of Student Perception Questionnaire (Q2)

In Table 70 below, the columns retain the same values as those defined for Questionnaire 1 above. In the column entitled mean, a score of 5 equates with 'likes a lot', above 4 with 'like', above 3 with 'not sure', above 2 with 'dislike', 1 and above with 'dislike a lot' and 0 with 'not done'. The same abbreviations used for Questionnaire 1 apply here. The distribution of the number of letters chosen by the whole population surveyed is A (15%), B (36%), C (22%), D (14%), E (3%) and F (9%). Table 70 shows not only the likes and dislikes of students but also the percentage of students who have experienced or are yet to experience a certain type of classroom activity.
Chapter Seven

Table 70
The Number of Students Who Choose a Statement in Reference to Each of the Classwork Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Not Done</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>299</td>
<td>3220</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The effect of 299 zero scores in the column 'not done' gives an incorrect perception of the true student views about the activities being analysed in this questionnaire. In Table 71, the same results obtained in Table 70 are analysed for a second time. The old mean is calculated on the basis of all 92 respondents but a second mean is calculated only on the number of respondents who did not reply with the letter F and are therefore able to comment on a specific type of teaching. By way of example, the results in Table 70 show that for Q30 only 70 students have given a comment on their perception of the class activity. The remaining 22 have never experienced this specific teaching strategy. Consequently, they have been left out of the equation when calculating the new mean for Table 71 in order to give a mean score for only those who have experienced the teaching strategy. The old mean for Q30 was 3.11 but when the zero effect is taken into account, the mean increases by 0.19 to 3.3. The effect which this statistical correction has on the overall findings for Questionnaire 2 is profound primarily for three teaching strategies. Chanting grammar rules aloud after the teacher (Q8), making a recording of students in English onto cassette (Q3) and talking to a native speaker (Q1) are much more popular among UdSU students than was at first apparent when analysing just the old mean.
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Table 71
Rank Order of Classroom Activities According to Student Preferences and Experience
Calculated on the Basis only on those Respondents who Expressed an Opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Old Mean</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Watching films in English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Talking to a native speaker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Translating from English to Russian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>Reading English magazines</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Reading about Great Britain</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Short structured conversations in English with a partner</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Reading the United States</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>Learning facts about Great Britain/other English speaking countries</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Making up a story</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Answering orally the teacher's questions about a text</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Listening to English on the tape recorder</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Acting out conversations with a partner in front of the class</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Answering questions on a text</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>Making a recording of students in English onto a cassette</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>Writing a letter</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>Translating from Russian to English</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>Writing about anything to do with Russia</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Repeating words aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>Doing a project on an aspect of British life</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Answering true or false questions on a text</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Learning lists of words</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Learning verbs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GR/LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Learning conversations</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>S/LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>Looking up the meaning of English words in an English dictionary</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>Reading articles on their specialist topic</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Completing grammar exercises</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>W/GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Chanting texts aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Writing about themselves</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Writing about what they did</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Looking up words in a Russian/English/English/Russian dictionary</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>Learning grammar rules</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>LR/GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>Chanting grammar rules after the teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Copying from the board</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the column of revised mean scores in Table 71, the mean scores for each skill are more tightly clustered than in Table 57 for Questionnaire 1. All the mean scores are within a 0.7 range. Translation is ranked in first place. This is not surprising given that UdSU students are familiar with this technique from FL classes at school. The second rank (listening) reflects the recent shift to greater TL linguistic exposure through the use
of music, video and cassette work. Among the population surveyed, no student has had previous access to authentic listening materials outside of UdSU. The materials themselves provide a motivation for several reasons. In particular, they are a novelty to all and lead to less stressful TL classes because of the passive nature of the learning experience. The third ranked skill of speaking has grown in popularity with ever increasing opportunities to meet foreigners and even travel abroad. The fourth-ranked reading has a long established tradition in Russia but, as the section below on this skill will reveal, the nature of the importance of reading to the students is evolving. The positive attitude to the learning material is supported elsewhere in this research. It forms part of a long Russian educational tradition to which the students are accustomed but, as with reading, there are signs that the students' perception of what 'learning' means are different to those of their teachers. The less positive response to the active skill of writing is not surprising. By its very nature, it forces a learner to produce language which is less spontaneous than speaking and more stressful for the learner than passive skills. Grammar's consignment to last place is not an unexpected outcome but its position is in contradiction to a teaching system which focuses heavily on grammar. The spread of results within each point range for the skill groups is shown below in Table 72. The mean scores for all seven categories are as follows: (1) Translation - 3.77, (2) Listening - 3.76, (3) Speaking - 3.59, (4) Reading - 3.47, (5) Learning - 3.34, (6) Writing - 3.33 and (7) Grammar - 3.11.

Table 72
Table Showing the Distribution of Skill Rankings for Questionnaire 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>0 - 1</th>
<th>1 - 2</th>
<th>2 - 3</th>
<th>3 - 4</th>
<th>4 - 5</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 72 shows that there is little negative feedback about the different skill-based tasks in Questionnaire 2. Five tasks (10% of all tasks) are strongly liked by the population surveyed. A further 37 tasks (77%) are liked while only six tasks (13%) invoke indifference in the students. None of the 48 tasks receive an overall negative response from the 92 students. The UdSU students' most preferred skills are translation and listening followed closely by speaking and reading which occupies three of the four most favoured activities. In the following sections, tasks in each individual skill are ranked according to the rank order of the means of each skill for further analysis. The order in which the skills are analysed follows the rank order of Table 72 above.

7.2.1 Translation
Translation is a favoured task among UdSU students both from and into the TL. Thirteen students (14%) express a strong like for translation from Russian into English (Q27), and a further 38 (41%) express a liking for the same task. 24 (26%) have no strong like or dislike of the skill but twelve (13%) dislike it and a further five (5%) strongly dislike it. Table 73 indicates that translation from the TL into the LI (Q26) is preferred by more students. 25 (27%) like the task a lot and 54 (59%) like it. Only nine students (10%) surveyed express indifference, three (3%) dislike it and one (1%) strongly dislikes it.

Table 73
Table Showing the Rank Order of Translation Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Translating from English to Russian</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translating from Russian to English</td>
<td>TR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.2 Listening
There is a very strong overall preference for listening among the student population surveyed. Listening as a passive skill is the most popular of these tasks as it applies less pressure on the student. The high rank of Q10 in Table 74 can be attributed primarily to
the students' desire to watch as many TL films on video as possible during class. Only one (1%) student expressed a dislike, the other 91 (99%) liked or strongly liked watching videos. It is a frequent activity during the lessons of some teachers, particularly younger ones. They are more easily persuaded by their students to show videos. While the use of video has a value in teaching, its usage in the FLSP has clearly not been thought out or planned.

Among the listening comprehension activities in this subsection, listening to authentic material on cassette (Q9) is popular. 37 (40%) like and 21 (23%) strongly like the activity. Only two (2%) strongly dislike and 11 (12%) dislike the task, with the remaining 21 (23%) expressing no strong opinion. A similar distribution is apparent for listening to the teacher reading a passage (Q11). The findings about Q11 reflect the students' attachment to the old familiar teaching techniques but this is balanced by the keenness for new ones, as expressed in Q9.

The activities involving both listening and speaking are of an interactive nature. There is a stronger preference for communicative situations (Q2, Q6 and Q7) as opposed to artificial situations (Q4 and Q5) which involve no true exchange of information. The subsection on speaking below deals with these questions in more detail.

Table 74
Table Showing the Rank Order of Listening Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Watching films in English</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talking to a native speaker</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Short structured conversations in English with a partner</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Answering orally the teacher's questions about a text</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Listening to English on the tape recorder</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Listening to the teacher read a text aloud</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acting out conversations with a partner in front of the class</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Repeating words aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chanting texts aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.2.3 Speaking

From Table 75 it is evident that there is a strong preference among UdSU students for communicating with a native speaker (Q1). Thus far, one third of them have never had the opportunity to speak to a TL speaker but two thirds have. In most cases, this has occurred when an academic visitor has been invited to the class to answer general questions about life in the West. Consequently, the high score for Q1 is due to a one-off encounter with a foreigner in class. In such cases, between one third to one half of the students contribute at least one question and may be limited to just one question and answer. The others remain attentive but silent throughout. In no sense is there a proper conversation between the visitor and the students. Essentially, it is an artificial communicative exercise. However, it is an exercise which has substantial cultural value for the FLSP's students as it is their first encounter with a TL speaker.

Apart from this brief exposure to authentic communication, students experience simulated or artificial TL learning contexts. 21 (23%) strongly like and 47 (51%) like short structured conversations in pair work (Q2): Fifteen (16%) express no opinion, eight (9%) dislike the task and one (1%) has never done it. A cognate activity, acting out conversation with a partner in front of the class (Q7) displays a similar distribution of preference among the students surveyed. However, structured dialogue (Q2) is still more preferred to the open-ended type of oral work (Q7) or recording oral work (Q3). Less popular are the three activities which relate to the mnemonic activity of learning (Q4, Q32 and Q5).

Teacher-centred oral work, when students answer reading comprehension questions about a text (Q6), is prevalent in the UdSU textbook exercises. It is clearly a technique with which the UdSU students are familiar and which they still find comfortable as a technique for TL learning. 14 (15%) strongly like and 45 (49%) like the activity. A
Further 26 (28%) have no strong opinion about the task but only six (7%) dislike it and one (1%) strongly dislikes it.

Table 75
Table Showing the Rank Order of Speaking Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talking to a native speaker</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Short structured conversations in English with a partner</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Answering orally the teacher's questions about a text</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acting out conversations with a partner in front of the class</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Making a recording of students in English onto a cassette</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Repeating words aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Learning conversations</td>
<td>S/LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chanting texts aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.4 Reading

The students' responses in Table 76 reveal an orientation towards reading for factual information about TL culture (Q13, Q14 and Q12) and about their own L1 culture in the TL (15) rather than academic reading (Q19). Only five (5%) have not read about Russia in the TL, four (4%) have not read articles from English magazines, one (1%) has not read about the USA but everyone has read material about Great Britain during their studies at UdSU. Q12, Q13 and Q14 all have similar numbers of students who express a like or strong like. In each case, 67 (Q12), 70 (Q13) and 65 (Q14) students express a positive view while only two (Q12), seven (Q13) and six (Q14) indicate that they dislike the three tasks.

Reading comprehension is generally well-liked although 18 (20%) students express a dislike for true or false questions (Q16) and 14 (15%) a dislike for answering questions on a text (Q20). There is a greater inclination to use a bilingual dictionary than a monolingual one although seven (8%) students have not used a monolingual dictionary and one (1%) has not used a bilingual dictionary. Some form of independent research on an aspect of TL culture has not been carried out by 22 (24%) students but among the
other 70 (76%) students, the activity has been experienced and is well-liked. Q35 has a mean of 3.37 when the 22 students, who have never done project work, are left out of the calculation.

The most surprising finding from Table 70 (see earlier) is that 18 students (20%) have never read articles on their specialist topics (Q19). Given that they are taught by the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes, this evidence contradicts the claims made by the FLSP at UdSU that the teaching methodology is ESP-focused. Furthermore, among those students who expressed an opinion on the task, Q19 has the fourteenth lowest total of opinions expressing a strong like by nine students.

### Table 76
**Table Showing the Rank Order of Reading Tasks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reading English magazines</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reading about Great Britain</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Reading about the United States</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reading about Russia in English</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Answering questions on a text</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Doing a project on an aspect of British life</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Answering true or false questions on a text</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Looking up the meaning of English words in an English dictionary</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Looking up words in a Russian/English English/Russian dictionary</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Copying from the board</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Reading articles on their specialist topic</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 7.2.5 Learning
The highest rank in Table 77 (Q34) is the learning of facts about the TL culture. 24 students (26%) strongly like and 37 (40%) like the task. 15 (16%) students express no strong opinion but 12 (13%) dislike it. The remaining four learning tasks are based on traditional Russian mnemonic activities, such as those of the Milashevich Method and the Intensive Method. A total of 38 students (41%) express a positive opinion about learning verbs (Q30) and learning lists of words (Q31). Similarly, 41 (45%) students like
or strongly like learning conversations (Q32) and 26 (28%) express the same about learning grammar rules (Q33). The figures indicate a like of structured learning among almost half of the student population surveyed.

There is a small number of students who have not experienced these same teaching strategies. Five (5%) have never learnt verbs in class (Q30) or learnt lists of words (Q31). One (1%) has never learnt a TL conversation (Q32), a further six (7%) have never learnt grammar rules (Q33) and four (4%) have never learnt facts about Great Britain or other English speaking countries (Q34).

Table 77
Table Showing the Rank Order of Learning Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Learning facts about Great Britain/other English speaking countries</td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Learning lists of words</td>
<td>LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Learning verbs</td>
<td>GR / LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Learning conversations</td>
<td>S / LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Learning grammar rules</td>
<td>LR / GR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.6 Writing

Two key preferences are highlighted by the findings contained in Table 78. The students like creative written work (Q24 and Q25) and also focused work, such as responding to a text (Q20). 59 students (64%) indicate a positive attitude about making up a story (Q24), 54 (59%) indicate the same about answering questions on a text (Q20) and 47 (51%) likewise on writing a letter (Q25). Most noticeable among the remaining group, nine (10%) students state that they have never written a letter in the TL (Q25).

The next most popular tasks involve writing about aspects of L1 and TL culture (Q29 and Q35). Only 31 students (34%) like writing about an aspect of L1 culture and 35 (38%) are equally positive about doing a project about British life. Interestingly, in both cases 22 (24%) students have never done either task.
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The UdSU students surveyed have less preference for completing grammar exercises (Q28), writing about themselves (Q22) or their own lives (Q23) and copying from the board (Q21). 36 (39%) students like doing grammar exercises and 24 (26%) dislike them (Q28). 38 (41%) like writing about themselves and what they have done but 32 (35%) dislike the same activities (Q22 and Q23).

Table 78
Table Showing the Rank Order of Writing Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Making up a story</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Answering questions on a text</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Writing a letter</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Writing about anything to do with Russia</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Doing a project on an aspect of British life</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Completing grammar exercises</td>
<td>W/GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Writing about themselves</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7=</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Writing about what they did</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Copying from the board</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.7 Grammar

There is little difference between the four categories in Table 79. Three out of the four focus on learning grammar. 38 students (41%) like learning verbs (Q30), 36 (39%) like completing grammar exercises (Q28), 26 (28%) like learning grammar rules (Q33) and 19 (21%) chant grammar rules under their teacher's instruction (Q8). This chanting activity is part of the Milashevich Method and indicates that a substantial proportion of the student group surveyed has been exposed to this method. There are, however, more students who have not been exposed to the chanting of grammar rules. One third (32 students) has never chanted grammar (Q8). Six (7%) have never learnt grammar rules (Q33), and five (5%) have never learnt verbs (Q30).
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Table 79
Table Showing the Rank Order of Grammar Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Learning verbs</td>
<td>GR/LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Completing grammar exercises</td>
<td>W/GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Learning grammar rules</td>
<td>LR/GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chanting grammar rules after the teacher</td>
<td>GR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.8 Multi-skilled Activities

The multi-skilled activities, listed in Table 80 below, which involve speaking and listening, are the most popular averaging 3.7 as opposed to the mean of 3.3 for reading and writing. The overall popularity of multi-skilled activities (3.4) is still less than the focus on the individual skills (3.6) analysed above.

Table 80
Table Showing the Rank Order of Multi-Skilled Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Skill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talking to a native speaker</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Short structured conversations in English with a partner</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Answering orally the teacher's questions about a text</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Answering questions on a text</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acting out conversations with a partner in front of the class</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Repeating words aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Doing a project on an aspect of British life</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Learning verbs</td>
<td>GR/LR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Learning conversations</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Completing grammar exercises</td>
<td>W/GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chanting texts aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>S/L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Learning grammar rules</td>
<td>LR/GR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Copying from the board</td>
<td>R/W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.9 Homework

There is an overall liking of the range of homework tasks set (343 opinions in total) as opposed to disliking (108 opinions) but also there is a high degree of uncertainty (170 opinions). If the students' experiences were positive enough, this would be less but the inference is that the learners' experiences are not sufficiently interesting for them to enjoy the work. The rank order listed in Table 81 indicates a preference for homework
which focuses on passive skills, such as reading an article for general comprehension (Q49). This activity is followed closely by translation work (Q41). Learning homeworks (Q36, Q37 and Q42) are much less favoured.

### Table 81
**Rank Order of UdSU Students' Most Preferred Homework Tasks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Reading a magazine article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Translating sentences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Answering questions from the textbook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Learning vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Writing an essay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Revising for a test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Learning grammar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.2.10 Analysis of individual Students' Responses

The results contained in the above tables indicate that UdSU has a broad range of student opinion. This ranges from the positive and interested student type to the negative, non-interested one. The third key group are the students who have strong preferences and dislikes and at different times match the characteristics of the three groups who remain at the top, middle and bottom of the range in each of the eight categories. The following examples confirm the above points:

1. At the top end of the range is Student 71 who is ranked in each of the categories as follows: first in listening, reading, writing, translation (joint) and multi-skills and second in grammar and learning (joint). A similar picture emerges with Student 12, who is second overall. This person is first in grammar and translation (joint) and second in listening and writing and third in reading.

2. At the bottom end of the scale, Student 84 is ranked last in terms of positive opinions about the teaching techniques. In the individual sections, this person is ranked 92nd in listening, joint 91st in grammar, 90th in writing, joint 86th in learning, joint 75th in reading and joint 24th in translation.
(3) In the middle of the overall ranking is Student 45, who is ranked 47th overall. He is ranked 74th in listening, joint 27th in reading, joint 12th in writing, joint 9th in translation, joint 75th in grammar and joint 79th in learning.

Due to the small sample size, it is accepted that it would be inappropriate to draw too many detailed conclusions from the distribution of male and female students. However, the following general observations can be made from the information contained in Table 82 below. There are 29 (32%) students who fall below the top ten ranks but above the bottom twelve ranks in all eight skills. In this group there are seven males (33% of all males) and 22 females (31% of all females). This distribution reflects the overall ratio of males to female students in the survey. Consequently, the evidence obtained from Table 82 suggests that there are no significant differences in attitude between the male and female student populations at UdSU.

Table 82
Distribution of Male and Female Ranks of Students
According to the Most Positive Questionnaire Returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Range</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.11 A Combined Statistical Analysis of Q1 and Q2

In Table 83 the teachers give a higher rank to 14 of the 35 activities than the learners who in turn give a higher rank to the remaining 21. There is a high degree of correlation between the two values which indicates that the teaching strategies broadly match the TL
learners' requirements. Ten of the students' higher ranks fall within close range of the teachers' rank. The teachers' top five choices (with the students' rank in brackets) are (1) Q2 (students' rank 5), (2) Q9 (students' rank 12), (3) Q20 (students' rank 14), (4) Q6 (students' rank 11) and (5) Q26 (students' rank 3). The students' top five choices (with the teachers' rank in brackets) are (1) Q10 (teachers' rank 21), (2) Q1 (teachers' rank 35), (3) Q26 (teachers' rank 560, (4) Q12 (teachers' rank 26) and (5=) Q2 and Q13 (teachers' rank 1 and 23).

Table 83
Table Showing the Overall Rank of Teacher Preferences and Student Likes of Teaching Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qu. No.</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>T. Rank</th>
<th>S. Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Talking to a native speaker</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Short structured conversations in English with a partner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Making a recording of students in English onto a cassette</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Repeating words aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Chanting texts aloud after the teacher</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Answering orally the teacher's questions about a text</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acting out conversations with a partner in front of the class</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chanting grammar rules after the teacher</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Listening to English on the tape recorder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Watching films in English</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Listening to the teacher read a text aloud</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reading English magazines</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Reading about Great Britain</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Reading about the United States</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Reading about Russia in English</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Answering true or false questions on a text</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Looking up words in a Russian/English English/Russian dictionary</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Looking up the meaning of English words in an English dictionary</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Reading articles on their specialist topic</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Answering questions on a text</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Copying from the board</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Writing about themselves</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Writing about what they did</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Making up a story</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Writing a letter</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Translating from English to Russian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Translating from Russian to English</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Completing grammar exercises</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Writing about anything to do with Russia</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Learning verbs</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Learning lists of words</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Learning conversations</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Learning grammar rules</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Learning facts about Great Britain /other English speaking countries</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Doing a project on an aspect of British life</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to verify if there is any correlation between the different categories of observed data the statistical tool Spearman's Rank Co-efficient Correlation has been used to compare the rank of the FLSP teachers' most favoured teaching techniques with the FLSP students' most preferred activities. The rank values in Table 83 above have been used for the calculations. Note that equal ranks have been retained where they existed in the two sections above.

**Learning**
The values are: \( n = 5, \sum d^2 = 14, r_s = 0.3 \). The significance for \( r_s \) using critical values for a two-tailed test at the 10\% level with a significance level of 0.05 is less than the accepted critical value of 0.9. Therefore we conclude that there is no evidence at the 10\% level of positive correlation.

**Listening**
The values are: \( n = 9, \sum d^2 = 208, r_s = -0.73 \). The significance for \( r_s \) using critical values for a two-tailed test at the 10\% level with a significance level of 0.05 is less than the accepted critical value of -0.6. Therefore we conclude that there is no evidence at the 10\% level of negative correlation.

**Reading**
The values are: \( n = 11, \sum d^2 = 348, r_s = -0.58 \). The significance for \( r_s \) using critical values for a two-tailed test at the 10\% level with a significance level of 0.05 is less than the accepted critical value of -0.535. Therefore we conclude that there is no evidence at the 10\% level of negative correlation.
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Speaking
The values are: \( n = 8, \Sigma d^2 = 72, r_s = 0.15 \). The significance for \( r_s \) using critical values for a two-tailed test at the 10% level with a significance level of 0.05 is less than the accepted critical value of 0.643. Therefore we conclude that there is no evidence at the 10% level of positive correlation.

Writing
The values are: \( n = 9, \Sigma d^2 = 120, r_s = 0 \). The significance for \( r_s \) using critical values for a two-tailed test at the 10% level with a significance level of 0.05 is less than the accepted critical value of 0.6. Therefore we conclude that there is no evidence at the 10% level of positive correlation.

Homework
The values are: \( n = 7, \Sigma d^2 = 56, r_s = 0 \). The significance for \( r_s \) using critical values for a two-tailed test at the 10% level with a significance level of 0.05 is less than the accepted critical value of 0.714. Therefore we conclude that there is no evidence at the 10% level of positive correlation.

In conclusion there is no significant statistical evidence of any positive or negative correlation between the stated preferences of the UdSU students and their teachers about the teaching activities encountered or used during TL classes in the FLSP. Therefore it is evident that the teachers' preferences for teaching strategies fall within the accepted statistical boundaries of their students stated preferences but to no significant degree.
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7.2.12 Conclusion to Section 7.2

The statistical findings of this section confirm that the students are broadly happy with the teaching strategies employed by the teachers of FLSP. Close parallels can be drawn between the FLSP's students' preferences and traditional aspects of Russian education in the areas of translation and acting out short structured conversations. At the same time, the students are more progressive in their desires for new teaching strategies which offer an authentic exposure to the TL, most notably through direct contact with a TL speaker (which involves interaction) or through exposure to the target language and Western culture (which is a passive role). For the students, the same two tasks offer a less demanding rigor than the current UdSU approach which is based on structures and lexis. These two strategies offer less teacher-control in the TL classroom (which is less appealing to UdSU teachers) and less teacher-effort in the preparation stage (which would be welcomed by FLSP teachers who are already overloaded with teaching hours).

There are activities which every student has experienced in UdSU class teaching. They are (Q6) answering orally the teacher's questions about a text, (Q9) listening to English on the tape recorder, (Q10) watching films, (Q13) reading about Great Britain, (Q26) translating from English to Russian and (Q27) translating from Russian to English. This total of six is extremely small and can be interpreted to mean that there is a lack breadth in the daily delivery of teaching strategies within the FLSP. Evidently, the experiences of a certain teaching style depend primarily on the teacher to whom the students are assigned. This is highlighted by the isolated cases where one or two students have missed doing an activity (See questions 2, 14, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 28 and 32).

There are other examples where large numbers of students have not experienced certain teaching strategies: (1) 51 students (55%) have never made a recording of themselves onto cassette, (2) 32 students (35%) have never chanted grammar rules after the teacher,
(3) 27 students (29%) have never spoken to a native speaker, (4) 22 students (24%) have never written anything about Russia, and (5) 18 students (21%) state that they have never read articles on their specialist topic at all. This last figure carries great significance. UdSU claims to teach English for Specific Purposes but one fifth of the students surveyed state that they have never read articles on their specialist topics. Clearly, a substantial number of teachers do not deliver the syllabus which the FLSP strives to deliver to all students. Such findings suggest an inconsistency in the range of teaching strategies employed throughout the FLSP. This fact is not as directly evident in the taxonomic survey of Chapter Five but is confirmed by classroom observations carried out in many UdSU classrooms.
7.3 Analysis and Discussion of Student Attitudinal Questionnaire (Q3)

The statements marked thus * in the column entitled 'Section' in Table 84 below have been given a positive statement value. Originally they were worded in the negative for the purposes of creating a balanced questionnaire containing both positive and negative perceptions. In the analysis phase their values were reversed to give a positive value. Consequently they have been worded positively for this and all subsequent tables.

The results in Table 84 show that the students surveyed have more positive attitudes to the issues of: (i) the usefulness of English and (ii) contact with native speakers. In the top half of the rank order of results these two occupy 17 out of 19 places with only seven out of 19 places in the bottom half. The mean score is 3.92 for usefulness and 3.77 for contact. Furthermore, with an outright positive statement starting at rank 15 and above, both of the aforementioned attitudes have more than 50% of their statements mentioned within this top half of statements.
Table 84

Rank Order of Responses as Expressed by Students at UdSU in Questionnaire 3

NB Note that the abbreviation 'S' represents the word 'statement'. Each of the statements is referred to below as S1, S2, S3 etcetera in the comments which follow this table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Learning English is not a waste of time for me.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>English will be useful to me after I leave university.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>I would be interested in meeting up with English speaking students during their visits.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>I would like to meet some English speakers.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I would like to go to Great Britain one day.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>I would like to go to the United States.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I think my family is pleased that I am learning English.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>It is a good idea for Russian students to have an English speaking penpal.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>I would like to be able to speak several languages.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>I am interested in going to Great Britain.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I am interested in going to the United States.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I am interested in learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I learn useful things in my language classes.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>I am interested in learning about other countries.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I need English for what I want to do after my studies.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>English is of use to me as I want to go to an English speaking country.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>English is easy if you try.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English is one of my favourite lessons.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I want to learn more English after I leave university.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I would like to get a job where I could use my English.</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>I like learning new words.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I like English because I am good at it.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>English lessons are not usually boring.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I like English classes most of the time.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I think that I will visit the West.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>English is not too difficult to understand well.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I find English less difficult than other subjects in my course.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>I would like to live and work in an English speaking country.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would like to live in an English speaking country.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>I do not find it hard to remember words in English when I speak.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>English is one of the easiest lessons in my course.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>I like English because it seems easy.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I am better at English than I am at other subjects.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>I am quite good at English.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>I think it would not feel strange staying in an English speaking country.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>I do get a chance to practise my English outside of class.</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>I am good at English.</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are not many more important things to learn at university other than English</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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For the purposes of further clarity, the rank sequence of the most frequently expressed activity is presented in Table 85 below. The discussion based on these results follows immediately afterwards.

Table 85
Rank Order of Attitude Statements as Expressed by Students at UdSU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the motivation framework presented by Gardner and Lambert (1972, p. 15), Usefulness is identified as instrumental motivation while Contact with Foreigners is
perceived as integrative motivation. The findings of this research reveal positive results of a similar magnitude for both so that it is justifiable to state that the learners at UdSU have indicated that they are both instrumentally and integratively motivated. There is evidence of strong aspirations and personal relevance when learning English at UdSU.

In the case of Difficulty and Enjoyment (task motivation), both occupy only two out of the top nineteen but twelve out of the bottom nineteen ranked responses contained in Table 85. Therefore, the students surveyed have a much less positive attitude to task motivation through the activities done in the classroom. By inference, the classroom deliverables do not match the instrumental and integrative motivation brought to the class by the students.

The bulk of the student responses for Enjoyment lie between the attitudes of Uncertain and Agree. The lack of returns above the 'Agree' threshold reveals a high degree of indifference to what goes on in the classroom even though the students express a clear desire to have contact with English speakers and are also aware that they require the language for their future careers. The reason for this is clearly linked to their perception of how difficult they find the language experienced in the classroom. In the Difficulty section, many express uncertainty about their abilities in English but the majority clearly find English difficult, with five out of the bottom nine places in the overall survey filled by that section.

Each of the four subsections is dealt with individually in the results sections which follow. The breakdown into subdivisions was explained earlier in the methodology section in Chapter Four. For each subsection, the results are analysed for the entire section before each subdivision is further analysed.
7.3.1 Usefulness

Table 86

Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements about Usefulness of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Learning English is not a waste of time for me.</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>English will be useful to me after I leave university.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>I think my family is pleased that I am learning English.</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>I would like to be able to speak several languages.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I am interested in learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I learn useful things in my language classes.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I need English for what I want to do after my studies.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>English is of use to me as I want to go to an English speaking country.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I want to learn more English after I leave university.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I would like to get a job where I could use my English.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are not many more important things to learn at university other than English.</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest score in Table 86 is 4.45 and the lowest 2.28, giving a range of 2.17. The mean is 3.92, which is almost equal to the value of agree (the score four). Overall, there are six out of the eleven questions which return a score over four (agree). Four out of eleven return a score of over three (uncertain) and only one returns a score of over two (disagree). Of the four questions which fall in the over three category, they are extremely close to the four threshold, indicating that a clear majority have a strong instrumental motivation.

The highest mean for an individual statement both within this subsection and in the entire questionnaire is for the statement that English is not a waste of time (S12). All but nine of the 92 students expressed agreement or strong agreement with the statement. Eight of the nine were unsure about the relevance of learning the language while only one expressed outright dislike. A similar pattern emerges with the responses to S11, S4, S14 and S15. S12 indicates a high degree of personal relevance in learning the TL. S11 shows both instrumental and integrative relevance for many students. S4 emphasises the family support and social recognition attached to learning English. S14 and S15
emphasise the students' aspirations to master other languages for personal relevance. 31 students (34%) express a strong desire to continue learning English after the completion of their studies (S3) as opposed to eleven who do not wish to do so.

The findings are contradicted to a certain extent by the lowest ranked statement in this section. There is some doubt about whether English is an important subject for students to learn at university (S2). Three students (3%) strongly agree and a further nine (10%) agree that there are not many more important things to learn at university other than English. 15 (16%) are unsure but 48 (52%) disagree and a further 16 (17%) strongly disagree with the statement. However, the students in the FLSP are not language specialists but study primarily in other faculties. In this respect, the above opinions fall within the range of expected outcomes.

One further point arising from the above findings in Table 86 concerns the order in which the statements are ranked overall. In particular, the phraseology of these ranked statements reveals key information. The top two are concerned with the general usefulness of English, the fourth and fifth ranked statements refer to languages generally, while the seventh, eighth, ninth and tenth ranked statements denote the personal relevance of English to the student. In other words, English has a place in their lives but for more general utilitarian purposes (as would be the case with other languages) but there is less agreement among the students as to how relevant English might be for them specifically within their field of study. Analysis and comments now follow on each subdivision.
(a) How useful will English be after university to them?

Table 87
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements of How Useful English Will Be to UdSU Students in the Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>English will be useful to me after I leave university.</td>
<td>4.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>I need English for what I want to do after my studies.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>English is of use to me as I want to go to an English speaking country.</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>I want to learn more English after I leave university.</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I would like to get a job where I could use my English.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean for Table 87 is 3.98. This is only slightly higher than the mean of 3.92 for the entire section calculated from Table 86 but second lowest among the other subsections. These results show that influences outside the TL classroom are a strong motivating factor at UdSU. The nature of this influence is categorised by a higher degree of general personal utilitarian or instrumental value (see S11) and supported by S23. Both of these score a higher mean than S35 which suggests that more students have a preference to stay and use their TL knowledge in Russia than travel abroad to a TL environment. Current economic hardships for UdSU’s students may have an influencing role in this current state of mind. Less important but still returning an overall positive response is the personal utilitarian purpose of seeking a job using the TL (see S13).

(b) How relevant is learning English to them at present?

Table 88
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements of How Relevant Learning English is for UdSU Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Learning English is not a waste of time for me.</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>I learn useful things in my language classes.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>There are not many more important things to learn at university other than English.</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 88 produces the lowest mean for the entire subsection at 3.58 which is well below the section's mean. This outcome can be attributed to S2 which returns the lowest mean score of all statements in the complete results table (see Table 84 earlier). This outcome is not unexpected given that the FLSP students are obliged to learn a TL parallel to their main area of study. The difference in the mean scores between S12 and S10 suggests that learning the TL has personal value to the FLSP students but that they do not believe that the teaching fully matches their aspirations.

(c) How useful are foreign languages in general to them?

Table 89
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements of How Useful Foreign Languages are to UdSU Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would like to be able to speak several languages.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am interested in learning foreign languages.</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean for Table 89 is 4.17 which is the second highest mean for the section. The two statements confirm that learning languages is a strong personal motivating factor for many. However the results contained in Table 88 appear to contradict these findings. S2 has a lower mean which suggests that the students' priorities lie with the subject which they have chosen to study rather than the learning of a TL. However this result is to be expected as the students are not FL specialists.

(d) How does their family react to the news that they are learning English as non-specialists?

Table 90
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements of How The UdSU Students' Families React to the Fact that they are Studying English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I think my family is pleased that I am learning English</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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With only one statement in this subdivision the mean for S4 is the mean for the subdivision at 4.24. This is the highest mean of all categories but it is impossible to interpret further the result in Table 90 because of the limited scope of the subdivision.

### Contact

Table 91

Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements about Contact With Native Speakers of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>I would be interested in meeting up with English speaking students during their visits.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>I would like to meet some English speakers.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I would like to go to Great Britain one day.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>I would like to go to the United States.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>It is a good idea for Russian students to have an English speaking penpal.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>I am interested in going to Great Britain.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I am interested in going to the United States.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>I am interested in learning about other countries.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I think that I will visit the West.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>I would like to live and work in an English speaking country.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would like to live in an English speaking country.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>I think it would not feel strange staying in an English speaking country.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>I get a chance to practise my English outside of class.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 91 the highest score is 4.32 and the lowest 2.75, giving a range of 1.57. The mean is 3.77, which is less than the mean score in the Usefulness section. Overall there are seven out of thirteen questions which return a score over four (agree). Four out of thirteen return a score of over three (uncertain) and only two out of eleven return a score of over two (disagree).

In a similar manner to the section on Usefulness, the outcome of the questionnaire has ranked cognate statements beside each other. The first and second ranked statements (S38 and S32) express an interest in meeting native TL speakers on visits to Izhevsk. This possibility is the most tangible opportunity for all UdSU students to have real exposure to TL speakers, given the present restrictions on travel into the half-closed city.
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of Izhevsk. On closer inspection, there is a core of students who are not interested in either of these two options. Six are undecided in S38 and a further nine in S32. A further four (S38) and two (S32) do not want to be involved in such meetings.

The third and fourth ranked statements (S5 and S27) incorporate the expression 'I would like to go to' either Great Britain or the United States. These are closely followed by but ahead of the series of three statements containing 'I am interested' in either going to the two countries or learning more about other countries (S17, S20 and S29). Clearly there is genuine and strong interest in the ethnolinguistic background of TL speakers and culture. However once again, there is a core of students who express no interest in the latter. A mean of ten are indifferent to all five of these statements, a further four disagree with them and two strongly disagree. Together, these students constitute 20% of the population surveyed.

There is more reserve expressed about living in a TL country (S37 and S7). 25 and 23 students express indifference to the notion of living in an English speaking country, with a further 24 and 20 against it and a further eight and four students strongly against the idea. This is in part due to the realisation of financial constraints but also a preference to stay in the L1 culture. This sentiment is strong among many teachers and students. The current problems are not an excuse to 'jump ship' and go abroad to live. Therefore the conclusion drawn from these findings, in terms of motivational theory, is that the students are motivated integratively, primarily within a Russian context when foreigners come on business or as tourists with less emphasis on instrumental motivation.
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(a) What do they think about contact with native speakers of English?

Table 92
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements Expressing an Opinion about the Value of Contact with Native Speakers of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>I would be interested in meeting up with English speaking students during their visits.</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>I would like to meet some English speakers.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>It is a good idea for Russian students to have an English speaking penpal.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>I never get a chance to practise my English outside of class.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean result for Table 92 is the third highest among the subdivisions at 3.9. It is 0.13 higher than the mean for the entire section. The results show two key realities of being a TL student at UdSU. There is a high degree of aspirational motivation for integrative contact with TL speakers (S38, S32 and S19) but in reality the FLSP's chances of contact with TL speakers is limited (S25).

(b) What perceptions do they have of living in an English speaking country?

Table 93
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements Indicating the Perceptions Which UdSU Students Have of Living in Another Country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>I would like to live and work in an English speaking country.</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would like to live in an English speaking country.</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>I think it would not feel strange staying in an English speaking country.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 93 has the lowest mean of all subdivisions in this section at 3.04. This is 0.73 below the overall mean. The results suggest that the FLSP's students' integrative motivation is limited primarily to contact with TL speakers in the L1 environment and that there is a lack of strong desire to work in a TL environment (S37 and S7). It is perhaps not by accident therefore that S36 holds the lowest mean in this subdivision. Their limited experience of TL culture in their language classes has resulted in a majority of the group surveyed feeling that they would feel strange staying in a TL environment.
This observation contrasts sharply with the findings of Table 94 and Table 95 below which show a stronger aspiration for integrative contact with the TL culture but only in the capacity of visiting the countries.

(c) What attitudes do they have about visiting Great Britain?

Table 94
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements Indicating the Attitudes Which UdSU Students Have about Visiting Great Britain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I would like to go to Great Britain one day.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>I am interested in going to Great Britain.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean for Table 94 is the highest of all subdivisions in this section at 4.24. S5 and S17 merely support each other's finding, namely that a clear majority of UdSU students wish to visit Great Britain at some stage. This evidence supports the observations made about integrative and instrumental motivation noted in the above section on the usefulness of learning English at UdSU.

(d) What attitudes do they have about visiting the United States of America?

Table 95
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements Indicating the Attitudes Which UdSU Students Have about Visiting the United States of America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>I would like to go to the United States.</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I am interested in going to the United States.</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings contained in Table 95 show 0.04 of a statistical difference in the means between the UdSU students' perceptions of and attitudes towards Great Britain and the United States of America. While this difference is inconsequential, Table 95 serves to support the observations made about Table 94 and the comments made about the findings noted in Table 93.
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(e) What attitudes do they have about visiting any country in the West?

Table 96
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements Indicating the Attitudes Which UdSU Students Have about Visiting Any Country in the West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>I am interested in learning about other countries.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I think that I will visit the West.</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean for Table 96 is 0.02 below the mean for the entire section at 3.75. S29 confirms the strong integrational attitude of the UdSU students as observed earlier. However, the mean for S30 is lower than the results in Tables 94 and 95 above. The statements in these tables contain the aspirational words 'I would like' and 'I am interested' in visiting the TL countries. In S30 the phrase 'I think that I will visit' has yielded a much lower result. The implication deduced from this observation is that a section of the student population believes that they will never be able to visit the West.

7.3.3 Difficulty

Table 97
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements About The Difficulty of Learning English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>English is easy if you try.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>English is not too difficult to understand well.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I find English less difficult than other subjects in my course.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>I do not find it hard to remember words in English when I speak.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>English is one of the easiest lessons in my course.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I am better at English than I am at other subjects.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>I am quite good at English.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>I am good at English.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest score is 3.94 and the lowest 2.7, giving a range of 1.24. The mean is 3.06, which is almost equal to the value of uncertain (the score '3') and the lowest recorded by any of the four sections. Overall none of the eight questions return a score over 4 (agree).
Three out of eight return a score of over 3 (uncertain) and five out of eight return a score of over 2 (disagree). Clearly, this is the least popular of all four attitudes investigated. They express either uncertainty or pessimism about the issues raised here.

The top score of 3.94 is much higher than the second placed 3.3. The 0.6 gap between the two covers the gap between the remaining seven positions. The inference drawn from this is that English is easier for students if they try but that they are reluctant to do so. The two statements containing the phrases 'I do not find it hard' or 'more difficult' are higher ranked than those statements containing the expressions 'I am good / quite good / better'. They have a lower impression of themselves as learners than of what actually goes on in the classroom. They believe this despite the fact that 25 students strongly agree and 42 agree that English is easy if one tries (S24). Only four believe, that the statement in S24 is not true at all. This apparent contradiction further confirms the low self-image which many students have of their own ability in the TL. At the same time however, the evidence suggests that the vast majority of students could improve their TL ability with greater effort. Avis' (1990, p. 94) comments on the 'psikhologiia troika' apply here.

(a) Do they have a general perception that English is easy or difficult?

Table 98
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements Indicating the Perceptions Which UdSU Students Have About Whether English is Easy or Difficult

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>English is easy if you try.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>English is not too difficult to understand well.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>English is one of the easiest lessons in my course.</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>I am better at English than I am at other subjects.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The mean for Table 98 is 3.23 which is the highest mean of all three subsections. The evidence obtained from these results suggests that success in the TL can be best achieved through learner effort (S24). In attribution theory, learner ability also plays a key role. This is evident in mean for S16 which reminds us that these students are not TL specialists. Between these two poles lies the confirmation that the student group is equally split when expressing opinions about whether English is difficult or easy. The 3.3 and 2.9 mean scores for S21 and S6 show evidence of this divide in opinion.

(b) Do they have a negative perception of themselves as learners?

Table 99

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>I am quite good at English.</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>I am good at English.</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score for Table 99 is 2.75. This is the lowest mean in the entire section. The calculated means for S34 and S31 are so close that any difference is negligible. However, in both cases a score lower than 3.0 signifies that a majority of the UdSU students have a negative self image about their abilities in the TL. Such low self-esteem can be brought into the TL classroom by learners and subsequently effect the quality of their learning experience.

(c) How do they find learning the language?

Table 100

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I find English less difficult than other subjects in my course.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>I do not find it hard to remember words in English when I speak.</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean in Table 100 is exactly the same mean for the entire section. What is most interesting in these results is the 3.2 for S8 which implies that a majority of UdSU students find English less difficult than other areas of their course. However Table 98 above shows that the mean for S16 is 2.79. With a mean lower than 3.0 the inference drawn is that more students find that they are not as good at English as they are at other areas of their course. Thus the hypothesis can be drawn from this evidence that the UdSU students find the TL easier than other areas but are not prepared to put in the work to ensure that their perception of English becomes a firm reality. The evidence obtained earlier from Table 94 shows that a majority of students believe that English is easy if they try but they appear not act on their own belief and thus retain a negative self-image as learners.

7.3.4 Enjoyment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>English is one of my favourite lessons.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>I like learning new words.</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I like English because I am good at it.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>English lessons are usually not boring.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I like English classes most of the time.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>I like English because it seems easy.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest score in Table 101 is 3.87 and the lowest 2.85, giving a range of 1.02. The mean is 3.59 which is 0.41 lower in value to that of 'agree' (the score '4') and the third highest out of the four sections. Overall, none of the six questions return a score of over four (agree). Five out of six return a score of over three (uncertain) and one out of six return a score of over two (disagree). Within the section, S1 (enjoying English classes) is the most popular of the questions but is ranked a low 18th overall in Table 84. This
indicates a less than enthusiastic response when compared to the findings of all statements. Only 20 students (22%) strongly agree with S1, a further 43 (47%) agree with it but 25 (27%) are indifferent to it and a further three (3%) disagree with the statement. Similar figures expressing uncertainty are found when the other statements are analysed. In S33 for example, a small majority of students (53%) state that they do not find English lessons boring with 23 (25%) unsure and a further eight (9%) expressing the view that they are boring.

(a) Do they have a positive attitude to learning English?

**Table 102**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>English is one of my favourite lessons.</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I like learning new words.</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English lessons are usually not boring.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I like English classes most of the time.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean for Table 102 is 3.75 which is the higher of the two means for this section. For all four statements, there is a clear positive response. The results for all show that conditions for situational motivation at UdSU are favourable and should not hinder learner progress. However these results do not explain why the UdSU students still retain an overall negative perception of themselves as learners.
(b) Does their ability in English affect their attitude?

Table 103
Table Showing the Rank Order of Statements Which Indicate Whether The Attitude of UdSU Students Towards English Is Affected By Their Ability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I like English because I am good at it.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>I like English because it seems easy.</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean for Table 103 is 3.29. The result for S9 confirms a majority of positive responses about liking English because the students are good at it. Interestingly, the mean for S28 is much lower than that for S9 which implies that a large representative sample of the student population does not believe that learning the TL is an easy activity.
73.5 Analysis of Individual Students' Attitudes

The emphasis shifts now from the analysis on individual statements about attitude to an investigation about the individual respondents. By collating information in this manner it has been possible to provide sufficient information not only to identify key trends among the UdSU learners but also to create learner profiles of individual students in the analysis which follows Tables 104-106.

Table 104
Table Showing the Overall Rankings of Students who Completed Questionnaire 3 (Part One)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.25</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26.25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33.25</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 105
Table Showing the Overall Rankings of Students who Completed Questionnaire 3 (Part Two)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Difficulty</th>
<th>Enjoyment</th>
<th>Usefulness</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37.25</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38.25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>42.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>43.75</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45.25</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49.75</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results contained in Tables 104-106 above suggest that there is a mixed but predictable pattern of results on the opinions of the student population at UdSU. There is a small group of students at both the top and bottom ends of the table who are consistently motivated positively or negatively. Only two out of 92 have been ranked in the top ten in each section. Student 71 is ranked in first place in each of the four sections while Student 12 is ranked 7th in Contact, 4th in both Difficulty and Enjoyment and 2nd in Usefulness. Student 49 has her total rankings for the four sections fall under the average of ten but is...
ranked 20th in the Usefulness category. In all three cases, the students show strong integrative, instrumental motivation and retain a positive self-profile as learners.

The reason why only a small proportion of the student population responded consistently positively is clear. Many students have indicated a more positive attitude for one section (in some cases two) but less enthusiasm for the remaining sections. For example, Student 17 is ranked 51st overall. She shows strong integrative motivation (ranked 2nd in Contact) which is aspirational and not based on current realities. She is less instrumentally motivated (37th in Usefulness) and she has a previous negative learning experience (63rd in Difficulty). In addition she does not enjoy the FLSP classes (82nd in Enjoyment). By comparison, Student 30 is ranked 44th overall and likes English classes (5th in Enjoyment) and shows strong instrumental motivation (6th in Usefulness). However she is less integratively motivated (ranked 44th in Contact) and has a lower self-image on the issue of coping with the difficulty of learning the TL (56th in Difficulty).

The pattern at the bottom end of the distribution range in Table 106 contains a greater concentration of low rankings for individual students. Student 1 is 92nd in all four categories, thus showing that he is neither integratively or instrumentally motivated. He is representative of a sizeable group among the UdSU student population who hold negative views about learning English. Other students in this category include Students 8, 85, 80, 89, 67, 24, 27 and 29.

As the bottom three ranks in Table 106 are occupied by male students there is clear evidence that male students are less motivated than their female counterparts. Table 107 below shows that the spread of male students is not uniform in pattern. Only six males (29%) are in the top ranked half with Student 71 ranked first overall in Table 106 above.
Conversely fifteen male students (71%) are in the bottom half of the distribution. It is clear therefore that male students at the FLSP are less motivated than their female counterparts.

Table 107
Table Showing the Distribution of Female and Male Students According to Overall Rank Based on Completed Questionnaires

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Range</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-90</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91-92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3.6 Statistical Analysis
Calculations have been carried out using the non-parametric Mann-Whitney U-test. The test assumes an ordinal level of measurement as the mean figures lead to the ranking of scores. The results for the comparisons of each section with the remaining sections are given below.

Difficulty and Enjoyment
Since $U_2$ is the smaller of the two values, $U = U_2 = 10$. When $N_1 = 6$ and $N_2 = 8$, the Mann-Whitney $U$-test critical value of $U$ for the 5 per cent level in a non-directional test is 8. Since the calculated value is more than this, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore there is a significant difference between the two sets of ratings.
Difficulty and Usefulness
Since $U_1$ is the smaller of the two values, $U = U_1 = 10$. When $N_1 = 8$ and $N_2 = 11$, the Mann-Whitney $U$-test critical value of $U$ for the 5 per cent level in a non-directional test is 19. Since the calculated value is less than this, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore there is a significant difference between the two sets of ratings.

Difficulty and Contact with Foreigners
Since $U_1$ is the smaller of the two values, $U = U_1 = 21$. When $N_1 = 8$ and $N_2 = 13$, the Mann-Whitney $U$-test critical value of $U$ for the 5 per cent level in a non-directional test is 24. Since the calculated value is less than this, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore there is a significant difference between the two sets of ratings.

Enjoyment and Usefulness
Since $U_1$ is the smaller of the two values, $U = U_1 = 20$. When $N_1 = 6$ and $N_2 = 11$, the Mann-Whitney $U$-test critical value of $U$ for the 5 per cent level in a non-directional test is 13. Since the calculated value is more than this, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore there is a significant difference between the two sets of ratings.

Enjoyment and Contact with Foreigners
Since $U_1$ is the smaller of the two values, $U = U_1 = 27$. When $N_1 = 6$ and $N_2 = 13$, the Mann-Whitney $U$-test critical value of $U$ for the 5 per cent level in a non-directional test is 16. Since the calculated value is less than this, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Therefore there is no significant difference between the two sets of ratings.
Usefulness and Contact with Foreigners

Since $U_1$ is the smaller of the two values, $U = U_1 = 68$. When $N_1 = 11$ and $N_2 = 13$, the Mann-Whitney $U$-test critical value of $U$ for the 5 per cent level in a non-directional test is 40. Since the calculated value is more than this, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore there is a significant difference between the two sets of ratings.

These calculations confirm that there is significant difference in the ranked statements of UdSU students in all but one category, namely Enjoyment and Contact with Foreigners where there is an accepted correlation between the two sets of ratings. However, in the other five categories, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that there is little correlation between the various factors. This implies that the motivational forces of instrumentalism and integration do not combine to increase overall motivation. These findings corroborate the evidence gathered in Chapter Six on the assessment procedures in practice at UdSU. They confirm that the students have little motivation to work well in class or improve their knowledge of the TL due to the current inconsistencies of awarding marks within the FLSP. In fact, there is clear evidence that students are better off trying to be placed in a group which contains weaker students than they are. Until a system which rewards ability and effort in a more discerning categorisation of assessment criteria is developed and adopted by the FLSP, it is difficult to see how the Faculty can reverse the situation identified by these findings.

7.3.8 Conclusion to Section 7.3

The conclusions drawn from this questionnaire must be interpreted in the light of the following premises:

1. It is evident that all non-linguist students at UdSU are obliged to study a foreign language in the FLSP. The vast majority study English because they have already started it at school and have no alternative. For all students the FL forms only a minor element
of their studies and therefore the students' preferred choice of subject is naturally their main subject of study.

(2) All the findings in this section are influenced by general issues which affect life for all at UdSU. As expounded by the Maslow theory on physical environment, the basic standard of living and the current economic difficulties experienced in Izhevsk distract the students from study and consequently affect their motivation to differing degrees. Sometimes the problems may actually block motivation completely.

(3) There is little aspirational motivation among UdSU students. The lack of streaming and preference for mixed ability teaching means that the students have no incentive for self-improvement. This leads to the classic 'psikhologiia troika' which is only broken by the need to cram to some degree before an examination.

The specific findings of the student perception questionnaire are:

(1) The factors from outside the classroom influence motivation more than those occurring within the classroom. The higher overall ranking of usefulness and contact with TL speakers and culture confirm this.

(2) At UdSU both integrative and instrumental motivation influence students' attitudes equally. Instrumental motivation is characterised by personal relevance (S11 and S45) and family recognition and approval (S4). English is perceived as a useful general skill to possess but its usage in a UdSU context is less relevant. Integrative motivation is characterised by the limited aspiration to have contact with TL speakers. There is a clear realisation that this is more likely to occur in a Russian context with visitors (S32 and S38). However, there are few opportunities of this nature (S25) at present. There is also a perceived value in having TL penpals or keypals. While an acceptance that they may not ever visit the West in their life might be realistic, the high figure of 43 students (47%) suggests a high degree of accepted resignation among the students that they will never visit the West (S30). Among the remaining 53% of the surveyed population, even less
want to work abroad, implying that most students want only limited integration with outside cultures.

(3) While positive motivation is brought into the classroom by students from different sources, the level of motivation is not matched by the classroom experiences. The sections on Difficulty and Enjoyment verify this when the individual rankings of the statements are compared to the instrumental and integrative statements. For many, English is difficult (S8) and they have low self-esteem when it comes to learning languages (S31). While many students have difficulty remembering words when speaking (S26), there is some internal conflict in other findings within both sections. Many students believe that English is easy (S24) but most say that they are not good at the subject (S31). Through inference, it is hypothesised that many students do not work hard enough in English.

(4) Task motivation is limited given the findings of the earlier Spearman Rank Coefficient Correlation for Q1 and Q2 between the teachers' choice of tasks and the students' preferences of the same. The teaching strategies do not appear to be a high motivating factor. Yet a clear majority of students enjoy the lessons, with circa 30% being indifferent to them. From observations, this can be attributed more to the personality of the teacher and the individual characters of the students.

Aspects of the motivation in the FLSP's students are evidently different in nature to the motivation experienced by their Western counterparts. The UdSU students' previous life experiences in seclusion from the West affect their current attitudes to FL learning. They are more child-like in their enthusiasm for contact with foreigners, which mirrors the attitudes held by new TL learners in British secondary schools. However, by the age of sixteen, the vast majority of British pupils have abandoned their foreign language studies believing that they will never need a foreign language and in the knowledge that 'all foreigners speak English'. By contrast, UdSU students of all disciplines continue with
their FL studies as a subsidiary part of their University course. In comparison with the United Kingdom, the findings of this student attitudinal questionnaire reflect positively on the UdSU students because they have generally retained a positive view of FL learning, even when the classes are obligatory.

7.4 Conclusion to Chapter Seven

The cross-sectional methods employed in this chapter have yielded results which serve two functions. First, they confirm some of the key findings of Chapter Two. Second, they provide evidence which the longitudinal methods in Chapter Six do not show.

Questionnaire 1 shows that there is a close correlation between the teaching techniques used by FLSP teachers in the ESP classroom and the tasks found in the UdSU corpus of books. The UdSU teachers use a limited range of teaching techniques to elicit FL production from their students. This is predominantly in the form of what Galperin describes as reproduction. There is little attempt to encourage the learners to manipulate the TL in open conversation. The FLSP teachers' most favoured teaching strategies (translation and listening) focus primarily on the passive learner and his ability to follow the TL in the spoken and written forms. Student originality and creativity in the production of the TL are seen as less important. Within the teaching group, there are obvious differences in the methodological approaches adopted by a group of six teachers and their colleagues. The smaller group have a more limited range of teaching strategies which includes the chanting aloud of texts and even grammar rules.

The views expressed by UdSU students in Questionnaire 2 correlate closely to the FLSP teachers' preferred teaching strategies, expressed in Questionnaire 1. They have a similar distribution of students who have a broad range of likes concerning FL learning techniques and others who are unenthusiastic about FL learning. This last finding is to be
expected, given that UdSU students are obliged to learn a foreign language. However, within the student group surveyed, there are examples of learning experiences which substantial numbers of students have never experienced. Most notable among these activities is the fact that one fifth of the students have never written about Russia in English. This fact contrasts with the Russian tradition of writing about the mother country in the TL. The same finding is also surprising, given the fact that so much of the UdSU corpus of books focuses on Russia.

The Student Attitudinal Questionnaire (Questionnaire 3) shows that the same students who express positive or negative views about FL learning, are similarly positive or negative about FL language and culture. The implication, in the case of those who express negative views, is that they are not instrumentally or situationally motivated to learn the TL and do not believe that they will ever have the chance to use their TL skills with a TL speaker during their lives. By contrast, others are positive in their aspirations concerning visiting the West and speaking the TL with native speakers. However, the same group is less keen to live or work in the TL country and prefers to stay in Russia.

Student motivation is a key issue in FL learning. Evidently, UdSU students have more basic concerns that their Western counterparts but this does not appear to affect their motivation in learning a foreign language. However, UdSU teachers must learn from the findings of this research that their students find English difficult to learn and are not as positive about the amount of enjoyment which they experience in the ESP class, in comparison to the students' views on TL usefulness and contact with foreigners. The FLSP teachers can increase the level of positive motivation by using materials which are more student-oriented and which offer the learners a broader and more current range of issues.
8.1 Recent Developments at UdSU

The analysis and interpretation of results in Chapter Six and Chapter Seven have been concerned primarily with the research tools of naturalistic observation, elicitation techniques, interviewing and the collection of existing data. However, they require presentation against the background of the latest developments at UdSU. Only in this way can the conclusions and theoretical implications for future research be regarded as truly relevant. The updated information presented here has been obtained primarily through regular contact with FLSP teachers through electronic mail.

It is clear that the FLSP continues to face substantial problems in the delivery of its teaching in several key areas. These problems restrict the effectiveness of the teaching which the teachers of the FLSP are striving to achieve. Some of these are the result of the FLSP's own action (or inaction) but most issues lie beyond the control of the FLSP. The problems can be categorised as follows:

(1) The 'Host' Faculty

The amount of time allotted for the study of a foreign language is dictated by the 'host' faculties from which the students come. Often the FLSP teachers are given time slots during the day which are either very early or very late. In either case, this results often in the students being tired, uninterested or unmotivated to the point where they actually fail to turn up to class. In addition, the FLSP can have its hours of teaching reduced or increased from one year to the next upon the decision of the 'host' faculty. This happens when the Dean of the 'host' faculty contracts the services of FLSP at the start of each academic year. The Central Higher Education Ministry in Moscow specifies a minimum
but the 'host' faculty has a degree of freedom to decide on the number of hours above this minimum. In general, the tendency is to reduce the number of hours. This contrasts with past practice when the number of hours was fixed. A similar problem occurs in the area of room allocation. In several recent cases, the 'host' faculty has taken all the language classrooms away from the FLSP for its own use. When this happens, the teachers are obliged to move from room to room with the relevant textbooks and other equipment required for their teaching. This affects not only the standard of the teaching delivered but also teacher moral, as the FLSP is unable to change the situation.

(2) Finances
The FLSP has no real financial independence and is chronically under-funded. While some faculties have their own independent budgets, often financed by long-distance student franchises, the Faculty is a 'service' faculty with a short history and therefore it has less franchises. However, this situation might change over time. A by-product of this current problem stems from the fact that the FLSP has no standard budget mechanism for reprographics or other consumables. This results in the new computers and photocopiers (bought by TEMPUS) remaining unused by most FLSP teachers.

(3) Access to Resources
Today, despite all the money and new materials which have been pouring into UdSU, access to teaching materials is restricted. The new FLSP library is often unmanned during the day and therefore locked because the librarian is absent, playing computer games in the new Open Learning Centre or joining chat rooms on the Internet. This issue has not been resolved yet. Furthermore, the FLSP continues to experience on-going technical problems with TEMPUS funded equipment. For example, access to the Internet is often interrupted and there is insufficient back-up, both in terms of knowledge and financial resolve to pay for the replacement of damaged hardware and software. There is
little access to TL publications and a proper system for availing of satellite television has
still not been set up.

(4) Problems faced by Individual Teachers

Many individual teachers face a wide range of problems which include student
absenteeism - often up to half of the students fail to turn up to class. While individual
teachers may keep their own absentee records, there is no official system in place to
record the frequency of absentees throughout the FLSP or UdSU as a whole. Similarly,
there is no system of official warnings in place throughout the University. There is also a
growing trend for the 'host' faculties to withhold their students from language classes for
further teaching in these disciplines without seeking compliance from the teachers
concerned. Often no prior notice is given. Similarly, students are taken from class by the
University authorities for civic duties, such as snow clearance. As no students are full-
time in the FLSP, the authorities prefer to remove students from these classes first.

The individual teacher is disempowered as there is no forum for discussion for
channelling new ideas into the Faculty's policy. Many FLSP teachers encounter
difficulties in dealing with the deans of the 'host' faculties on an individual basis. For
example, the Dean of Psychology has applied pressure on the FLSP teachers since 1997
to teach Psychology through English. The teachers are not qualified to do so, nor do they
have sufficient knowledge about psychology. In response to their inability to do so
(which the dean interpreted as a refusal), they lost their room allocation. The teachers of
the FLSP have no forum for dissemination of good teaching practice. On 7th July 1998 at
a staff meeting, reports were given by an elected speaker representing the different
groups of teachers who (i) had been on mobility to Germany for four months, (ii) had
attended a language conference in Grenoble France and (iii) had participated in a
TEMPUS funded conference at the State Technical University in St. Petersburg. In all
three cases, the speeches lasted no more than three minutes and were all anecdotal. One proceeded to thank everyone for helping her 'have such a wonderful holiday' in Germany. There was no professional gain for those teachers who have never been to the West.

The criteria laid down by TEMPUS meant that a majority of FLSP candidates for mobilities to the West had to be under thirty-five years of age. Obviously, TEMPUS was building for the future, but there has been an unfortunate consequence of this policy. In the case of UdSU, the FLSP has lost four young teachers who have since left UdSU. In some cases, the opportunities gained through TEMPUS were directly responsible for the teachers' decisions not to return to UdSU. Had TEMPUS adopted a more flexible approach and allowed more teachers in their late thirties or early forties to go on mobility, then UdSU might not have found itself in this position (It could be argued that TEMPUS might see the dispersal of teachers as an advantage because it leads to a broader pool of Western-influenced teachers who disseminate throughout Russia.). Often these teachers are married with children and therefore have greater family ties to Izhevsk. It is less likely that these teachers would have left the FLSP in a similar fashion. Many of them still have at least twenty years to offer the FLSP. In this respect, TEMPUS will have failed to deliver (unless this consequence had been envisaged and accepted by TEMPUS as a natural outcome of the project) fully on its aim of planning for the future of the FLSP as a percentage of the output (i.e. the staff who have been on mobility) has been wasted and the FLSP is the loser. The situation is further aggravated because the best staff are siphoned off to a few top faculties (Law, Economics and Public Relations). This has resulted in the creation of a two-tier teaching system. The more experienced and better teachers work for the 'elite' faculties where they have a greater degree of autonomy. The remaining faculties are served by the unselected majority.
By contrast, student groups have made complaints through their own faculties about the frequent lateness of individual FLSP teachers. As the FLSP has no central control of what its members are doing, such problems can go unchecked for many weeks, or even months until the students finally complain.

Throughout this research, there has been an ever-present danger that the investigation could develop into a negative and critical assessment of UdSU. A consistent attempt has been made to be as objective as possible in the presentation of the findings. After all, it is rare in ESP research that a single faculty at one university should find itself under such a high degree of scrutiny. In Britain, the nearest approach has been through the HEFCE TQA which is carried out by a respected government funding authority within a recognised framework. It is inconceivable that a researcher would be granted the freedom in the United Kingdom which has been given at UdSU.

Both as a group and as individuals, the teachers of the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes have allowed themselves to be observed and questioned in detail about every aspect of life at UdSU. It is inevitable that some readers of this research may focus primarily on the weaknesses of the Faculty and its teaching methodology but all findings must be viewed in the above context. Inevitably, methodological and organisational weaknesses could be found in any university faculty in the West, if it were to allow itself to be subjected to such an examination.

Within this context, it is essential to qualify and quantify the progress which the FLSP has made since 1980 (the date of the first in-house publication acquired for this research) in the methodological development of ESP teaching theories. At that time, UdSU suffered complete geographical, political, cultural and educational isolation from the West, from the Warsaw Pact countries (except Bulgaria), and partial isolation from other
parts of the USSR. UdSU teachers of ESP worked in a subsidiary section of the Faculty of Romance and Germanic Philology. They did not carry out research in their discipline, unlike their Western counterparts. They had no freedom to decide what to teach. Their Faculty had limited TL resources and the staff had a restricted knowledge of the TL culture.

There are four current issues which determine the extent to which there is quality in the EFL teaching methodologies used at the FLSP. First, there is little freedom for innovation at UdSU. In this situation, it becomes difficult to teach ESP properly to such broad mixed ability groups. If there is no movement on this issue, ESP at UdSU will remain a subject of secondary importance within the curriculum. In this context, the work carried out through TEMPUS can only be a limited success. Second, a key area which hinders success in the delivery of the teaching methodologies, is the long standing Russian tradition that students receive a large number of contact hours and therefore have less private study or research to do outside of classes. Some critics argue that the students have no time for proper reflective study, arguing that quantity does not necessarily mean quality. This scenario is a legacy of the Soviet era when educational institutions had more control over their students. At UdSU, frequent classes cause teachers and students to become mentally and physically tired. Third, until the 1990's, the teaching staff at the Faculty of Languages for Specific Purposes at UdSU was used to a top-down centralised approach. Educationalists in Moscow dictated the number of hours to be taught per subject. These educationalists have now been replaced by 'host' faculties at UdSU whose students avail of the ESP teaching of the FLSP. They dictate when and for how many hours their students are taught English, without a proper system of consultation between the two faculties involved. These faculties continue to resist the notion of integrating with students from different faculties in order to stream the students according to similar ability. Even within the EFL groups from a particular faculty, there is no freedom for the
Chapter Eight

FLSP teachers to stream. Instead, the groupings are dictated to them by administrators who seem unaware of the nature of language learning problems. An extension of this problem is the rigid tradition of having small classes meeting on a regular basis. While that can be a positive characteristic, it has become a burden to teachers who have to teach up to 1,500 hours per year. This can only mean that the teachers do not have enough time to prepare properly for all their classes. In some cases, classes could be combined in order to free up teacher time for other professional duties. At present, these duties are carried out in addition to the usual teaching load. This does not take into account the additional work which most teachers do for cash. Fourth, UdSU claims that it has always tried to promote the dissemination of good practice through a programme of seminars and workshops (a) within the University and (b) among other tertiary level institutions in the Udmurt Republic. To a limited extent, the FLSP has achieved its goal of internal dissemination. However, there are inconsistencies and this research has highlighted several cases where inadequate or no dissemination has taken place. In terms of the second and larger goal, dissemination has extended to other universities in Udmurtia including the Udmurt State Agricultural University, Izhevsk, the Udmurt State Technical University, Izhevsk, the Udmurt State Medical University, Izhevsk and the Udmurt State Pedagogic Institute, Glazov, as well as to some of the local schools, as originally envisaged by TEMPUS. Success in dissemination has been limited up until recently. Inadequate finances and a lack of experience in organising conferences and other means of dissemination have held this process up. However, recent evidence indicates that progress continues to be made in this area. For example, UdSU held a conference in March 2000, entitled 'Teaching Foreign Languages for Specific Purposes at Non-Linguistic Faculties of Higher and Vocational Institutions' at which representatives from other tertiary institutions were in attendance.
Many of the organisational problems faced by the FLSP, are not unique to UdSU. In fact, they are widespread throughout Russia. For example, the 1986-87 Higher Education Reform (Kerr, In Dunstan (editor), 1992, p. 146.) sought to tackle some of the key problems facing the then Soviet education system. It proposed a tightening of admission criteria and more leeway for administrators to dismiss students unable to make satisfactory progress. It also advocated a shift away from a narrow specific training to a broader one, with more emphasis on learning foreign languages with more independent study and fewer weekly classes.

8.2 An Evaluation of the Success of the Role of TEMPUS in the FLSP

Bearing in mind the points made in 8.1 above, it is evident that after four years involvement with TEMPUS, the FLSP and its teaching staff have made substantial progress in methodological thinking. The Faculty started from a position where it had exposure to no Western methodologies, possessed no Western textbooks and had no official documentation on syllabus design. Since then, substantial progress in the development of its teaching methodologies has been achieved and TEMPUS has been instrumental in this process. The Tacis Monitoring Programme in Moscow acknowledged this progress in a report on the FLSP’s TEMPUS project in June 1998 (Kovalchuk and Nielsen, 3 June 1998, p. 4). It found that the implementation of the goals of the project and the achievement of the envisaged outputs were of an acceptable standard. The most notable achievement was the fact that UdSU had been awarded the 'Yeltsin Initiative' for the new syllabus for Business English, with the highest possible rating. This achievement is tangible because only four of the 90 competing institutions throughout Russia were awarded this category.

However, the influence of TEMPUS has been different to that which was originally envisaged. In hindsight, the goals of the project were too idealistic, when one considers
the true realities of life in Udmurtia. For example, the geographical location has had a major effect on the outputs of the project. In addition, it must be realised that it is not possible to impose Western methodologies on the FLSP teachers. There are three reasons for this assumption. First, the Western approach to teaching languages has been built up over fifty years since the Second World War. The same pattern is also true in Russia. UdSU's past methodologies cannot simply be removed and forgotten but rather they can be changed and adapted over time. The methodologies will evolve naturally as they come into contact with Western methodologies but take on its own unique character. Second, the traditional background of UdSU's students is one where they are concerned with grammatical and lexical detail and not with expressing their own ideas or interacting naturally with other speakers. Such preconceptions will have to be broken down if the UdSU teachers wish to change their learners' perceptions of what to expect in the ESP classroom in order to bring about this change. Third, the entire University structure is set against what TEMPUS has tried to achieve with the FLSP. The FLSP has to service all other 'host' faculties individually and ultimately carries no real power to impose new policies or change structures which affect it. If the TEMPUS project had been with any other faculty, greater control of syllabus implementation, teaching staff and the number of contact hours per subject area could have been achieved because all the other faculties have a greater degree of autonomy.

Evidently, the FLSP has experienced increased isolation post-TEMPUS. However a new project for accountancy with The Manchester Metropolitan University (TEMPUS II, 1999-2000) has avoided a severing of links for UdSU, but not for the FLSP. Given this fact, there are doubts about the sustainability of the progress made by the FLSP. Finance is the main factor which inhibits further advancement in the future. The teachers are still poorly paid and limited resources mean that not all teachers can avail of the TEMPUS-funded textbooks. Furthermore, there is evidence that FLSP continues to fail to
implement the new syllabus with tiered entry. In this sense, it is possible to argue that the FLSP is actually regressing in the absence of TEMPUS.

8.3 Conclusion and Theoretical Implications for Future Related Research
This research has sought to answer the question whether there is quality in the EFL teaching methodologies at UdSU from longitudinal and cross-sectional perspectives. As a consequence, the following conclusions can be drawn. First, it can be said that progress has been made at UdSU in the face of many past problems and numerous current ones. UdSU's achievements in ESP methodologies are substantial in the nature of both their quantity and quality. This research has revealed that there is a long tradition of ESP methodology at UdSU, stretching back over a period of more than twenty years. Within the methodology, there are specific types of ESP learning: These include role-play work, reading comprehension based on precise knowledge of lexis and grammar, translation work from the TL into the L1 and from the L1 into the TL. Most aspects of the methodologies are clearly rooted in traditional Russian educational practices. The level of the material is comparable to much of the EFL material produced elsewhere in Russia. However, much of the material from both corpuses can be viewed as being low in cognitive and affective value by Western educationalists.

Second, evidence of an UdSU adaptation of methodologies can be found in two key areas. The UdSU-produced variants of (1) the Milashevich Method and (2) the Intensive Method provide both quantitative and qualitative evidence of on-going theoretical development in the field of linguistics. Both methods reached UdSU from other educational institutions located elsewhere in Russia. Two UdSU teachers have taken both methods and developed them for their own educational requirements to differing degrees of success. Clearly, the Milashevich Method has been developed much further and refined more thoroughly than the Intensive Method. There is a cogent development
from Milashevich's original ideas. Through an evolving process, the elements of the original have been resequenced: some have been extended: others have been dropped and replaced. All of these facts confirm that a healthy level of methodological debate has been on-going about the related methods. However, the key problem concerning both the Milashevich Method and the Intensive Method lies in the fact that only the same two teachers in the Law section were involved in both projects. No other teacher has been involved in the practical production of the methodology for the FLSP's ESP purposes. There is a cause for concern that so few teachers have been actively involved in research.

Third, there is no evidence that the UdSU variants, analysed in this research, have been promoted within Russia or abroad. However, based on the evidence found in Ziozenkova and Milashevich, St. Petersburg (1992), which contains flaws in the presentation of the German language's use of the perfect and imperfect tenses, it is clear that Korneva and Reshetnikova (1994 and 1996) have reached a more advanced stage in their work than the authors of the latter. There is potential to develop the method further for use in translation work from the TL into the L1. However, the absence of certain verb forms and other related issues, as discussed in Chapter Three, need to be resolved before the method variant can be given greater publicity within Russia.

Reference must be made here to Kerr (1992, p. 150) who writes that the Russian Federal government estimated in 1992 that only 5% of the vuzy were of world quality. A further 20% were in a position to contribute actively to the country's further economic development. Given the evidence gathered in this research, UdSU does not contribute at present at a national level to the debate on ESP. However, Korneva and Reshetnikova's work on the Milashevich Method is on the verge of making a contribution to the national debate on EFL. With more refinement, their work could become part of the 20% mentioned above. The same does not apply to their work on the Intensive Method which
falls short of the methodological rigor created by Kitagorodskaya. The remainder of the UdSU corpus material, which was analysed in Chapter Five, offers no innovative contribution to the evolution of EFL teaching methodologies.

Fourth, UdSU’s approach to assessment shows little progress in terms of methodological development. The format and criteria used in the Entrance Examination are essentially the same as those used at the oral exit test. The progress tests are primarily based on structural linguistics and most questions focus on grammar and lexis. Authentic communication (as perceived in the West) is not seen as important. As ESP courses are meant to offer greater specific focus in terms of the range of activities and situations covered, the exit test should surely reflect this. However, there is little evidence of such specificity in the FLSP’s assessment methods. This is mainly due to the issue of authenticity of task setting. The tasks are chosen for their ease of administration and marking and because a traditional approach to assessment has been established. Consequently, the same set format is used throughout all the 'host' faculties for oral examinations and at all ability levels. There is no established approach for making distinctions between the different levels of learner ability which reduces student self-motivation.

Fifth, the cross-sectional analysis in Chapter Seven reveals that there is an eclectic range of teaching styles among the FLSP teachers. Generally, the strategies employed by the ESP teachers in the UdSU classroom meet the expectations of their learners. While many of the techniques can be viewed as old-fashioned and of limited value, the reality of life experienced by the UdSU learners must be taken into account. Most were used to an antiquated style of TL teaching at secondary level. The classroom product delivered by the FLSP teachers at UdSU either matches that with which they are familiar or surpasses it. However, what the teaching has not achieved, is a change in the negative self-
perception of many UdSU students about their ability in the TL. In this sense, it has failed primarily because of the limited range of approaches used to teach a broad range of learners, each with his own individual learning style."

Since the break-up of Communism, the FLSP has found itself in a protracted transitional phase. While this period has been unstable, it has presented the FLSP with an opportunity which few tertiary establishments in the world ever have. It has the chance to carry out a major self-evaluation of what its own methodological practices. This research has shown that it is not just impossible but, more importantly, inappropriate for UdSU to simply adopt Western teaching methodologies completely. There are several reasons for this view. First, both the Russian and Western educational systems are fundamentally different. Second, Russian and Western methodologies are constantly evolving and have grown organically in isolation of each other over the last century. The wholesale adoption of Western teaching methodologies would be expensive, impractical and unrealistic. Third, UdSU could not afford to purchase sufficient quantities of Western-produced materials for their students. Clearly then, what is appropriate for the West does not necessarily have to be appropriate for UdSU. Interestingly, Burnaby and Sun (1989, pp. 219-238) have shown that Chinese teachers at tertiary level institutions have long held this viewpoint. The latter teach EFL to those students who need the language for professional purposes but teach ESL to those students who intend to visit or live in the TL country. In the case of EFL, Chinese educationalists believe that it is more logical to teach such learners the analytical skills and knowledge of English grammar and concentrate less on cross-cultural issues. It is methodologically possible to argue that UdSU might find the Chinese approach more appropriate for their environment.

However, unlike the Chinese, UdSU has been methodologically influenced by the West through TEMPUS which has exposed the FLSP staff to Western teaching methodologies
and practices. Clearly, many UdSU teachers should have learnt enough by now to know how to set about improving their own teaching methodologies. They should be able to draw on the best of Russian and Western FLT methodologies. The development of syllabuses needs to be addressed simultaneously with the issue of assessment. If UdSU wishes to shift to a more Western style of teaching, it must start with a more structural syllabus which takes into account the skills already acquired by its students on their arrival at UdSU in order not to alienate them totally. Over the three years of the basic degree, the emphasis should shift from structure to a syllabus which shows both lexical and functional relevance in a modern world. The emphasis does not necessarily have to be on TL culture as it is more likely that the UdSU students will require a knowledge of English for an international environment where it serves as the lingua franca for all. Similarly, assessment must reflect the new changes in the teaching methodologies. Furthermore, in terms of the organisation and the standardisation of the application of assessment, the FLSP must improve the standard of the performance of its staff.

While recent developments have provided UdSU with a window of opportunity, Western researchers have also gained an opportunity to contribute to the debate about EFL in an environment which was hitherto closed to them. The opportunity has presented us with the chance to review our perceptions of FL learning and teaching and obliged us to review the theoretical impact which this new experience has had on Western methodological thinking. It is clearly not appropriate to assume that Russia should simply adopt all Western approached to methodology. With the increasing importance of the Intercultural Method, a middle path between what they have at present and what we can offer them appears to be the best way forward.
Appendix 1  TACIS

Tacis Programme

The European Training Foundation is an agency established by the European Union to support and co-ordinate activities between EU and partner countries in Central and Eastern Europe. The European Training Foundation, through its self-funded Tacis Programme has been contributing to the process of transition to market economies and democratic societies in the states of Central and Eastern Europe formerly controlled by the USSR and more recently in the former Republics of the USSR (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Moldova, Mongolia, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan). The remit of Tacis is extremely wide and ranges from reforming public administration to nuclear safety and environment, to transport and communication to restructuring social services and education. TEMPUS I ran between 1990 and 1994. It was followed by TEMPUS II for the period 1994 to 1998. Between 1991 and 1994 (Tacis, European Commission, 1995, p. 4), Tacis provided ECU 1,757 million in more than 2,000 projects.

TEMPUS

TEMPUS (Trans-European Co-operation Scheme for Higher Education) was adopted by the Council of Ministers of the then European Community on 7th May 1990 and was originally conceived as a four year project which was then extended on 29th April 1993 for a further four year period (TEMPUS II). The two key objectives of TEMPUS are (Tacis, European Community, Luxembourg, 1995, p. 2):

(1) To promote the quality, and support the development and renewal of Higher Education systems in the Newly Independent countries (NIS).

(2) To encourage the co-operation between NIS countries and the European Community (now European Union).
TEMPUS has a two phase cycle. First, each project starts with a one-year Pre-Joint European Project (called Pre-JEP). Special consideration is given to a balanced geographic distribution across each partner country. During this period a team is built on which a full JEP project could be based. If the Pre-JEP is successfully completed, funding can be granted for a further three year JEP project but this funding is by no means automatic. In terms of finance the sum for each project amounts to c.£500,000. In the academic year 1995/96, there were 36 Pre-JEP projects and 35 T-JEP projects.

TEMPUS in the Russian Federation

The Russian Federation was one of the first three countries to join the TEMPUS programme in 1993. Between 1993 and 1998 a total of 264 projects have been financed through the programme, 71 of these being three year joint European projects. Support to the Russian Federation focuses on the social sciences, humanities as well as on university management.
Appendix 2 Additional Background to Udmurt State University

The following additional information is included for further clarification of issues related to the UdSU environment. The information is of secondary relevance to the background of this research and therefore deserves inclusion in this appendix.

The Ethnic Udmurt Population and their Language

The Udmurts constitute 31% of the total population of Udmurtia, the Russians 58% and the Tatars 7%. Representatives of another one hundred nationalities live in the Republic also. The Republic was set up by Stalin but was left with an in-built Russian majority to control the region politically. An example of the political manipulation which went on is confirmed by the fact that the former capital, Glazov has a majority Udmurt population and it was Stalin who shifted the capital to the majority Russian city of Izhevsk to ensure that political control remained with Russian majority.

The minority Udmurt population’s language is a member of the Finno-Ugric languages, a subfamily of the Uralic languages which are spoken by about 25 million people in parts of northern Scandinavia, Eastern Europe, and north-western Asia. Udmurt (or Votyak) and Komi (or Zyrian) are spoken by small, widely scattered groups in a vast area extending over the north-eastern European part of Russia. The Cyrillic alphabet is used but the spoken and written forms of the language cannot be understood by Russians. Most Udmurt students studying at UdSU have mastered Russian as a second native language but a small minority fall into the category of students who learn Russian as their foreign language for specific purposes.
Economy

Russia's economy was affected severely both before and following the dissolution of the USSR. From the position of an over-staffed economy which delivered an extremely poor output, annual economic decline reached at its worst 20% in 1992. Analysts estimated that the total decline in gross domestic product was 40-50% for the period 1990-1994. This constitutes a much greater drop than that which occurred in the United States in the 1930's during the Great Depression.

The structure of Russian industry was greatly affected by theoretical assumptions of Soviet planners on the role of industry in economic growth. In accordance with Soviet theory, heavy industry was promoted above all other sectors, with the greatest emphasis on machine-building and metalwork industries because they were meant to provide the means for more production. Industrial output for national defence also received high priority in Soviet plans. Soviet industries were always very technologically advanced in the production of certain items, such as aerospace technology, but the overall level of technology remains far below the levels of other highly industrialised countries. The more successful machine-building industries are usually located in the largest cities because they are labour intensive. Fitting into this pattern of industry, Izhevsk has long been an important steel mill centre. Other important businesses include forest products, oil, machinery and armaments, most notably Kalashnikov rifles and ballistic missiles.

With the on-going economic collapse in Russia, the Soviet order of wages for various professions has disintegrated. In Izhevsk, state employees, such as doctors, nurses, dentists, police, civil servant, secondary and tertiary level teachers, have seen the financial value of their work crash. Their counterparts in the ever-growing private sector earn far more. If one of the above professionals can find a similar job in the private sector the swap-over will occur. Others choose to supplement their wage through extra
private employment for cash in hand. Yet it is demoralising for all of them to receive no salary some months, or perhaps a mere 20% of what they are entitled to, simply because the federal government has no finances to pay them (which led to a national strike in 1997). For most professionals, more money could be earned by abandoning their jobs and choosing to do other more practical work which offers direct payment for the hours worked (e.g. taxi driving, selling provisions at the market), yet most persevere, juggling their full-time work with their part-time job which can constitute up to a further twenty hours of weekly employment.

More recently, hardships have grown more acute due to the frequent and sharp devaluations in the Rouble, from the official rate of 0.4 rouble per £1 in 1988 to more than 10,000 roubles per £1 in 1997 (prior to revaluation in January 1998). Following the launch of the new Rouble, there was a further collapse of the currency which led to another devaluation and increased instability in August 1998. This particular crisis hit hard because it happened to the new currency which was heralded as the start of a new era of financial stability upon its introduction. This financial instability has many consequences for UdSU and its employees. There is no point in keeping money in banks because of high inflation, nor is there any security in keeping savings in the form of Rouble notes. Instead, the US Dollar in paper form is the general currency of stability. Both UdSU and its employees have learnt through harsh lessons that the stashing of such notes is the only way to plan future finances, particularly since an influx of Western consumer goods at Western prices has reached the limited number of shops in Izhevsk. In the case of UdSU itself, TEMPUS-bought goods are either purchased in the West and then transported to Izhevsk (which often encounters major bureaucratic difficulties involving huge amounts of paperwork as the sums reach tens of thousands of pounds at a time) or a visiting Western academic carries up to US $20,000 on his person which is then handed over to the university for purchasing equipment previously agreed upon.
National Government
Since independence the lack of clear lines of authority in the Russian Federation has aggravated a power struggle between reformers and conservatives throughout the whole Republic. Under the new 1993 Constitution, the Russian Executive is headed by President Putin who has sweeping powers. Russia's national legislature, the Federal Assembly, is composed of a two-chamber body, the State Duma and the Council of the Federation. The Council of the Federation is composed of two representatives from each of the 89 republics and regions which make up the Russian Federation. The Udmurt Republic has two representatives in the Council of the Federation, which represents only a small voice at the national level politics but the national government's actions can have a dramatic effect on Udmurtia.

Regional Government
In terms of local government, Russia is composed of 32 ethnic divisions: 21 republics, 1 autonomous oblast, 10 autonomous okrugs, 55 administrative divisions, 49 oblasts and 6 krais (provinces). Separate administrative districts exist for Moscow and St. Petersburg. In late 1990 the term 'autonomous' was dropped from the names of the republics as it was feared that it might encourage individual republics to move for independence. Predictably, following the dissolution of the USSR, several ethnic republics did seek more autonomy within the federation, among them the Udmurt Republic. By granting them some devolved powers in the 1993 Constitution, including the right to adopt their own constitutions, anthems and flags, the federal government hoped to keep them in check which has proved successful.

The Udmurt Republic has had Alexander Volkov as its President since 1994. He has fairly extensive powers which include the authority to return legislation for amendments to the Udmurt State Parliament. As with most aspects of Russian reality, the boundaries
of his authority are vague and can be changed according to how politically aggressive or
defensive he chooses to be. The tendency is to seek expansion of his power. As recently
as 6th March 1997 President Yeltsin sounded a warning to Udmurtia in particular for
refusing to pay taxes to the Federal Government and failing to adhere to federal laws
(International Herald Tribune, 26th March 1997, page 5). The key factor in the 1997
crisis concerned the Federal Government's inability to pay the workers their wages
throughout the Russian Federation. At that time, the Udmurt State Government withheld
its federal contribution in a bid to deal with its own problems at a more local level. This
has happened several times in the intervening period.

Russian Education System
In 1991, Russia inherited an extensive system of education from the Soviet Union. Soviet
authorities had established a network of institutions at pre-school, primary, secondary,
and tertiary levels. In 1991 Russia had 519 establishments of higher education with
2,763,000 students. Universities comprise only a small proportion of the higher
educational establishments; the vast majority of these establishments are institutes which
specialise in vocational training. The country's most prominent universities include
Moscow M. V. Lomonosov State University (1755), St. Petersburg State University
(1819), Kazan' State University (1804), and Novosibirsk State University (1959).
Noticeably, UdSU is not seen as one of the top universities.

The relationship between central and regional government still affects the field of
education. The Communist centralised control extended to all areas of life over the last
seventy years. During the Soviet period, the Ministry of Higher and Secondary
Specialised Education controlled virtually all aspects of university life. This included
admission criteria, preparation and approval of curricula, staff recruitment, specialities
taught at institutions, methodological directives, organisation of instruction for
Candidate and Doctorate degrees, provided state sanctioned textbooks and building plans approval. It also dictated that students should have between 4,000-5,000 hours of instruction and cover 20-30 subjects during their degree. The first three years should be of a general study and the last two of a more subject specific nature.

From the late 1980's onwards educational institutions were granted much greater freedom under Mikhail Gorbachev's policy of 'glasnost' (openness). The 1986-87 Higher Education Reform, for example, sought to tackle some of the key problems facing the then Soviet education system. It proposed a tightening of admission criteria and more leeway for administrators to dismiss students unable to make satisfactory progress. It also advocated a shift away from a narrow specific to a broader training with more emphasis on learning foreign languages with more independent study and fewer weekly classes (Kerr, 1992, page 146). Later, ideological training disappeared and new teaching methodologies were developed and promoted in public schools. Private schools were established and religious and other previously banned themes of artistic expression were allowed to flourish. These changes in policy will continue to affect Russian education but more deeply rooted national characteristics will become apparent without the communist slant and that these will be distinct from Western European countries.
Appendix 3

Map Showing the Location of Izhevsk in European Russia
Appendix 4  Survey of UdSU's ESP Books

The following notes are based exclusively on the material contained within the UdSU in-house publications. There is no reference to how these exercises have been, are being or will be delivered by an UdSU teacher using the material. That does not fall within the remit of this section.

(1)

Title: Home Reading Aid for 3-d Year Subjects (Part II)
Author: Chaznova, L M and Shalamov, Y V
Date: 1980
Level: Third Year
Subject group: Language and Literature
Topics dealt with: Jennie Gerhardt by Theodor Dreiser and Room at the Top by J. Braise

Comments: The activities are standard throughout each chapter analysis and consist of the following: read chapter, memorise the vocabulary lists, reproduce the situation in which they were used, give the setting, describe key elements of the character, complete reading comprehension questions, summarise certain aspects of the work. Most of these tasks are low on the cognitive scale, at point (iii). However, there is personal engagement when the student is asked, for example, to offer his 'own opinion' on certain characters (p. 45). There is a sense of progression through the book, though this is slow. The end of the book suggests related topics for general discussion which require evaluation, explanation, reasoning and interpretation which match some of the elements in point (xii) on the cognitive scale.
Title: Home Reading Aid - O. Wilde, The Importance of Being Earnest
Author: Deriosheva, F B
Date: 1984
Level: Second Year
Subject group: Language and Literature
Topics dealt with: Each Act of the Play 'The Importance of Being Earnest'
Comments: The Introductory notes at the start are written in the TL with L1 equivalents for more unfamiliar words in brackets (e.g. guffawing, ranting, incarnates). The activities specified include listen and find in the text, recall and reproduce, transcribe, find the synonyms, create dialogues (i.e. read from text in pairs) and reading comprehension questions. The style is very similar to other textbook formats with the same activities scheduled for each act. The activities themselves are designed to take as long as possible (other activities include recall and reproduce the situation and reproduce the contents of the play using the given words and expressions) and are based on lower cognitive skills, up to point (iii).

There is some evidence of requiring the learner to analyse the character in Question 8 (p32), where he has to 'give character sketches of Jack and Algernon'. However, due to a lack of direction in the question, there is no emphasis on the student to apply his knowledge about the characters. Therefore the wording of the activity restricts the question to point (iv) of the cognitive domain.

There is evidence of taking activities from western sources without adapting them for appropriate use within UdSU. Activity III, page 12, advises students to use D. Jones' Dictionary and activity IV, page 12, directs the students towards Hornby's Dictionary. However, neither of these dictionaries are in the FLSP library or the main UdSU library.
Another important aspect of the book can be discussed briefly within the affective domain. Clearly, the play is set within the TL culture but at an earlier period in social history. There is no evidence of support or guidance for the student for coping with what is quite a difficult text linguistically. This appears to be left up to the individual teacher.

(3)

Title: Home Reading Aid to 'The Painted Veil' by S. Maugham

Author: Pushina, N I

Date: 1983

Level: Third Year

Subject group: Language and Literature

Topics dealt with: Chapters of 'The Painted Veil'

Comments: The activities are based on each chapter and include the following: read the chapter, memorise the vocabulary, recall the situations in which the words were met, the must think up his own sentences using the same phrases. On the cognitive scale, these tasks only reach point (iii). The answers are self-contained in each unit and do not challenge the student in the cognitive or effective domains. In some cases, the structure of the answer is controlled. On page eight, certain phrases and words must be used in the answer to question three. However, what is given in note form is the answer, so the student does not need to look for the answer.

At the end of the book, there is a change in the style of approach. First, in the activation of vocabulary (p. 21), there is a gap fill exercise on prepositions. The answers are to be found in the active vocabulary. To find these, the student must only turn back to the start of the book and look through each section for the correct preposition as the exercise follows the order of the vocabulary lists. Second, in the section entitled Contents and Discussion, the aim is to elicit an individual response from the student, with questions
such as: 'Do you consider the end of the novel to be optimistic?' (p. 20). This is further up the cognitive scale than the rest of the activities which reach point (iii).

(4)
Title: Plani seminarskiy zanyati i teksti dlya analize po stilistike angliskogo yazika
Author: Ivanova, E A
Date: 1983
Level: Fourth Year
Subject group: Language and Literature (Seminar Material)
Comments: There is a clear structure to the layout of this specialist's seminar book which has the following pattern: introduction to the topics to be covered, a short list of recommended critical reading provided and the material extracts to be analysed. All the critical literature mentioned are of Russian sources with no reference to Western approaches, although almost half of the sources mentioned refer to reading Soviet material which exists in the TL.

There is a clear sense of progression through the seminar materials, with evidence that each new chapter builds on from the work completed in the previous seminar. However, there are no listed questions for each textual excerpt which weakens the cognitive purpose of the book.
Title: Scholars About Stylistics
Author: Ivanova, E A
Date: 1990
Level: First Year
Subject group: Language and Literature
Topics dealt with: Problems of style, Connotation, Simile and Metaphor, How connotation changes, Linguistics and Poetics.
Comments: These texts are extremely technical and far removed from the world and even ability of a first year student. They have been copied from presumably Western sources but with several spelling errors. The exercises do not appear too challenging on the cognitive scale (again point (iii)), one requiring the student to take out the Russian word from an English text and replace it with its English equivalent (p. 10). There is no obvious gradational development in the range of questions but rather the exercises constitute a form of translation which offers no variation in style of cognitive challenge.

Page 29 is included in the book by mistake as it comes from a German textbook and merely lists vocabulary. The book emits a teacher-centred ethos where the teacher is in control of the content and the classes. The affective domain is a non-issue is this book.

Title: Scholars About the English Language (Part Two, Section 2)
Author: Ivanova, E A and Kuznetsova, F M
Date: 1991
Level: Second Year
Subject group: Language and Literature
Topics dealt with: Language, Philology, Middle English History (1066), Vocabulary, Origins of Language

Comments: These texts appear to be adopted from Western sources but the questions are not as technical as the text, but repetitive and simple (p. 10). There is evidence of the usage of less commonly used TL constructions ('to admit of any scientific appraisal' p. 13 and 'publicistic', p. 15). There are five texts but only two sets of questions. On pages 43 and 46, the text refers the reader to accompanying tables but none have been included. This book shows very few signs of any thorough planning. The texts appear too detailed for second year EFL learners and the accompanying activities are low on the cognitive scale at point (iii). There is little direction given to the student who has very little opportunity to work freely with language.

(7)

Title: Video Nasties (Role Play)
Author: Kuznetsova, F M
Date: 1987
Level: Senior Classes
Subject group: Language and Literature

Topics dealt with: A newspaper article on Videos and Sex and Videos and Violence, two long newspaper extracts on research into video violence, a class discussion on the issues covered and a role-play on the same issue.

Comments: There is plenty of background material available on the topic of video nasties which helps to build up a substantial quantity of vocabulary and, more importantly, the student's ideas on the topic. All of this is building up towards the discussion which requires the student to formulate his own ideas. Furthermore, each student is given a character to play in the role play. The latter provides a positive
challenge to the student in both the cognitive and affective domains. With the increased level of freedom, there is a greater chance of increasing student motivation.

(8)
Title: Unemployment (Role Play)
Author: Kuznetsova, F M
Date: 1993
Level: Senior Classes
Subject group: Language and Literature
Topics dealt with: Automation and Redundancy, Unemployment, Norman Lamont as Chancellor of the Exchequer and an article of social comment.
Comments: There is an inconsistent pattern in the way in which the reading materials are utilised. There are only reading comprehension questions for the first text and none thereafter. The other texts are for translation and vocabulary building. The material is well chosen because it offers personal insights into Western perceptions of the issue of unemployment (however, the reference to Norman Lamont in 1993 is out-of-date). In the role play the student chooses his own character which increases the level of personal engagement in the work and leads to an increased level of motivation and creativity which is reflected in the higher ranking on the cognitive and affective scales.

(9)
Title: Metodicheskaya rekomandatsii po modifikatsii uchenogo protsessa na I-II kursach FRLG
Author: Trofimova, L S
Date: 1982
Level: First and Second Years
Subject group: Language and Literature
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Topics dealt with: Rhymes such as: Monday's child is fair of face,, Hickory Dickory Dock, The big bell sings, Pussy cat Pussy cat - where have you been, etc.: and poems by Thomas Moore, Robert Burns, William Shakespeare: and also a section on Kinetics (i.e. non-linguistic communication)

Comments: There are no cognitive exercises in this book. The book serves only as an aid to the teacher in the classroom as a source of texts. Clearly, the texts encourage the belief that gesture, mimery, gesticulations and outer-actions can be taught best consciously, through analysis of theory and then applying it consciously in action. The exercises, or more appropriately activities, fall into the psychometer domain (physical dexterity) as they focus on the developmental sequence of imitation, manipulation, precision, manipulation leading to naturalisation.

(10)

Title: Metodicheskiye ukazaniya k laboratornym rabotam po praktike pervyoda

Author: Shutova, N M

Date: 1988

Level: Fourth Year

Subject group: Language and Literature


Comments: The main aim of this book is translation from the TL into the L1, although circa ten percent of the activities involve translation from the L1 into the TL (though on a much simpler level). On the cognitive scale of the development of intellectual abilities and skills, translation is point (i) of a three point scale and therefore the lowest.
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(11)

Title: Metodicheskaya razrabota po angliskomu yaziku dlya studentov filologicheskogo fakulteta

Author: Ivanova, E A and Kuznetsova, F M

Date: 1988

Level: Literature Specialists working in the area of Philology

Subject group: Language and Literature

Topics dealt with: English writers and critics about literature. Authors include H.G. Wells, Virginia Wolf, Dickens, Evelyn Waugh and Turgenev.

Comments: The tasks include: read and translate text, give Russian equivalents, quote the sentences in which the words and word combinations given are used in the text, find in the text the English equivalents for words given, insert prepositions or adverbs, insert articles, correct form of a verb, find in the text and translate sentences containing forms of the conditional tense and imperatives, make up ten questions based on the text, find sentences in the text which can serve as answers to the following questions, make up a plan of the text and outline the main problems of the text in Russian, choose a topics and prepare a short report and give a free translation of the passage which follows. The length of one Dickens text is three and a half pages, compared to nine and a half for the tasks related to the text (pp. 27-41). On that evidence alone, the balance of tasks in relation to length of text is disproportionate. Furthermore, the exercises are of low cognitive value at point (iii).

(12)

Title: English Scholars About Literature (Section II)

Author: Ivanova, E A

Date: 1989

Level: Literature Specialists
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Subject group: Language and Literature


Comments: The tasks include: give Russian equivalents, find the English equivalents in text, insert prepositions, adverbs, articles and verbs in sentences, make up a plan of the text, write a summary, find sentences which serve as answers to the questions listed and a discussion of the text. All tasks but the last one are of a low cognitive value at point (iii). The latter requires higher cognitive as well as affective skills.

(13)

Title: Logical Grammar In Exercises

Author: Korneva, O N and Reshetnikova, T K

Date: 1984

Level: First Year and Upwards

Subject group: Law

Topics dealt with: This deals with aspects of grammar and focuses on verb forms and syntax using a mathematical approach.

Comments: See section 3.5 on The Milashevich Method for detailed analysis.

(14)

Title: Metodicheska razrabota

Author: Korneva, O N and Reshetnikova, T K

Date: 1996

Level: First Year and Upwards

Subject group: Law

Topics dealt with: This deals with the same aspects of grammar and focuses on verb forms and syntax using a mathematical approach, as in (13). It is an extension of the
theory and material offered in the previous version, offering more detail and a greater
degree of refinement of the theory itself.

Comments: See section 3.5 on The Milashevich Method for detailed analysis.

(15)
Title: Criminal Case (Part 3)
Author: Korneva, O N and Reshetnikova, T K
Date: 1989
Level: Third Year
Subject group: Law
Topics dealt with: A short play which deals with a murder investigation.
Comments: The play is short and is written for study under the Intensive Method. For
extended comments, see the section 3.4 on Kitaigorodskaya and the Intensive Method.

(16)
Title: Methodichekaya razrabota po angliskomi yaziku dlya studentov zaochnogo
otdelyeniya ioridicheskogo fakulteta
Author: Korneva, O N, Reshetnikova, T K and Stelkova, L M
Date: 1982
Level: First Year
Subject group: Law (by Correspondence)
Topics dealt with: UK and US governments, UK monarchy, UK local government.
Comments: The texts offer a mixture of British and American culture and contain only
two errors in total (one a typing error and the other a spelling error). The texts are also
shorter than the length of the exercises which accompany them. For example, passage A
contains 26 lines of text but 76 lines of tasks accompanying it. There is no constant
pattern in the choice of activities suggested. The tasks include: read aloud, analyse the
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verb forms, write out the verb forms, write out the derivatives, change the active sentences into the passive, complete the end of the sentence and translate, disagree with the statements, find the international roots of words, find the English for the Russian words, write the sentences in the passive and translate, translate the paragraph, give the Russian equivalents for the English, transcribe the words and explain the rules of reading and write down a plan of the text. The activities are low on the cognitive and affective scales.

There is an inconsistent use of providing the Russian translation in brackets within the TL texts. This is due to the presence of a vocabulary list for texts one, two and three at the back of the book but the lack thereof for texts four and five, where the Russian is offered within the TL text. The former average eleven words in the vocabulary lists whereas the latter average only one, yet the level of textual difficulty looks similar.

Within the affective domain, there is a misrepresentation of the role of the monarchy in the United Kingdom with a strong overtone of Soviet propaganda (P. 12):

The rising industrial bourgeoisie was quick to appreciate the uses to which the monarchy could be put. Among these uses the propaganda aspect is by far the most important.

(17)

Title: Legislative Power

Author: Korneva, O N and Reshetnikova, T K

Date: 1982

Level: Second Year

Subject group: Law

Comments: The exercises vary from text to text with some tasks occurring only once. The material requires no application of factual or linguistic knowledge but focuses on the skills of grammar and translation which are low on the cognitive scale. The factual material requires that the student fills in the blanks from the text. The tasks covered include: identify the sentences containing the gerund and participle I and translate, read words and transcribe, reading comprehension, sequencing, cloze exercise on prepositions, find the synonyms and antonyms, write out the key sentences, translate the sentences from L1 into TL and write a plan of the text.

In the book, there are nine errors in total, three typing mistakes, five spelling errors and one wrong preposition chosen. The material is predominantly UK-focused with the last text being US-based. The texts are factual and historical. Text E refers back to the 1960 census but the book was published in 1982. There is evidence of anti-Western propaganda and exaggeration of the facts (p. 12):

In Alabama the voter must take an 'anti-Communist oath' and fill in a questionnaire to the satisfaction of the registers. As a result of this, millions of people are deprived the right to vote. ...

... In the United States there are two major bourgeois political parties, the Democratic and the Republican.
Subject group: Law

Topics dealt with: Solicitors, barristers, civil and criminal law, magistrates and judges, juries, punishments, being in court, law related newspaper articles, listening section, role play set in prison, capital punishment, legal terms, role of The House of Lords.

Comments: There is a varied pattern of tasks in relation to the texts. Text one has no activities, text two has a reading comprehension exercise, text three directs the student to make a list of words and word combinations pertaining to the English court system, text four has a listening comprehension, text five has a role play, text six has a listening comprehension, text eight has a self text on legal terms from the L1 to the TL, text eight asks the student to retell the story in English and task nine invites the student to explain the English legal system using the diagram provided. In cognitive terms, there is little progress on the scale, with activities reaching point (iii).

The texts and spellings are UK-based but in one text on British law, the American spelling 'behavior' is used.

(19)

Title: The English Court Trial (Role Play - Part II)

Author: Kuznetsova, F M and Ivanova, E A

Date: 1991

Level: Fourth Year

Subject group: law

Topics dealt with: It contains newspaper articles from the Morning Star which are critical of the police. The first article concerns corruption, the second deals with a policeman accused of shooting somebody and the third one describes a police shooting on a car with three innocent people on board which leads on to a role play which takes place in the courtroom.
Comments: There are few connections between the first article and the remainder of the book. The articles do not have activities attached to them beyond saying 'why more juries are refusing to convict on police evidence' (task one) and saying 'what the jury's verdict in this case might be and why' (task two). The two activities are low on the cognitive scale at point (iii). Interestingly, advice is given to the student (p. 16) not to be too technical in the role play as this will inhibit spontaneity. He is advised to focus on the skills of how to defend, accuse, question and cross-question. Although the precise nature of how the role play should develop is not specified, there is clear evidence of a greater degree of challenge both cognitively and affectively.

There are eight spelling errors in total: five of these are typing errors (e.g. 'it it' instead of 'it is'), one spelling error (e.g. "juries' verdict" when "jury's verdict" was meant), one missing indefinite article and a preposition was added where none was needed. The student is addressed throughout as 'you' which attempts to inspire a sense of personal engagement. The materials are reproduced mainly from the Morning Star. Given the political stance of this newspaper, there is clearly a political anti-Western stance taken in the articles which does not give an objective viewpoint on life in the United Kingdom.

(20)
Title: Methodicheskaia razrabota po angliskomu yaziku dlya shustatelei zaochnogo podgotovitel'nogo otdeleniya
Author: Korneva, O N
Date: 1984
Level: Preparatory
Subject group: History
Topics dealt with: My friend, my flat, town and country, London, my study, my future profession, the education system in the USSR, holidays in the USSR, the Soviet
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Communist Party, Constitution Day, Victory Day, the Komsomol, Lenin and his cause are immortal, Lenin in London, Road to the Stars Soyuz-Apollo, youth organisations in the United Kingdom, We need peace, the bulwark of peace, Socialist youth festivals, Olympic Games and sport in England.

Comments: There are no questions in this book. The purpose is to provide lexical and grammatical analysis for themes through texts for reading and translation. This work forms the basis of retelling the contents of the texts in the student's own words. The tasks are of low cognitive and affective value.

(21)

Title: Some Glimpses on History of Great Britain (Part I)
Author: Ermalyeva, M F, Konyachina, L M and Shishkina, R L
Date: 1987
Level: First
Subject group: History
Topics dealt with: A glimpse on the history of Great Britain, the Celts, Why Tyler leads the Peasants' Revolt, the development of feudalism in England.
Comments: The tasks include: transcribe the following words and be ready to explain the rules of reading, complete the pronunciation exercise, plurals, verb 'to be', tenses, find the Russian and English equivalents, cloze exercise on prepositions and find the passive verbs in the text. The above tasks are all low on the cognitive scale, at point (iii). There is more emphasis on pronunciation and accuracy than on interactive communication. The latter is of secondary importance.
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(22)  
Title: Metodicheska razrabota po grammatike angliiskogo yazika dlya studentov zaochnogo otdeleniya istoricheskogo fakulteta  
Author: Ermalyeva, M F, Konyachina, L M and Shishkina, R L  
Date: 1988  
Level: Correspondence  
Subject group: History  
Topics dealt with: Basic grammar covered includes demonstratives, possessive adjectives, few, little and some, whose, adjectival word combinations, plurals, prepositional verbs, verb tense formation, passive verbs and an irregular verb list.  
Comments: This is a reference book of grammar. Many of the grammar areas have already been covered by the students in their schools. The key areas of grammar are covered in classes five, six and seven with consolidation taking place in classes eight, nine, ten and eleven.

(23)  
Title: Some Glimpses on Ancient History  
Author: Ermalyeva, M F, Konyachina, L M and Shishkina, R L  
Date: 1992  
Level: Second Year  
Subject group: History  
Topics dealt with: Egypt, Rome, the seven wonders of the world.  
Comments: Tasks used include: reading comprehension questions, vocabulary extension exercises, cloze exercises, translation, and pronunciation exercises. There is much duplication of work devised. On page 21, the first task is to read and translate the text but then there are seven other tasks including writing out the principal idea of each paragraph and writing a precis of the text. While some of the tasks listed have a veritable
cognitive value, there is too much repetition. A related problem can be seen in the next
text on Alexander The Great which is three pages long but the exercises fill five pages.
Therefore the relation of text to exercises is disproportionate. All these particular tasks
are low on the cognitive and affective scales.

(24)
Title: USA in Brief
Author: History Section, FLSP (No author specified)
Date: 1994
Level: First
Subject group: History
Topics dealt with: Early American History, English Colonisation of North America, The
Boston Tea Party, The American Revolution, America's First President, Thomas
Jefferson, Structure of Government and Election System, Legislative, Holidays, customs,
traditions, New Year, Christmas, Higher Education.
Comments: This is not written by a Russian and uses American spelling. There are some
typing errors (Philidelfia, Philidelpie) with just a few real spelling problems. The texts
are factual, providing lots of information. The questions are unimaginative and merely
require the student to copy a section of the text. The question forms are virtually all 'wh'
type questions (who, what, when, where). There is no balanced text length, ranging from
3 sides and 8 questions to 10 sides and 27 questions. The questions are not clearly listed
but presented in a paragraph which offers a lack of clarity on the page. There are many
details but no supplementary tables or diagrams to help explain the legislative powers or
supplementary images to bring American traditions to life. There is no skill development,
nor sense of progression. The activities are very long; translations from Russian to
English are typically two sides in length. The summary topics are not given any sense of
direction in the task setting, while the writing topics are vague (e.g. Write a composition:
American System of Higher Education). There is no encouragement to give personal reflection: the student is merely a vehicle for carrying information. On the cognitive table, the task setting limits the student's cognitive development to point (iii).

(25)
Title: British Agriculture Today
Author: Konyachina, L M
Date: 1985
Level: Second Year
Subject group: Economics
Comments: The three key features of methodology, as stated in this book, are phonetics, lexics and grammar. However, the three texts which are two to three sides in length are erratic in covering these topics. On average, there are one to two spelling errors per page and also some poor forms of expression (e.g. young men and 'girls', repetition of 'conference', 'during' one year, p. 3).

Text A was not written using conventional every day English (e.g. Each day the students are to write down in the diaries what they do and see on the farm. p. 4). Task II is very vague in the nature of its academic purpose as it requires the student to find sentences with passives and translate them into Russian, but gives no information as to how many should be found. In fact, there are six but two of these use the same verb. In task III, a similar activity concerns modal verbs but this time there are only three examples to be found. This lack of clarity can only cause the learner confusion and can be put down to badly selected tasks. Other problems include task V having the wrong symbol and being
incorrectly labelled Task III. Here the student has to fill in the missing preposition but the answers can be copied straight from the text. In addition, some of the sentences used here were already covered earlier in Ex.II (e.g. Question 3). In general, all questions are simple and of a general nature. On the cognitive scale, there is no advancement beyond point (iii) and the knowledge of specific facts.

Text B imitates the format of Text A. In Text C, however, there are some fundamental flaws. For example, the digits for numbers are written without the correct punctuation (e.g. 200000). In factual terms, the text refers to Britain's poor farmers (p. 15) and that two thirds of them earn less than £1000 per year (pp. 18-19). Furthermore, in the comprehension exercise to Text C, question one uses inappropriate English while question four has no link to what is in the text. There is not even a single mention of the EEC or the Common Agricultural Policy. In fact, the only dates mentioned refer to 1950 and 1966. The mention of five or ten year plans is also inappropriate as it leads the learner to believe that the use of these terms is current in the TL. The above findings alter the function of the affective domain as much of this material is factually incorrect or out-of-date.

(26)
Title: Agriculture In the USSR
Author: Konyachina, L M
Date: 1985
Level: First Year
Subject group: Economics
Topics dealt with: Changes on the farm, New machines some to the field, Agriculture in to USSR, Collective farm today, Cotton growing farm. All material is L1 culture-focused.
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Comments: The tasks include: read and transcribe the rules of reading, give three forms of the verb and translate, convert words to plural (e.g. man, farmer, law), give comparisons of words and translate them, translate sentences given and analyse the verb forms, complete cloze exercise on prepositions, read text and answer the following questions. All the tasks listed are low on the cognitive scale at point (iii).

(27)
Title: Metodicheskaya razrabota po angliskomu yaziku dlya studentov zaochnogo ekonomicheskogo fakulteta (Chast 1)
Author: Strelkova, L M
Date: 1988
Level: First Year

Subject group: Economics

Topics dealt with: Economic science, wants, price and value, law of value, and salary and wages. The supplementary material includes division of labour, types of commodity, demand, law of supply and demand and profit.

Comments: Tasks include: transcribe words, find the words in the text with international roots, find the English equivalents, give Russian equivalents, reading comprehension and write down a plan of the text. In all cases, where tasks are supplied with the text, there are more lines of tasks than text. The tasks are of low cognitive and affective value.

(28)
Title: Metodicheskaya razrabota po angliskomu yaziku dlya studentov zaochnogo otdeleniya filologicheskogo fakulteta (Chast 1)
Author: Dubovcheva, N B, Mamushina, L K and Sobakina, E I
Date: 1983
Level: First Year
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Subject group: Philology

Topics dealt with: My family, a letter to a penpal about oneself, Shakespeare, James Fenimore Cooper and Robert Burns.

Comments: The tasks include: read the following words, read the word combinations and give the Russian equivalent, give the English equivalent to the Russian supplied, copy out the sentences from the text containing the present indicative, reading comprehension and write a plan of the text. The tasks are low on the cognitive and affective scales.

(29)

Title: Metodicheskaya razrabota po angliskomu yaziku dlya studentov zaocchnogo oteleniya filologicheskogo fakulteta (Chast 3)

Author: Dubovcheva, N B and Mamushina, L K and Sobakina, E I

Date: 1987

Level: Third Year

Subject group: Philology

Topics dealt with: Robert Burns, Charles Dickens, William Thackery, Byron and Russian poetry and Walter Scott.

Comments: Tasks include: arrange the words according to the type of syllable, nominalise the verbs, write out and translate the sentences from the text which are in the passive voice, insert the necessary form of active and passive verbs, compose a question for each paragraph of the text, give Russian equivalents for the word combinations, translate the sentences using the active vocabulary and translate the paragraphs specified. The activities specified are low on the cognitive and affective scales.
(30)
Title: Prakticheskaya fonetika angliiskogo yazika
Author: Shutkiña, L N and Trofimova, L C
Date: 1993
Level: Specialists
Subject group: Phonetics
Topics dealt with: Phonetics, rhythm and repetition of sound.
Comments: The materials are exclusively instructive and have no formal exercises for
the students to complete. The material shows how sentences can be built up from single
units into several.

(31)
Title: Let Us Get Acquainted
Author: Dubovcheva, N B, Korneva, O N, Mamushina, L K, Reshetnikova, T K and
Strelkova, L M
Date: 1987
Level: First Year
Subject group: General
Topics dealt with: Booking theatre tickets, Invitation to the ballet, Have you got a spare
ticket?, Marilyn Monroe, Robert and Jane are going to the theatre, At the police station,
We arrive at Victoria station, Some glimpses of London, Londoners' occupation, Famous
places in London, London underground, A farewell and A cup of tea.
Comments: There is substantially more text than language exercises in this book. After
most texts, there are comprehension questions and a few language exercises. However,
there is no sense of task gradation as the book progresses. On the cognitive scale, level
(iii) is achieved but there is a dearth of development in the affective domain.
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There is an attempt through the choice of topics to offer a sense of realism in terms of TL culture and to a certain extent this has been achieved as it offers a more realistic representation. However, the book is littered with linguistic errors (e.g. luckily, to-day pp. 20-21), discourse errors (e.g. I'll gladly accept your invitation to see the fabulous Bolshoi ballet which commands the love and admiration of audiences all over the world p. 6) and factual errors (Here we see the unloading and loading of ships at London Bridge. Freighters bring oil, ore, timber and food to London and carry electrical equipment, steel, textiles, fish and other products to other countries, p. 40. These facts are long out-of-date by 1991), up to ten errors on each page.

(32)
Title: Let Us Acquainted (NB: There is a word 'missing in the title of the book but otherwise this book is exactly the same as the 1987 edition.)
Author: Dubovcheva, N B, Korneva, O N, Mamushina, L K, Reshetnikova, T K and Strelkova, L M
Date: 1991
Level: First Year
Subject group: General
Topics dealt with: As Book 31
Comments: As Book 31

(33)
Title: Abiturientu-96
Author: Alekseeva, O A and Ivanova, E A
Date: 1996
Level: New Entrants
Subject group: Abiturientu
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Topics dealt with: Mastering English, Books in your life, Nature Protection is everybody's concern, Smoking is dangerous to Health, Welcome Guest, Travelling, Modern Technology, TEMPUS: How it works in Udmurt State University, Television in modern life, A visit to the doctor, The Transatlantic connection, The history of some cities and place names, School education, Handicapped people fit into our world, Holidays, Hard work isn't bad for you, The Samaritans: who are they?, Sports in your life, The use of leisure, Unemployment, Planning your daily round, Keeping your rain fit, Art and artists, Music in your life, Keeping fit, Alcohol problems are huge, Myth or mystery and Good service works wonders.

Comments: Tasks include a reading section and a listening section. In the reading section, there are two texts, the first is to be read, translated and have questions answered on it while the second is for reading and giving an opinion about the topic. The section on listening asks questions which require factual answers. For further details, see section 6.1.

(34)

Title: Abiturientu-98

Author: Ivanova, E A, Izmetinskaya, N N and Kuznetsova, F M

Date: 1998

Level: New Entrants

Subject group: Abiturientu

Topics dealt with: Mastering English, Modern technology, Nature Protection is everybody's concern, The Transatlantic connection, The history of some cities and place names, The use of leisure, Travelling, The Samaritans: who are they?, Planning your daily round, Unemployment, Keeping fit, Art and artists, Holidays, School education, television in modern life, Handicapped people fit into our world, Sports in your life, Music in your life, Great Britain, This is America, Good service works wonders,
Smoking and alcohol drinking are dangerous to health, Myth and mystery., A thousand diseases, My psychic dog saved my life, The man who took notice of notices, Mrs. Packletide's tiger, the unicorn in the garden.

Comments: Tasks include a reading section and a listening section. In the reading section, there is a mixture of one or two texts, the first is to be read, translated and have questions answered on it while the second is for reading and giving an opinion about the topic. The section on listening asks questions which require factual answers. For further details, see section 6.1.

(35)

Title: English Education System
Author: Kuznetsova, F M and Tronina, L A
Date: 1987
Level: Senior Classes
Subject group: Pedagogics

Topics dealt with: Definition and explanation of educational terms, Diagram of school education in Britain, Sixteen plus exam faces schools boycott, Single-sex schools Vs mixed schools, Harrow School: 400 years on, Park Bern School in Guildford, Teacher roles and Soviet schools.

Comments: No tasks are specified as the primary purpose of the book is extended reading for vocabulary, grammar and translation practice. While the material is factually correct for 1987, there is no reference to the variations in the education system in Scotland and Northern Ireland. More priority is given to public schools than state schools, thus giving an over-emphasised status to the former.
Title: Metodicheskiye ukazaniya dlya obucheniya i bipolneniya samostoyatelnoi rabot

Author: Milich, M P

Date: 1990

Level: Second Year

Subject group: Mathematics

Topics dealt with: IBM personal computer 8087, Real numbers, Special values, Data format conversion, Word processors, Parallel and serial communications, Serial interface, Off-line and on-line, Progressing graphics, User-defined characters, Choosing an interface and Genius mouse.

Comments: The only single repeated type of task is reading comprehension which requires the student to find the sentence in the text and say it aloud or write it down. It is factual and contains the greatest amount of technical TL in comparison to the rest of the UdSU corpus. The only specific grammar with which the book deals is 'if' clauses.

The evidence clearly point to a publication from elsewhere in Russia. All that has been done is a name change in the place of publication. This is a common practice as there are examples of Western textbooks which have been copied and reproduced with an Izhevsk publication reference.
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Appendix 5  Methodological Theories of Learning Taxonomies

An analysis of a learning taxonomy can be achieved by drawing on the work produced by Bloom (1956) who remains the foundation on which most modern taxonomies are built. The taxonomic survey in Chapter Five follows Bloom (1956) as its basis. The descriptors have been adapted to fit the language learning process more specifically, where appropriate. Other researchers who have influenced the remaining categories include Hartmann and Judd (1978), Carrell and Eisterhold (1983), Valdes (1986), Smith (1987), Wallace (1988), Widdowson (1990) and Alpekin (1993).

The Cognitive Domain

This deals with:

(1) The Recall or Recognition of Knowledge with a sliding scale which moves from elementary aspects through to more advanced, abstract concepts in a process of ever increasing internalisation. Given that the ultimate goal of a TL learner is to pass as a fluent L1 user (both in terms of use of language and expression of ideas) it would be anticipated that a British language graduate would be able to reach the last stage in this process as specified below.

(i) Knowledge of Specifics - This includes symbols with concrete referents or a low level of abstraction from which more complex or abstract forms of knowledge are built.

(ii) Knowledge of Terminology - This implies knowledge of referents for specific symbols.

(iii) Knowledge of Specific Facts - This incorporates dates, events, persons and places.
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(iv) Knowledge of Ways and Means of Dealing with the Knowledge of Specific Facts - This includes key skills such as how to study, enquire, judge and criticise. This is half way to knowledge of universals.

(v) Knowledge of Conventions - This concerns understanding the formal conventions imposed on communication within a specific field e.g. plays, science.

(vi) Knowledge of Trends and Sequences - This includes knowing how a society or organisation has developed from its inception to a specified later stage, often up to the present.

(vii) Knowledge of Classifications - The learner must be cognisant of classes, sets, divisions and arrangements and categories within a field.

(viii) Knowledge of Criteria - The facts, principles, opinions and conduct are tested.

(ix) Knowledge of Methodology - The learner knows how to make an inquiry and has the techniques and procedure to achieve this goal.

(x) Knowledge of the Universals - This is the highest level of abstractions within a field.

(xi) Knowledge of Principles - The learner possesses sufficient knowledge about a culture and is now able to make generalisations.

(xii) Knowledge of Theories and Structures - The learner has mastered sufficient knowledge of the whole system.
(2) The Development of Intellectual Abilities and Skills, such as thinking, creating and problem solving (Bloom, 1956, p. 2). These intellectual abilities and structures are organised modes of operation and generalised techniques for dealing with materials and problems (which could be part of the individual's general knowledge) and mental process of organising. Comprehension is the lowest level of understanding and can be broken into three sections

(i) Translation - How accurately and carefully has the material been conveyed and how faithful to the original is the new L1 version (for example understand non-literal statements such as metaphors, symbolism, irony and exaggeration)?

(ii) Interpretation - There is a further stage in the development of skills as the learner must master explanation and summary of content, re-ordering and re-arranging of material and creating a new view on material.

(iii) Extrapolation - The learner must be able to determine implications, consequences etc. of conditions as expressed in the original language when transferring details to the L1 or TL.

(3) Application of the Intellectual Skills and Abilities gained in stage two. In particular, the learner must master the ability to use abstract ideas in specific situations.

(4) Analysis - This breaks down into three parts and helps to clarify hierarchy and show relations between ideas.

(i) Analysis of Elements - The learner must be able to identify unseated assumptions and ascertain what is fact as opposed to hypothesis.
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(ii) Analysis of Relationships - The learner must be able to check links between the points of view put forward.

(iii) Analysis of Organisational Principles - The learner must identify explicit and implicit structures.

(5) Synthesis - The learner must be able to bring the contents back together again but to constitute a pattern or structure not clearly there before.

(i) Production of a Unique - The ability to convey ideas, feelings and experiences in communication to others effectively.

(ii) Production of a Proposed Plan - The ability to develop one's own ideas independently or complete a proposed set of operations from a unit of instruction for a particular situation.

(iii) Derivation of a Set of Abstract Relations - The ability to formulate appropriate hypotheses based upon analyses of factors given.

(6) Evaluation - This incorporates a quantitative and qualitative standard of appraisal.

(i) Judgement in Terms of Internal Evidence - The ability to assess accuracy of reporting and observe the ability to develop logical ideas.

(ii) Judgements in Terms of External Evidence (Bloom, 1956, pp. 201-207) - The ability to compare major theories and facts about an external criteria of a particular culture and also to compare with the highest known standard in the field.
On a more global level, all of the above criteria are essential for communication in one's own L1 as well as in the TL. Carrell and Eisterhold (1983) summarise this well as follows:

(1) Content Schemas - i.e. the person's background knowledge of the content area of a piece of discourse.

(2) Formal Schemata - i.e. the person's background knowledge of the organisational structure of a given piece of discourse

When the learner is familiar with the above two elements in the TL, there is less pressure on the cognitive domain and more can be achieved schematically in the L1. When the above are missing in the learner's TL, it is the learning institution's responsibility to introduce, nurture and develop these in its learner in order to allow him to advance further up this taxonomic scale of TL learning. Naturally, this gap in the learner's knowledge will slow down the pace of TL teaching but any short-term gains would be lost in the long-term, if the institution were to neglect these.

The Affective Domain
This describes changes in interest, attitudes and values and the development of appreciation and adequate adjustment.

The issue of Target Language Culture versus L1 Culture
How TL learners come to gain their ability to communicate in a TL is disputed. Should the learner approach the TL through his own L1 or should full immersion be the approach? The history of FL learning documents this whole process clearly, through the different linguistic movements and counter-movements which have been established over the last century. The issue is developed by Stewart (1982) who believes that it is essential for TL learners to experience TL culture at every stage of the language learning
process (Alptekin, April 1993, p. 139). Were this research based on another TL such as Russian (a language which is more or less self-contained within one country's borders), the discussions on this matter would be more straightforward. However, English is in a unique position. First, it is the national language not just of one but of several countries scattered throughout the world. Second, it is the unifying common language in countries of great linguistic and ethnic diversities such as India. Third, it is also an international language which can be used among non-native speakers of English, for example on holiday or at an academic conference. Fourth and more recently, it has become the dominant common language of the Worldwide Web with over 80% of all material in English. It has therefore become an international 'lingua-franca'. Smith (1987) supports this point of view when he writes that 'English already represents many cultures and it can be used by anyone as a means to express any cultural heritage and value system,' such as pidgin English, Indian, American and Australian English.

The above paragraph indicates both the strength and weakness of English in terms of being a candidate for TL learning. Unlike any other widely taught language, there are so many variations of what is acceptable both culturally, linguistically and grammatically (the differences between American and British English are but two examples) with the result that what is acceptable in one culture, is not acceptable in another.

The issue is complicated yet further and the following issues are raised. Is it more acceptable to remain faithful to one standard form of English and teach the other forms as variants? Or is it acceptable to teach an eclectic (some say impure) from of English which no single culture speaks? Or is this variant of English the new international variant which is unique to the many millions of non-native English speakers?
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There are differing viewpoints on whether FL materials which use TL culture elements to present systematic data interfere with the natural learning sequence, thus having a negative effect on the learning process (See Alptekin, April 1993, p. 136). While it is not within the remit of this section to challenge either side of the argument, the findings of this research can contribute to the general background knowledge for those working within the field. It is accepted that culture involves socially acquired knowledge and that such a system develops naturally in a person as a result of the society in which the former grows up because the latter influences it. Widdowson (1990) labels this socially acquired knowledge as 'systematic knowledge' which includes the knowledge of a language. Anything which the individual encounters is interpreted within this framework (Widdowson, 1990, p. 110). In learning a foreign language, the learner's naturally developed system of learning is challenged and subjected to new or alien criteria (Alptekin, April 1993, p. 137). On a simple level, this might be how to do shopping in the United Kingdom because this process is completely different in Russia. The learner, while understanding the words individually, (even with the aid of a dictionary) will not be able to fully appreciate all the implications which this activity involves unless able to experience it at first hand. Wallace (1988) describes this issue as 'cultural competence'. (i.e. a package of beliefs, knowledge, feelings, attitudes and behaviour). Up until 1990, the same could also have been said of not just the UdSU students but their teachers who were living in Izhevsk, a city which was closed to all foreigners, with no real chance for the inhabitants to travel to an English speaking country.

The dilemma for the producer of the teaching materials is whether to make the materials TL or L1 based. Which of the two approaches would yield the better results? On the one hand, if learning materials are focused on the TL culture there is a tendency to generalise, simplify or misinform when relating factual evidence. An example of this nature can be found in Hartmann and Judd (1978) who reveal how American men and
women are portrayed through one-sided role allocation, overt put-downs or simple omissions (Alptekin, April 1993, p. 141). This creates a sterile image of the TL culture and leads to stereotyping of different nationalities. Valdes (1986) goes further by seeing the native culture issue as a trap which leads to a dead end because it is virtually impossible to teach a language without the cultural content (Valdes, 1986, p. 121). It is a denial of an opportunity for a learner to experience how another culture views everyday issues. While this point of view would hold for virtually any language, the unique internationalisation of the English language for non-native speakers of the TL weakens this argument to a considerable degree though not completely. For instance, the Chinese teach EFL for two different groups, namely EFL for professional purposes and EFL for visiting the TL country. In Russia, the same system might be possible.

The complete removal of the TL speaker's identity is for many an unrealistic, if not utopian goal. Alpekin talks of differences among nationalities in the way in which they develop their speaking and writing habits (Alptekin, April 1993, p. 138). This is confined to not just the L1 but also to the TL. Hence the origin of the TL speaker or writer is also apparent through the discourse produced by that TL learning group or society. Thus the sequence offered in the above section on the cognitive domain (as perceived by the West) may not in fact be the sequential approach adopted by other non-Western styled cultures. Obvious examples include Russia and China.

Textbooks

Textbooks have a critical role to play in the presentation of TL culture and language as they are often the only exposure which many TL learners ever have. This point is particularly relevant for learners at UdSU. Edge (1987) writes that the task-based and problem solving activities (so frequently used in the West) which characterise communicative approaches and materials are not value-free modes of behaviour. Rather
they involve Western modes of communication which may not be in harmony with the tradition of some other cultures (Alptekin, April 1993, p. 139). The Chinese find that such Western methods do not really match up to what they require (see Burnaby and Sun).

In the EFL field, one view is that it is essential for EFL writers to seek to find a middle or cross-cultural road between the materials which have been produced in the West and those which have been produced hitherto in the L1 country in order to reduce the sense of alienation which the learner will encounter outside of his native country. This needs to be done to help the learner to use English in an international setting.

A textbook still needs to be realistic and present the TL culture as it is lived and talked about by people who are credible and recognisable as real human beings. Below are criteria by which to assess whether a textbook is realistic or not:

(1) Analysis at the micro-social level of the social identity of individuals, of their environment, of their personality (e.g. rural or city population, material environment through photos. Are the social acts mainly those of a tourist and/or of two people only conversing at one time? Are the characters emotionless, without individual problems or beliefs, whether political or religious and is there any display of specific values or interpretations of the culture?)

(2) Analysis at the macro-social level of socio-economic, geographic and historical representations (what social facts are given about the society and how have they been selected? Have any statistics been included?)

(3) Analysis of the viewpoint taken by the author, either explicitly or implicitly (The authorial view of the TL culture is present in two ways: (i) the characters serve as intermediaries presenting the culture, and (ii) if advice may be given about how to deal with specific events. The following questions can also be asked: are any evaluative statements given? Is the overall picture harmonious?)
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(4) Analysis at the intercultural level of mutual representations and recognition by the TL and FL cultures (Byram and Esarte-Sarries, 1990, p. 180). Are any comparisons made between the two cultures with issues of relationships of a socio-political nature between the two countries?

Implied Syllabus
Once the character of the UdSU textbooks is established using the above approaches, it will be possible to define the nature of the UdSU syllabus. Clearly, the syllabus did not exist as an individual document before 1998, but the pre-1998 unwritten syllabus can be examined by identifying the value judgements and the belief systems which brought about the textbooks themselves.

There are different syllabus types which can help define the nature of the implied UdSU syllabus. These are:

(1) Grammar-Based Syllabus with structural items to be acquired organised in a pre-selected order.

(2) Functional-Notional Syllabus in which the functions are the communicative purposes and the notions are the conceptual meanings.

(3) Analytical Syllabus in which language is not linguistically graded but content-based.

(4) Process-Oriented Syllabus which does not focus on the outcome-oriented thinking but on the process through which knowledge is gained.

(5) Task-Based Syllabus which seeks to teach language through real world tasks which are imitated in the pedagogical environment.

(6) Content-Based Syllabus which emphasises skills and knowledge and the relevance of the material to the learner.

(7) Structural Syllabus which promotes activities to internalise the formal properties of language.
The syllabus should also indicate and objectives which the learner is meant to aim to achieve. These can fall into the criteria of (i) performance, (ii) under certain conditions (iii) to a certain level.

Criteria for correct hyphenation when dealing with word splitting

The rules for hyphenation when dealing with word splitting at the end of a line are sketchy in many grammar books. The Oxford Guide to English Grammar makes only scant reference to the topic, stating that rules exist but does not actually provide any (Eastwood, John, 1996, p. 56). The points listed below are an amalgamation of the advice given in several books. The latter advise that where possible the practice of hyphenation should first and foremost be avoided but when necessary the following must be adhered to:

(1) The word must divide at the end of a syllable, where one or more syllables is a prefix or suffix, then the break is clear, e.g. free-/dom, dis-/respectful (or disrespect-/ful). Burt (1991) states that the last syllable of a word should not be separated onto the next line although others such as Aitcheson (1996) do not state anything about this issue at all.

(2) Words of one syllable should not be divided.

(3) Where the split is less clear, then it should be determined according to pronunciation and meaning, e.g. com-/plicate, illus-/trate. The latter examples follow the established convention that the break for hyphenation should be made after the first vowel but before the next consonant, except where the result is awkward, ambiguous or absurd, e.g. minis-/ter and not mini-/ster.

(4) The splitting of proper nouns, such as personal names and place names should be avoided. Aitcheson (1996) states that some publishers do not like this because it can lead to confusion and secondly because it shows a lack of respect.

(5) There should be no break mid-syllable as this can lead to confusion, e.g. disco-/ntinued.
There is a convention that when a verb doubles its final consonant to form the present participle, the hyphen is placed between the double consonant, e.g. run/-ning, travel/-ling. However when the root word already has a double consonant, then the double consonant stays intact, e.g. add/-ing, bless/-ing.

**Method**

To achieve randomness, systematic or quasi-randon sampling as described by Butler (1985) was employed to ensure that the findings of the research would reflect the state of each book analysed as a whole. 930 lines of text, totalling 5,600 words were taken from three individual UdSU in-house publications and analysed for the frequency and type of hyphenation which occurred at the end of a line of text. The initial findings were then scaled down to give a frequency of the hyphenation per number of lines and also per number of words. These results were then compared directly to the patterns evident in other books published in Novisibirsk, Kiev, Tashkent, the Czech Republic, France, Germany and Mongolia. For this purpose, similar sized samples were also taken from each of the book analysed. The older UdSU publications like most of the older Russian publications do not use text justification and were produced on typewriters. These books have been put together into a sub-group for the purpose of a more appropriate comparison. The first book published using text justification was the German Section's Abiturientu book, published in 1995 which would coincide with the arrival of the TEMPUS Pre-Jep project.

**Findings**

There is no justification of text in the UdSU publications but neither is there any consistency in the issue of hyphenation. At times, words are split in the wrong place i.e. mid-syllabic (travell -/ing instead of travel -/ling); proper names (Shake -/speare) and place names (Birming -/ham) are also split and there are occasions when hyphenation
could have been avoided altogether (provin-/ce and literatu-/re would have fitted as they only needed two letter spaces. In the line above each of the latter three more letter spaces were used.) In the latter case it comes across as a habit which is not thought about very often as there is clearly no consistency of approach.

Within the former Soviet Union, UdSU’s publication is ranked second with 1 word in every 48 split as opposed to 1 in every 36 in Novisibirsk (1993) and 1 in every 25 in Kiev (1989). Novisibirsk (1993) also splits words mid-syllabic (e.g. alt-/hough instead of al-/though, hig-/hest instead of high-/hest), place names (e.g. Lon-/don, Dow-/ning Street, Royal Opera Ho-/use, Christ-/mas, Com-/monwealth). There is also a strong tendency to split the first syllable away from the rest of the word. This occurs 26 times in the sample material viewed (e.g. po-/pular, pa-/pers, mo-/narch and co-/ronation). Kiev (1989) contains two examples of where the use of a hyphen could have been avoided altogether as there was sufficient room to complete the word based on the length of the lines on the same page (e.g. co-ordina-/te and po-/ints). There are 19 examples of splitting the first syllable away from the last (e.g. co-/ils, mo-/re ad-/vantages). In some cases, the split causes difficulty of pronunciation (e.g. as-/sist, the-/se, ste-/am, op-/entopped). The surname of a person is also split (e.g. La-/ne). The text in Tashkent (1982) is justified but it still splits 13 proper and place names (e.g. Russi-/an, Ru-/ssia, Car-/rington, For-/ rester, Forre-/ster) and 9 words after the first syllable (e.g. we-/re, wal-/ked, ne-/ver).

Table 108
Table Showing the Frequency of Hyphenation Occurring in Textbooks Published in Izhevsk, Kiev, Novisibirsk and Tashkent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Izhevsk</th>
<th>Kiev</th>
<th>Novisibirsk</th>
<th>Tashkent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>5600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of splits</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of splits per x lines</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of splits per x words</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>121.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Justified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to broaden the range of analysis, the results above were compared to a range of material which would be accessible to Russian teachers and authors of English language material. The Oxford English Dictionary splits 67 words, however it must be conceded that the OED had two columns of text per page. Nevertheless, it still splits proper nouns (e.g. Ger -/man) and words which start with a capital letter (International Phon -/etic Alphabet and received Pronunci -/ation). There is also one example of splitting both a first and a last syllable away from the rest of the word (e.g. fre -/quent and diction -/ary). The Oxford History of the Classical World splits words far less frequently and this book is primarily for native L1 speakers. However three proper nouns are split (Themis -/tocles, Cor -inth, Tyr -/taeus). Most surprising is The British Council's Russian office's ESP Russia publication which is produced specifically for Russian teachers of English. The July 1998 edition contains the largest number of splits with 176. This results in 1 words being split in every 32. Consequently, official titles are split (e.g. Department of Eco -/nomics): there are first and last syllable splits (e.g. syl -labus, busi -ness). It is questionable as to whether the frequent splitting of words is the message which The British Council wishes to send to Russian teachers of English. After all, the layout of the material in ESP Russia is to do with presentation and clearly, there is a way of avoiding it.

Table 109
Table Showing the Frequency of Hyphenation Occurring in Textbooks Published in Izhevsk and Other TL Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Izhevsk</th>
<th>Ox. Dictionary</th>
<th>Ox. History</th>
<th>Br. Council</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>5600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of splits</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of splits per x lines</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of splits per x words</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Justified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Czech example of not splitting any words (apart from four naturally hyphenated words, e.g. extra-curricular, full-member, previously-granted, so-called) while using text
justification is clearly the best example of good practice because it does not cause the learner any confusion about the sound of a syllable or where to split a word. Surely, the best message which should be conveyed to the learner is to avoid splitting words at all. In written work it is easy for the learner to simply start on a new line if it is clear that the word will not fit onto the previous line. Similarly, if the learner is typing or word-processing, then it is also easily avoided.

Table 110  
Table Showing the Frequency of Hyphenation Occurring in Textbooks Published in Izhevsk, France and the Czech Republic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Izhevsk</th>
<th>France</th>
<th>Czech Rep.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Words</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>5600</td>
<td>5600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lines</td>
<td>930</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of splits</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of splits per x lines</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of splits per x words</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Justified</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Czech example of not splitting any words while using text justification is clearly the best example of good practice because it does not cause the learner any confusion about the sound of a syllable or where to split a word. Surely, the best message which should be conveyed to the learner is to avoid splitting words at all. In written work it is easy for the learner to start on a new line if it is clear that the word will not fit onto the previous line. Similarly, if the learner is typing or word-processing a document, it is also easily avoided.
The California halibut is a member of the loach group (Heteropneustidae), characterized by a number of distinctive features:

1. **Body Shape**: The body is elongated and flat, especially in adults, with a maximum width at the base of the anal fin. The caudal fin is rounded to concave, and the pectoral fins are large, forward-facing.
2. **Coloration**: Typically, the color is a uniform brown in juveniles, becoming silvery with a darker back in adults. Some individuals have a speckled appearance.
3. **Mouth**: The mouth is terminal and large, with protruding teeth.
4. **Swimming**: They are strong swimmers, capable of covering long distances quickly.

These characteristics lead to their designation as a member of the loach group, which is characterized by a similar body plan and mouth structure. The California halibut is found in the coastal waters of California, with a preference for areas with a mix of sand and rock bottoms, and is a significant commercial and recreational fish.
1. Suspended sentences are today introduced for the first time in the penal system in Britain. Any court now passing a jail sentence of two years or less may suspend its operation for a period of between one and three years.

2. Quantities of the hallucinatory drug LSD worth £250,000 on the illicit market were found by Scotland Yard Drugs Squad men, a Bow Street magistrate was told yesterday. Six men and women who appeared on charges of possessing or receiving drugs were remanded for a week.

3. Sentence of nine months' imprisonment was passed yesterday on Det.-Con. G. S. Dilley for assaulting a man being questioned at a police station.

4. Mr. H. S. Pearson, prosecuting, said that while Mr. Bradshaw was being questioned, Dilley punched him a number of times. In May Dilley was fined on a charge of assault occasioning bodily harm.

5. An eight-man jury took only eight minutes to reach their verdict.

6. The appeals of 21 people convicted of assaulting a former U.S. President Press Secretary seven years ago during anti-American demonstrations were rejected today by Tokyo High Court. Prison terms ranging from eight to 18 months were imposed for assaulting James H. Haggerty.

7. He arrived in Tokyo in 1960 to prepare a visit by former President Eisenhower.

8. President Eisenhower's visit was later cancelled because of anti-American feeling. Mr. Haggerty, who had just flown in from Washington, was kept confined in his car for more than 20 minutes.

9. The defendants are reported to be planning appeals to the Supreme Court.
10. Six Madrid factory workers were sent to jail yesterday for taking part in street demonstrations a year ago. J. Santiago was sentenced to one year's jail, and five other men to six month on charges of having demonstrated illegally.

11. The 585 draft resisters arrested during the week of demonstrations at the Whitehall Induction Center went on trial last week at the Criminal Court. They are charged with disorderly conduct and/or resisting arrest.

12. In the closing days of the last session of Congress, the discredited Subversive Activities Control Board was given a new lease on life and a blank check to expose for exposure's sake and establish "a Register" of "Communist Action members, Communist Front and Infiltrated organisations".

13. Persons offending against the law are summoned before a court of law. The summons issued by a court states the charges moved against the offender by the person suing him. When a defendant is brought before a court the charge is read out to him and he is asked whether he pleads guilty or not guilty. If he pleads guilty, he is sentenced by the court. If he pleads not guilty, a jury of 12 persons must be formed and summoned to attend the court. When the jurors are sworn the trial proceeds.

14. The decision was expected to result in the dismissal of all charges against the Davises.

15. Most 10-year-old children are incapable understanding and waiving their own rights, much less those of their parents.

16. Some civil libertarians had compared the prosecution to the way Hitler enticed Germany's children to snatch on their parents by offering them rewards.

17. In oral arguments before the court, Atlanta lawyer Jay Building, who represented the Davises, had asked the justices to draw a bright line to make it clear that anyone under age 13 is not mature enough to consent to a search of his or someone else's property. The court, however, refused to go that far.

18. Prosecutors, who did not appear to argue the case, have not
rulled out an appeal to the US Supreme Court when asked for comment, Douglas County District Attorney David McDade responded: "Did they suggest what a 16-year-old should do when he finds drugs in his parents' possession? I'm at a loss to give kids advice in the future."

19. They just wanted our family to snitch at each other and send each other to jail.

20. A juvenile court judge ruled that Darrin was not old enough to understand what he had done.

21. Guarino, 71, was removed from the bench in November by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court for persistently punishing those who he felt were trying to get out of jury duty.

22. After getting the news, Guarino recessed a criminal trial and left the courthouse, reportedly in a state of shock. The judge could not be reached for comment.

23. Jeffrey Levy was punished last January for telling the judge he couldn't sit on a jury hearing a drug case because he is opposed to the criminalization of drugs.

24. Presser said there are ways for a judge to discipline prospective jurors who may be lying without violating their constitutional rights.

25. The duty of the U.S. attorney general is to seek justice without fear or favor.

26. To crack down on this hardened core of violent criminals you should draw a line deep in the sand.

27. Prosecution of white-collar crime and public corruption is important not only to punish illegal action, but also to send a powerful message to the public and potential law-breakers.
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---

Yours faithfully,

...

We have received a letter from Mr. Brown dated January 19...

Moscow, 11th August, 19...

Yours faithfully,

...

---

Your case to be made about 70 cm higher as suggested by you...

We have covered the measurements and arranged for...

 respecto, we propose to manufacture 50 cases with...

We have received your letter of the 1st May and are sorry to...

Moscow, 2nd May, 19...

... We are looking forward to your answer.

---

Complaint about inadequate packing

FAKES...
ПРИЛОЖЕНИЕ I

МАТЕРИАЛЫ ТЕСТОВАНИЯ ДЛЯ ОТБОРА ГРУППЫ

Выберите один правильный вариант.
1. These are her suitcases.
   a) that     b) these     c) this
2. Whose book is this? It is...
   a) my     b) mine     c) her
3. No furniture in the room.
   a) there was     b) it was     c) it had been
4. Let... go out together.
   a) we     b) us     c) 's
5. I can't say... about it.
   a) anything     b) nothing     c) anybody
6. Languages do you speak?
   a) whose     b) how     c) what
7. He said he... come on Sunday.
   a) will     b) would     c) can
8. She wasn't going to star in his film... she?
   a) wasn't     b) did     c) was
9. The town is famous for... beautiful architecture.
   a) its     b) it's     c) his
10. Yesterday I didn't eat... fruit.
    a) much     b) a few     c) many
11. His advice... always very useful.
    a) are     b) is     c) have been
12. This picture is... beautiful.
    I haven't seen a better picture.
    a) the least     b) more     c) the most
13. I... be there in half an hour, or it will be late.
    a) can     b) must     c) may
14. She... TV now.
    a) watches     b) watch     c) is watching
15. Last year I... to France for a holiday.
    a) went     b) have gone     c) was going
16. We... for him since early morning.
    a) are looking     b) have been looking     c) look
17. She... her flat every Sunday...
    a) is cleaning     b) cleans     c) clean
18. When I came to his place he... already.
    a) left     b) has left     c) had left
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19. I ... her for five years.
   a) have known  b) know  c) had known

20. When he came home his wife ... dinner.
   a) cooked  b) cooks  c) was cooking

21. John ... buy a new car next year.
   a) won't  b) don't  c) didn't

22. He ... very upset lately.
   a) is  b) was  c) has been

23. I will ... for you downstairs at 6 p.m.
   a) wait  b) be waiting  c) will be waiting

24. We'll have test when he ...
   a) comes  b) will come  c) will be coming

25. I suggest ... to a Moscow suburb.
   a) to move  b) we'll move  c) move

26. If I ... you, I would accept the invitation.
   a) will be  b) have been  c) were

27. I wish I ... this film before.
   a) had seen  b) have seen  c) saw

28. Did you see them ... chess yesterday?
   a) to play  b) playing  c) played

29. He is ... lawyer.
    a) a  b) the  c) a

30. The cathedral ... in the 15th century.
    a) was building  b) built  c) was built

- Translate the following

- Translate the following

1. How do you do!
2. Tastes differ.
3. He looks like you!
4. You are welcome!
5. Good luck!
6. Help yourself!
7. You've got the wrong number.
8. I'm lost.
9. He was ... success.
10. hungry and thirsty
11. sick
12. return ticket
13. to catch a cold
14. cinema-goer
15. weather forecast
16. water pollution
17. traffic lights
18. abroad
19. What has happened?
20. long-distance call
21. blue-eyed
22. My watch is 3 minutes slow.
23. He's married.
24. art gallery
25. single room
26. fridge
27. It's half past nine a.m.
28. It's my fault.
29. I can't afford it.
30. hairdresser's
31. the ground floor
32. fish and chips
33. father-in-law
34. suburb

* 3 3 *
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**Приложение I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35. local train</th>
<th>53. circus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36. pet</td>
<td>54. He complains of a headache.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. post-graduate</td>
<td>55. to furnish the room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. convenient</td>
<td>56. to waste time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. to wash up</td>
<td>57. to wear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Cambridge graduate</td>
<td>58. It is snowing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I'm fond of painting.</td>
<td>59. clothes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I was born in ...</td>
<td>60. It'll take you 15 minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. sense of humour</td>
<td>61. turn right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. opinion</td>
<td>62. physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The book is worth reading.</td>
<td>63. It depends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. He was sent for.</td>
<td>64. Take it easy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. to change trains</td>
<td>65. Can I take a message?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. sightseeing</td>
<td>66. I'll ring you up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. That skirt suits you.</td>
<td>67. to earn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Many happy returns of the day!</td>
<td>68. Can I have the bill?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I enjoy jogging.</td>
<td>69. appointment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. foreign affairs</td>
<td>70. neighbour</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Read the text and explain the point.

**THE POWER OF IMAGINATION**

Mr Brown got to a hotel late in the evening. He was very tired after the trip and asked the hall-porter if there was a vacant room. At that very moment another man came and asked for a room, too. The hall-porter told them that the only vacant room was a double room, that is a room with two beds in it. At first the two men didn't like the idea of spending the night in one and the same room. But soon it began raining hard and they had to agree.

They came into the room and went to bed at once.

Suddenly Mr Brown heard a noise and woke up.

— What has happened? — he asked in surprise. — What's wrong?

In a weak voice his neighbour answered:

— I am awfully sorry to wake you up, but the trouble is I have got asthma. I need fresh air. If you don't want me to die, open the window.

Mr Brown jumped out of bed and began looking for his matches. But it was dark in the room and he couldn't find them, the man's voice got weaker and weaker. Mr Brown was afraid the man might die. So he took a chair and broke the window with it. The man thanked him and felt much better with some fresh air in the room.

They both fell asleep again. But in the morning they were surprised to see the only window in the room still shut but the large mirror broken to pieces.
### Приложение II

**Основной активизируемый материал уроков учебника**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Учебные Темы</th>
<th>Грамматика</th>
<th>Синтаксис</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Начало</td>
<td>Начало</td>
<td>Начало</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Структура</td>
<td>Структура</td>
<td>Структура</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Семантика</td>
<td>Семантика</td>
<td>Семантика</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Фонетика</td>
<td>Фонетика</td>
<td>Фонетика</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Грамматика

1. **Past Simple**
   - "I saw a book." Моя книга была увидена.
   - "He read a newspaper." Он читал газету.
   - "We cooked lunch." Мы готовили обед.

2. **Past Continuous**
   - "He was reading a book at the time." Он читал книгу в то время.
   - "The students were doing homework." Ученики занимались домашним заданием.
   - "They were watching TV." Они смотрели телевизор.

3. **Past Perfect**
   - "I had written the letter before I went to bed." Я написал письмо до сна.
   - "She had finished her homework before she went to bed." Она закончила домашнее задание до сна.
   - "We had eaten breakfast before we went to school." Мы поели завтрак перед школой.

#### Синтаксис

1. **Сложные предложения**
   - "I will go to the park if it is sunny." Я поеду в парк, если будет солнечно.
   - "They didn't go to school because it was raining." Они не пошли в школу из-за дождя.
   - "He didn't buy a book because he didn't have the money." Он не купил книгу из-за отсутствия денег.

2. **Последовательные предложения**
   - "She put on her shoes and left the house." Она надела обувь и ушла из дома.
   - "They finished their homework and went to bed." Они закончили домашнее задание и легли спать.
   - "He started his journey and enjoyed the trip." Он начал путешествие и наслаждался поездкой.

3. **Английский язык**
   - "I am going to the library." Я иду в библиотеку.
   - "She is reading a book." Она читает книгу.
   - "They are watching TV." Они смотрят телевизор.

#### Фонетика

1. **Фонетические правила**
   - "She is reading a book." Она читает книгу.
   - "He is running in the park." Он бежит по парку.
   - "They are talking to each other." Они разговаривают друг с другом.

#### Семантика

1. **Семантические правила**
   - "I am going to the library." Я иду в библиотеку.
   - "She is reading a book." Она читает книгу.
   - "They are watching TV." Они смотрят телевизор.

#### Фонетика

1. **Английский язык**
   - "I am going to the library." Я иду в библиотеку.
   - "She is reading a book." Она читает книгу.
   - "They are watching TV." Они смотрят телевизор.

#### Семантика

1. **Семантические правила**
   - "I am going to the library." Я иду в библиотеку.
   - "She is reading a book." Она читает книгу.
   - "They are watching TV." Они смотрят телевизор.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Vocabulary</th>
<th>Grammar Syntax</th>
<th>Phraseology</th>
<th>Sentence Patterns</th>
<th>Syntactic-Often-Verb-Noun</th>
<th>Syntactic-Verb-Noun-Often</th>
<th>Syntactic-Noun-Verb-often</th>
<th>Syntactic-Verb-Subject-Object</th>
<th>Syntactic-Object-Verb-Subject</th>
<th>Syntactic-Subject-Object-Verb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Describing people</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Expressing opinion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Expressing purpose</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Presenting data</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>Describing way</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>Expressing purpose</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>Presenting data</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Describing people</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>Expressing opinion</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>Expressing purpose</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>Presenting data</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Grammar</th>
<th>Syntax</th>
<th>Functions</th>
<th>Word Formation</th>
<th>Idioms, Cliches, Set Phrases</th>
<th>Speech Patterns</th>
<th>Phonemes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Down in Surrey 1. Education 2. Medicine (general patient care, surgery, drugs) 3. Sports and games, a football commentary 4. Youth problems</td>
<td>1. The Unreal Condition: a) Subjunctive b) Conditional Mood c) Subjunctive!</td>
<td>1. Explanations: — I gather from this... Now look... Anyway it's like this, you see... Actually, that's not what... 2. Hesitation techniques: — Well... or... I wonder how... 3. Argument strategies (Continued): — In my view... As I see it... That may be true, but... — On the other hand... and what's more...</td>
<td>1. Helpful less this</td>
<td>to run short of (out of) time to be up to standard to get a word in a digression to have a go to be on top form to end in a draw to be off song things the thin end of the wedge to draw the line All's well that ends well.</td>
<td>1. The university has a technological bias. 2. You are not that punctual. 7. In case it stops you sleeping... 4. It's high time we met Mr... 5. There'll be no stopping us. 6. As... then they move on to... 7. Then you went on to...</td>
<td>1. (out) 2. (up) 3. (in) 4. (stop) 5. (in) 6. (on) 7. (go)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Talking Politics 1. Elections and politics 2. Charity, donations (institute to the disabled, handicapped, etc) 3. Church</td>
<td>Revision Paresthesia</td>
<td>1. Argument strategies (end) 1. I bet... Look here... Incidentally... Oddly enough... — Fortunately... The fact is that... I'm completely with you... Hugh... Frankly speaking... To tell you the truth... I take your point... There's no denying that... For one, there's no denying that... Call it whatever you like... I'm coming to that... You are being very hard...</td>
<td>1. Helpful less this</td>
<td>to run for office to make a fuss to be up to much to get the hang of things to put up with a put-down to set much store by doing things to be on the ballot longer than life to have the right to bewitch to go into politics</td>
<td>1. Each member is worth a million. 2. Why not donate? 3. You must be very politically-minded. 4. I've got to be going now. 5. I hate doing things for the sake of publicity.</td>
<td>Revision Units 1-6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Topics</td>
<td>Grammar</td>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Functions</td>
<td>Word Formation</td>
<td>Idioms, Cliches, Set Phrases</td>
<td>Speech patterns</td>
<td>Phonetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 8     | Talking Shop | Revision | Revision | 1. Preparing over a conference:  
- I'd like to get things underway ...
- So, without further ado from me, once to you ...
- Order, please, order ...
- We're getting off the point ...
- I must remind you that ...
- On behalf of ...
- I'd like to thank ...
  2. Making a speech:  
- I'll start with an overview...
- and then move on to ...
- I'll be happy to ... as we go along ...
  3. Talking points:  
- I'm talking to a conference:  
- Excuse me for interrupting, but ...
- That's completely irrelevant/irrelevant...
- If you don't mind my saying...
- You are taking a very narrow/short-sighted view ...
- Neither of you has the slightest idea ...
  | ed | to draft a report to drive a hard bargain to split the beans to be up in arms to rack one's brains to die of curiosity to keep an eye out for van to let secrets out of the bag to talk shop to score set off with theirs | Our best bet is ...  
Tennis to try to be ...
There aren't many rooms left to try ...
I've just had our travel agent on the phone. | Revision  
A General Table of the 
Tenses of 
Reading In 
Stressed Positions |
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Down in Surrey

The group is in Guildford, a town not far from London famous for the University of Surrey which has a technological bias.

AA—Excuse me, where can we find Mr. Welly?
Sec.—The Admission Tutor is in room 1157.

AA—Open the door.

AT—Come in, please. I'm sorry to say you are not that punctual. And I'm running short of time. Take a seat...

AA—Well...

AT—UCCA sent us your application form. Your GCSEs seem satisfactory enough. I gather from this you were at prep school and then went on to Eton.

AA—I wonder how...

AT—Now look, your poor maths result puzzles me a little, however...

AA—I don't think you quite understand. It's like this...

AT—Anyway, your science results are well up to standard and as you're applying for admission to the Science Faculty...

AA—Actually that's not what...

AT—Our Chemistry department runs a foundation course.

The group are preparing in...

EC—What's he doing there?

JJ—He seems to be applying for a course.

GH—Nonsense. He's a highly qualified computer analyst already.

AT—If I remember correctly you were rather concerned about fees and you implied that your financial situation was shaky.

AA—Well really I didn't come here to...

AT—Quite, quite. No need to feel embarrassed. There's a system of grants to help financially or you might win a scholarship or even be sponsored by a company. Lots of people take part-time jobs...
Appendix 11 - Syllabus from Ivitskaya, Samarova and Fletcher (1992)

The group was led by Mr. Wally leading the way.

GT - I can see a lot of sports grounds around.

AT - Oh, yes! We encourage our students to use our sporting facilities to the full.

EC - If I'm not mistaken last year Surrey won the South East of England Championship in ladies' fencing, golf, netball, soccer, rugby and something else.

AT - Right. We also had an extremely good cricket season. As you can see, our teams take their training very seriously. That's the football squad having a workout over there. Would any football fans amongst you like to join them?

GT - I'd like to have a go. Haven't played for ages though. Could I?

AT - Certainly. Come on, I'll introduce you to the coach. You can get some kit and change in the pavilion. In half an hour I'll be waiting for you at the Nursing Studies Department and then we'll drop in at the Students' Union House.

Greg jogs onto the pitch and joins the training session. After a few minutes the referee blows his whistle and a game starts.

BS - I don't understand anything about football. Can someone give us a commentary?

JH - I will. I watch matches in the Italian league very regularly. The excitement is very exhilarating.

GH - Come on, Joe. Cut the cackle and get on with the commentary.

AA - I think there's been a mistake.

AT - Do you think so? The application looks in order to me. Your references are excellent. Your tutor will be Mr. Fleming, so...

AA - But my question is...

AT - Research? Yes, I was just coming to that. There are various options open to you and forming part of the BSc syllabus but we're running out of time. I'm afraid. I have to meet a tourist group now.

AA - Hold on a moment. That's what I've been trying to say. I'm from that group.

AT - Well, why didn't you say so?

AA - I tried to, but I couldn't get a word in edgeways.

AT - So you're not Simon Smash, and you're not applying for admission... I'm terribly sorry. Admission time is so hectic, applicants everywhere. I do apologise.

AA - That's alright. I enjoyed the interview.

AT - Well, let's meet the group and I'll show you round the campus. I wonder why young Mr. Smash didn't show up?

GT - I can see a lot of sports grounds around.

AT - Oh, yes! We encourage our students to use our sporting facilities to the full.

EC - If I'm not mistaken last year Surrey won the South East of England Championship in ladies' fencing, golf, netball, soccer, rugby and something else.

AT - Right. We also had an extremely good cricket season. As you can see, our teams take their training very seriously. That's the football squad having a workout over there. Would any football fans amongst you like to join them?

GT - I'd like to have a go. Haven't played for ages though. Could I?

AT - Certainly. Come on, I'll introduce you to the coach. You can get some kit and change in the pavilion. In half an hour I'll be waiting for you at the Nursing Studies Department and then we'll drop in at the Students' Union House.

Greg jogs onto the pitch and joins the training session. After a few minutes the referee blows his whistle and a game starts.

BS - I don't understand anything about football. Can someone give us a commentary?

JH - I will. I watch matches in the Italian league very regularly. The excitement is very exhilarating.

GH - Come on, Joe. Cut the cackle and get on with the commentary.

AA - I think there's been a mistake.

AT - Do you think so? The application looks in order to me. Your references are excellent. Your tutor will be Mr. Fleming, so...

AA - But my question is...

AT - Research? Yes, I was just coming to that. There are various options open to you and forming part of the BSc syllabus but we're running out of time. I'm afraid. I have to meet a tourist group now.

AA - Hold on a moment. That's what I've been trying to say. I'm from that group.

AT - Well, why didn't you say so?

AA - I tried to, but I couldn't get a word in edgeways.

AT - So you're not Simon Smash, and you're not applying for admission... I'm terribly sorry. Admission time is so hectic, applicants everywhere. I do apologise.

AA - That's alright. I enjoyed the interview.

AT - Well, let's meet the group and I'll show you round the campus. I wonder why young Mr. Smash didn't show up?

GT - I can see a lot of sports grounds around.

AT - Oh, yes! We encourage our students to use our sporting facilities to the full.

EC - If I'm not mistaken last year Surrey won the South East of England Championship in ladies' fencing, golf, netball, soccer, rugby and something else.

AT - Right. We also had an extremely good cricket season. As you can see, our teams take their training very seriously. That's the football squad having a workout over there. Would any football fans amongst you like to join them?

GT - I'd like to have a go. Haven't played for ages though. Could I?

AT - Certainly. Come on, I'll introduce you to the coach. You can get some kit and change in the pavilion. In half an hour I'll be waiting for you at the Nursing Studies Department and then we'll drop in at the Students' Union House.

Greg jogs onto the pitch and joins the training session. After a few minutes the referee blows his whistle and a game starts.

BS - I don't understand anything about football. Can someone give us a commentary?

JH - I will. I watch matches in the Italian league very regularly. The excitement is very exhilarating.

GH - Come on, Joe. Cut the cackle and get on with the commentary.

AA - I think there's been a mistake.

AT - Do you think so? The application looks in order to me. Your references are excellent. Your tutor will be Mr. Fleming, so...

AA - But my question is...

AT - Research? Yes, I was just coming to that. There are various options open to you and forming part of the BSc syllabus but we're running out of time. I'm afraid. I have to meet a tourist group now.

AA - Hold on a moment. That's what I've been trying to say. I'm from that group.

AT - Well, why didn't you say so?

AA - I tried to, but I couldn't get a word in edgeways.

AT - So you're not Simon Smash, and you're not applying for admission... I'm terribly sorry. Admission time is so hectic, applicants everywhere. I do apologise.

AA - That's alright. I enjoyed the interview.

AT - Well, let's meet the group and I'll show you round the campus. I wonder why young Mr. Smash didn't show up?
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---

Textbook

JH—Greg's got the ball. He's dribbling up the touchline. The centre half is trying to tackle, but Greg's put round him... he's crossed the ball... good pass...
PE—I wish I were out there playing too.
BR—I don't. It's very ph, sick out there.
GH—I've seen gentler fights in a New York bar!
JH—Greg's got the ball back again. He's going to lose it... no — he's made some space on the edge of the area... a left-booted shot and — what a goal!!

All showing — Well played, Greg!
JH—The game's resuming. There's a lot of hard tackling. There's a mess of arms and legs. Oh, no!
BS—Why is the referee waving like that?
JH—He's got the red card out. He's sending someone off for a foul — and Greg's lying on the ground.

The group runs up to Greg who is rolling in agony.
EC—Are you all right, Greg? You were playing so well.
BR—Stop rolling about, Greg. I'm trying to take a photo.
GT—Thanks for the sympathy! It's nothing to worry about... but for the dizziness I'm fine. I've just got a few scratches. Oww!
BM—Stand back everyone. Let me have a look. Mmm. Your knee's swollen and your leg's covered in bruises and it looks to me as if you've sprained your ankle. Elaine, can you pass the first aid kit from my bag... thanks... I'll strap the ankle and put a bandage round the knee. There. How's that? Can you walk?
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G7—Ouch! It hurts! I put any weight on it. It was stupid of me to get involved.

BM—Leave me. We’ll get you to the Nursing Department and see if they’ll take an X-ray of the ankle.

Doc—Well young man. You won’t be playing in the world cup for a week or two! You’ve sprained the ankle—lucky your friend strapped it so quickly. The knee’s just bruised. Nothing serious.

GT—So, what should I do?

Doc—I’ll bandage the ankle lightly again. Otherwise—take it easy. In your place I should use a walking stick for a while. There should be no complications. If you were my age, you’d probably have broken your leg in a dozen places! Here’s the prescription. Every oct-Thanks, Doctor.

Larry goes to the chemist’s and collects Greg’s prescription.

LH—Here you are, Greg. The chemist advised you to take one pill now to ease the pain and another before going to bed.

BM—Before you swallow it let me see if the pills might have any side-effects.

Bert takes out the directions and reads them out:

Aspanol is not recommended for pregnant women, patients with heart, lung, stomach, kidney or liver trouble; people who had measles, the flu, mumps, scarlet fever or whooping cough. Side-effects: nausea, rash, diarrhoea.

CL—After taking these pills you’ll find you have the symptoms of every disease under the sun like Jerome K. Jerome.

BM—Greg, take my advice—never take any pills, capsules or tablets or apply any ointments if you can possibly avoid it. No medicine is completely harmless.

GT—Of course I won’t. I feel fine already, I’m on top form and ready to continue our visit. What are we going to see next?

EC—It’s high time we met Mr. Welly again.

The Admission Tutor is waiting for the group at the Nursing Studies Department.

AT—Did you enjoy the match? How did it end?

ET—If only you had been with us! It was the best game I’ve ever seen. Though we did win, you know. All’s well that ends well” as Shakespeare says.

LH—The match ended in a draw. And, as it happens, we’ve already seen the Nursing Studies department.

GT—We saw a lot of applicants there. I wonder how you manage to keep the nursing profession prestigious? In my country there’s a great shortage of nurses.

—Oh! Belkoo, если я наступлю на ногу, мне было бы с ножки, сделал бы я это...

—Слышишь на меня. Мы отнесем Вас в отделение подготовки медсестер и посмотрим, сделают ли они ремонт коленей.

Группа идет в отделение подготовки медсестер и обнаруживает, что пожилого доктора, который осматривает ногу Грега, схвачен пульсом крепких боевых.

—Так, молодой человек. Вы не сможете играть в соревнованиях на все годы мира недели — другую! Вы развлекли лодыжку и Вам повезло, что Ваш друг так быстро перевязал её. Коленчато, просто, небольшое. Ничего серьезного.

—Так, что мне следовать делать?

—Я течу перевязку лодыжку снова. С другой стороны — не берите в голову. На Вашем месте я бы послешел трестом некоторое время. Не давать больному лекарств. Я Вам ободряю, если лодыжка будет так сильно болеть, что вы не сможете стать. Вам повезло. Если бы вы были в моем месте, Вас бы сняли с пьедестала. Ваши ножки, увы, дают знать о себе.

—Все — Спасибо, доктор.

Лорри идет в бутик и забирает лекарство для Грега.

—Вот, пожалуйста. Грег. Аптекарь поставил принять одну таблетку сейчас, чтобы снять боль и другую перед сном.

—Перед тем, как мы это проползгим, дают мне влажный есть ли какие-нибудь побочные действия у этих таблеток?

Вера достает инструкцию и читает вслух:

Аспинаяль не рекомендуется беременным женщинам, пациентам с болезнью сердца, легких, желудка, почек или печени; тем, кто перенес кирпич, шину, скарлатину или коклюш. Побочные действия: тошнота, съешь, позы.

—После приема этих таблеток, ты почувствуешь у себя снятые болезни на свет — как Дженер К. Джереми.

—Грег, послушайте, моя совет — никогда не принимайте таблетки, капсулы, жевательные, причем или лечебные; так падает кровь, гет, сирень, скарлатину или коклюш. Побочные действия: тошнота, съешь, позы.

—После приема этих таблеток, ты почувствуешь у себя снятые болезни на свет — как Джереми К. Джереми.

—Грег, послушайте, моя совет — никогда не принимайте таблетки, капсулы, жевательные, причем или лечебные; так падает кровь, гет, сирень, скарлатину или коклюш. Побочные действия: тошнота, съешь, позы.

—Конечно, не буду. Я уже чувствую себя хорошо, а в отличной форме и готов продолжать наш визит. Что мы посмотрим следующее?

—Нам далёко пойти снова встретиться с г-ном Уэллсом.
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Textbook

A - How do nurses acquire practical skills? Where do they train?
B - Practice in outpatients’ clinics and hospitals is obligatory throughout the first two years. Trainees are taught first aid, how to give injections, general patient care and so on. Everything to enable them to help GPs. Then they move on to Intensive Care work and more complicated techniques.
E - Are we going to see the Students’ Union? I’d like to meet some real, live students.
T - Yes, it’s our next stop. It’s not far.

The group enters the Students’ Union House. A discussion is in full swing. The topic is a recent decision to make NHS medical personnel undergo random drug tests. Opinions are divided.

The group joins the discussion.

Student - These drug tests are humiliating for medical people. It’s the thin end of the wedge. If we allow these tests soon there’ll be AIDS and alcohol tests as well. There’ll be no stopping it. Where will we draw the line?
T - In my view tests like this can help protect the patient’s safety because medical personnel have access to various drugs in big quantities. Without them, there could be grave consequences.
M - But that doesn’t make sense. As I see it there’s no evidence that doctors or nurses abuse drugs more than any other category of people on whom people’s lives depend.
Voice - Take airline pilots, for example.
M - There is absolutely no guarantee that random testing will catch every abuser or even deter offenders.
P - Postgraduate - That may be true, but on the other hand, something has to be done. If the authorities had reacted quicker we wouldn’t be facing this problem now.
E - If I were in the NHS (National Health Service), I would at least want to hold a public opinion poll to see how people feel about it before introducing drastic measures like this.

An undergraduate - We feel very strongly about it because in a few years’ time we will be subjected to these tests.

L - And what’s more - it’ll put off some people from entering medical colleges. Nobody will be very enthusiastic about losing their privacy.

Another student rushes in: - It’s six o’clock. The bar’s open. Is anyone coming for a pint before dinner?

The Common Room empties.

The group (with the Admission Tutor) - Thank you very much indeed for giving us the opportunity of seeing Surrey.
T - It’s been a pleasure. You are always welcome. Enjoy the rest of your time in Britain, and, mind how you go. We don’t want any more accidents, do we?

A - Like how do you get to the practical lessons? Where do they train?
B - Practice in outpatients’ clinics and hospitals is obligatory throughout the first two years. Trainees are taught first aid, how to give injections, general patient care and so on. Everything to enable them to help GPs. Then they move on to Intensive Care work and more complicated techniques.
E - Are we going to see the Students’ Union? I’d like to meet some real, live students.
T - Yes, it’s our next stop. It’s not far.

The group enters the Students’ Union House. A discussion is in full swing. The topic is a recent decision to make NHS medical personnel undergo random drug tests. Opinions are divided.

The group joins the discussion.

Student - These drug tests are humiliating for medical people. It’s the thin end of the wedge. If we allow these tests soon there’ll be AIDS and alcohol tests as well. There’ll be no stopping it. Where will we draw the line?
T - In my view tests like this can help protect the patient’s safety because medical personnel have access to various drugs in big quantities. Without them, there could be grave consequences.
M - But that doesn’t make sense. As I see it there’s no evidence that doctors or nurses abuse drugs more than any other category of people on whom people’s lives depend.
Voice - Take airline pilots, for example.
M - There is absolutely no guarantee that random testing will catch every abuser or even deter offenders.
P - Postgraduate - That may be true, but on the other hand, something has to be done. If the authorities had reacted quicker we wouldn’t be facing this problem now.
E - If I were in the NHS (National Health Service), I would at least want to hold a public opinion poll to see how people feel about it before introducing drastic measures like this.

An undergraduate - We feel very strongly about it because in a few years’ time we will be subjected to these tests.

L - And what’s more - it’ll put off some people from entering medical colleges. Nobody will be very enthusiastic about losing their privacy.

Another student rushes in: - It’s six o’clock. The bar’s open. Is anyone coming for a pint before dinner?

The Common Room empties.

The group (with the Admission Tutor) - Thank you very much indeed for giving us the opportunity of seeing Surrey.
T - It’s been a pleasure. You are always welcome. Enjoy the rest of your time in Britain, and, mind how you go. We don’t want any more accidents, do we?

Группа входит в Дом студенческого союза. Обсуждение в полном разгаре. Тема - последнее решение Национальной службы здравоохранения заставить медицинского персонала проходить выборочные тесты на наркотики. Мнения разделились.

Группа вступает в дискуссию:

Эти тесты на наркотики унизительны для медицинского персонала. Это опасное предзнаменование. Если мы позволим проводить эти тесты, вскоре будут также тесты на СПИД и алкоголь. И это не будет концом. Где мы установим границу возможного?

На мой взгляд, подобные тесты могут помочь уменьшить опасность больных, т.к. медицинский персонал не будет иметь доступ к различным наркотическим средствам в больших количествах.

Но это же бессмысленно. Как я понимаю, нет никакого доказательства, что врачи и медсестры злоупотребляют наркотиками больше, чем другие категории людей, от которых зависит человеческая жизнь.

Ешьте, например, летчики.

Нет сущестования явной причины, чтобы выборочные тесты выясняли все наркоманов или даже удерживали правонарушителей.

А что дальше? Это может быть верно, но, с другой стороны, что-то нужно делать. Если бы власти отреагировали быстрее, у нас бы сейчас не было этой проблемы.

Если бы я работал в Национальной службе здравоохранения, я бы, по крайней мере, провел опрос общественного мнения, чтобы узнать, как к этому относятся люди, прежде чем вводить такие строгие меры.

Студент выпускного курса - Мы очень серьезно воспринимаем это, т.к. через несколько лет мы будем сами подвергаться этим тестам.

И кроме того - это открывает некоторые вопросы в медицине. Никому не понравится, если начнут ущемлять в его личную жизнь.

Все еще один студент: - Шесть часов. Бар открыт. Кто-нибудь идет выпить пинту пива перед обедом?

Общая комната пустеет.

Группа (Отечественного нарядом и вместе, в тепле) - Относится это к предстоящую нам возможность посетить Садер.

Мне было приятно. Всегда рады вас видеть. Желаем вам получить удовольствие от дальнейшего пребывания в Великобритании, и будьте осторожны. Нам ведь больше не нужны несчастные случаи, не так ли?
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Appendix 12 - Polylogue from Korneva and Reshetmorova (1989)

In b.

The relations between the field and the physical environment and the social environment are complex and interdependent. The social environment influences the field in various ways, including through the provision of resources, the setting of norms and values, and the shaping of social interactions. Conversely, the field can also influence the social environment through the dissemination of ideas and practices, the shaping of social norms, and the creation of new social structures.

The physical environment also plays a crucial role in shaping the field. The physical environment includes the natural elements, such as climate, topography, and vegetation, as well as the built environment, including buildings, infrastructure, and public spaces. These elements can impact the field in various ways, including by providing resources, shaping the physical layout of the field, and influencing social interactions.

The interplay between the field, the social environment, and the physical environment is complex and requires a multidisciplinary approach. Understanding these relationships can help to inform decisions about the future development of the field and to ensure that it is sustainable and equitable.
Appendix 12 - Polylogue from Korneva and Reshetnikova (1989)
This book is intended for school leavers and other candidates who wish to apply to Udmurt State University and have to take the University matriculation exam in English (with the exception of candidates majoring in Language disciplines).

The objective of the book is to help applicants assess their reading, speaking and listening skills and prepare for the exam.

The book includes 28 units, each independent of the others but having a similar structure. Each unit consists of an adapted text or excerpt from a book of fiction or magazine to be used for reading, translation, question and answer work and a discussion topic related to the reading text in its theme. The authors have put special emphasis on updating the topics, though some of the traditional topics have also been included.

Attached to the book is a cassette with texts for assessing candidates' listening comprehension skills. The texts are read by native speakers.

The teaching staff of the Faculty of languages for special purposes thanks the organizers of the TEMPUS Project in Helsinki and Manchester Metropolitan Universities for the materials obtained during the Pre-JEP stage.

The book and the cassette are available at the office of the Faculty of Languages for Special Purposes.
Appendix 14 - Sample Text and Reading Comprehension from Abiturientu-96

The text appears to be a mix of Dutch and English. It seems to be discussing educational policies and reforms. The content is not clearly legible due to the quality of the image. However, the text appears to be discussing the role of education in society and the importance of educational policies.

The text mentions the importance of education in society and the need for educational policies. It discusses the role of education in promoting social development and the importance of educational reforms. The text also mentions the challenges faced by educational institutions in implementing educational policies.

Overall, the text appears to be discussing the importance of education in society and the need for educational reforms to promote social development.
Appendix 14 - Sample Text and Reading Comprehension from Abiturientu-96

Irrigation

The irrigation shall be happy to be a...
Appendix 15 - Sample Listening Comprehension from Abiturientu-96

ПАРЧЕЛ ТРЕТИЙ

Listening Comprehension

Part One "Meet Different People"

1. Michael Jackson.

be fond of
be crazy about Walt Disney films rollerskater
нравиться быть помешанным на; сильно любить фильмы Уолта Диснея катающийся на роликовых коньках

Questions:

Where does Michael Jackson live in America?
What city?
What part of it?
What house does he have in the suburbs?

2. Willy from Mayfield Comprehensive School.

comprehensive school fairly bright out-of-school activities Susan shop assistant disco speed cycling second-hand bike "death trap"
средняя школа довольно умный, смышленный внешкольные дела, занятия подруга Вилли продавщица дискотека велоспорт подержанный велосипед смертельная ловушка.

Questions:

What form is Willy in?
How old is his girlfriend?
Is she older or younger than he is?
What does he spend most of his pocket money on?
Appendix 16 Sample Text and Reading Comprehension from
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Appendix 17  Discourse Analysis

As the Russian emphasis in both teaching and assessment is primarily on spoken as opposed to written discourse, the following section focuses on the former only. Analysis of the written TL for reading and translation skills development are dealt with in the section which focuses on taxonomies. The survey in this section provides an overview of key elements in research on discourse in both Western and Russian education, both in terms of monologue and dialogue.

Definition of key terms

There are several types of spoken dialogue, namely a conventionalised exchange (in a situation for which the speakers have a preconception of the sequence which will ensue) and the open, unpredictable dialogue (for which the speaker has no preconceptions):

(1) There are three key general terms which are of value in the analysis of the dialogues.
(a) Field - i.e. the subject matter of a dialogue. This includes how the writer or speaker of the language orients himself toward the socially and accepted norms.
(b) Tenor - i.e. the roles of the participants within the dialogue, their respective status vis-à-vis each other and the power which each hold within the exchange. This also incorporates the level of formality of language.
(c) Mode - i.e. what the language is doing itself as a channel of communication. The level of reciprocity for example within the mode adopted by the speakers can be analysed using the model produced in McCarthy and Carter (1994) by observing the use of second (i.e. when addressing the listener) and first person (i.e. when speaking about oneself) pronouns and also the number of third person references to the sender or receiver.

(2) In both spoken and written discourse, cohesion and coherence are important aspects which need attention. Halliday and Hassan (1976) highlight five principal types of
cohesion in spoken discourse which also prove helpful in the analysis of discourse of Russian produced TL material. These principals are:

(a) Anaphoric reference (i.e. the use of pronouns when referring to something or someone previously mentioned)

(b) Substitution (this is similar to anaphoric reference. Here the noun is substituted for the word 'one', as in 'Mark has a sweet. I want one too'.)

(c) Ellipsis (omission of a grammatical element already expressed)

(d) Conjunctions (which involve the use of grammatical connectors like soon (temporal), and (additive) and although (adversarial))

(e) Lexical cohesion (i.e. the direct repetition of the same term to refer to the same object rather than the use of another term for the same object)

Widdowson (1978, p. 29) sees a clear distinction between cohesion and coherence. The former is concerned primarily with how the literal meaning of discourse is interpreted whereas the latter also takes into account the communicative values of utterances in context. Widdowson offers the following example to clarify this point:

Person A: That's the telephone.
Person B: I'm in the bath.
Person A: OK.

While this short exchange is questionable in terms of cohesion, the imagined context permits this to be accepted in terms of coherence.

(3) Investigating the level of ethnomethodology in dialogues allows the researcher to scrutinise what, if any, natural habit patterns used in every day linguistic events are employed by the speakers. These patterns include by way of example telling, explaining, apologising, requesting, asking for clarification, asking for a person to repeat what has
been said and what he is thinking. Particular importance in FL learning is attached to spontaneousity as this marks the quality of native-speaker like competence.

(4) Analysis of Speech Turns

Many of the terms used below are adopted and in some cases adapted from the findings of Sinclair and Coultard (1975) and Canale and Swain (1980) for analysing spoken discourse. A turn can take one of four forms, namely sentential, clausal, phrasal and lexical (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1974, p. 702). Often, the speaker may not actually know how the initial utterance will end as the process of speech is an organic one. The issue of turn allocation is likewise important. Just exactly, who will follow on from the current speaker's turn, is open ended. The turn could be allocated by the current speaker's selection of the next speaker, by asking a question or seeking a response to a statement from someone. Or the next turn speaker could be self-selected. In both cases, there exists a potential for a gap or conversely an overlap between the two turns. The moment for speaker change from one turn to the next is not always clear. Inevitably, from the moment it starts, a turn will reach a transition-relevance place at which point one turn may end and another may begin but the perception of when this moment arrives can be different in the minds of the current and next speakers. In fact, the current speaker may not realise that he wants to continue until he is interrupted. In any case, there are linguistic repair mechanisms for dealing with such errors in turn-taking.

The character of turns changes throughout a dialogue. The first turns generally involve a form of greeting while the closing of a conversation is achieved by a sense of consensus (sometimes more explicit than others) between the speakers. In the case of an oral examination, there is a pre-existing format in existence which dictates the exact nature of the turns between the teacher-examiner and the student. In all of the above cases, the decision to begin a turn in a dialogue requires the individual to have a sense of
motivation for listening to the linear development of a conversation in order to be able to respond to the previous speaker or self-select for the next turn.

A turn or move can be divided into acts which are defined as discreet communicative functions. The acts can be defined as follows:

(a) Starter - A lead into a question.
(b) Elicitation - A question.
(c) Acknowledgements - Responding through actions or words indicating that the respondent's words have been understood.
(d) Checks - Confirming information heard by seeking clarification.
(e) Comments - Reacting to what one has heard by expressing a view or using a verbal gesture.
(f) Thank - Acknowledging the respondent's contribution in the conversation or expressing thanks.
(g) Command - Directing the respondent to do something.
(h) Expressing irritation with the learner - Indicating that what has happened or been said is not what is required.
(i) Correcting - Interrupting the speaker and correcting a word or expression either badly pronounced or wrongly expressed by the candidate.
(j) Back Channel - Using the sound 'Mmm' for example. A back channel can be both positive or negative.
(k) Guiding through a difficulty - Directing the learner to a place in the text so that the latter can offer an answer.
(l) Interactive markers - Such as 'you see' or 'well'
(m) Fillers - Such as 'uh' and 'okay'
(n) Interjection - Adding in an unrequested comment.
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(o) Ellipsis - The omission of the subject and in some cases the verb which are not necessary for understanding.

(p) Slang - The use of informal language which is not generally accepted as standard usage.

(q) Hedge - A linguistic feature marking the absence of certainty (Scarcella and Brunak, 1981, pp. 59-75).

Aspects of Russian Discourse

Some researchers believe that the organisation of any discourse is affected by cultural attitudes. Clyne (1992, pp. 116 ff.) offers German as an example by stating how essay writing plays a far less crucial role in German education than in those countries which have English as their L1. For Germans, the primary concern is content. Within the body of the essay, linearity is less important than in English essays and digressions are more tolerated. In both school (right up to Abitur level) and at universities, more importance is attached to oral expression than in the United Kingdom where the performance in a written examination remains the key assessment tool. In general oral communication, Germans are more formal in their routines for beginning and ending conversations and more direct in what they say but use much less small-talk. This can lead to confusion at times for the German speaker when communicating for example in English. English small-talk can be interpreted by the German as a sign of 'friendship' if he is unaware that it is used frequently in English, but mostly on a superficial level (Clyne, 1992, p. 119). In the realm of humour, it is well known that Germans are often accused of not having a sense of humour by English speakers. Clearly, this is untrue, but it is also true to say that they do not use or appreciate to the same degree the verbal humour and irony of English speakers in their daily discourse. This may be partly due to the fact that German children do not have the same richness of tradition in children's riddles and rhymes based on
linguistic creativity and polysemy which English speaking children have (Clyne, 1992, p. 123).

The reasons for including the above details are numerous and also important when analysing how Russians learn English discourse. First, Germany is much closer geographically to the United Kingdom and is part not just of capitalist Western Europe but also the political machine, called the European Union. By contrast, Russia is both much further away (and therefore more geographically isolated) and outside the borders of the EU. It is also just beginning to embrace capitalism after seventy years of communism. Second, many citizens from both Germany and the United Kingdom have been able to visit or reside long term in the L1 country, as they wish, for many decades. However, Russian citizens have been starved of these same opportunities and thus possess a much weaker knowledge and awareness of life in the West. Third, English belongs to the Western branch of the Germanic languages and has strong similarities to German itself. However, Russian is part of a completely separate branch of the family of Indo-European languages, namely the Eastern Slavonic group. Consequently, the level of transparency between Russian and English is substantially less than that between German and English. Gethin and Gunnemark (1996, p. 170) write that English and German have between 25-50% transparency, while English and Russian have circa 10% transparency, primarily in the field of international words.

In all these cases, there is more to unite than divide Germany and the United Kingdom, their two languages and cultures and yet difficulties still occur for the TL speakers of one language when trying to master the L1 of the other. It is therefore only logical to assume that Russian speakers experience greater difficulty in trying to master English as the L1 than their German counterparts. These difficulties occur at different levels such as grammar or cultural awareness, but for those who have completed their schooling in
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English, the key issue is often discourse. Therefore, in order to proceed with any deep evaluation of the discourse of Russian-produced textbooks, it is essential to highlight key differences between Russian and English. For this purpose, Wierzbicka (1992) has been analysed and the following comments supplied by the latter will shape the approach to the analysis of any discourse.

Wierzbicka observes that strong cultural themes in Russian culture and language can be found in Russian discourse with its many references to the soul, fate and yearning. The latter can be found categorised into four specific groups:

1. Emotionality - mirrored in the high emotional temperature of Russian discourse. Russians are warm and expressive and have a strong sense of affiliation but are seen as undisciplined and needing to submit to authority.

2. Irrationality or non-rationality - stresses the limitations of logical thinking, human knowledge and understanding and on the mysteriousness and unpredictability of life. This distrust contrasts sharply with Western emphasis on rationality and the individual's will and actions.

3. Non-agentivity - the feeling that human beings are not in control of their lives and events. There is a tendency for fatalism, resignation and submissiveness with less emphasis on the individual as an achiever. Wierzbicka (1992, p. 396) cites the comments of several Russian thinkers, such as Fedotov who compared the activism of the West with the fatalism of the East and Solev'ev's view of the West's energy and independence versus the East's subordination and submission.

4. Moral passion - the importance of the struggle of good over evil in oneself and others. There is a tendency to extreme and absolute moral judgements.

These conceptual differences between East and West also appear in the realm of language and how individuals from each society express themselves.
(1) Russian is rich in active verbs of emotion, many of which are reflexive, thus emphasising the strong personal involvement of the speaker. By contrast, the Anglo-Saxon culture, from whence English originates, lacks the same range of emotional expression and tends to use adjectives to convey a similar message.

(2) A distinction exists in the issue of the agent as the doer or the passive experiencer. The Russian language tends to overuse the passive in the experiential mode. The dative case stresses what is happening to the person, thus leading to greater emotional intensity. This construction is evidence of what Wierzbicka (1992, p. 413) terms a 'patientive orientation' or a 'what happens to me syndrome'. In English, however, there is a greater use of nominative constructions which emit an 'agentive orientation' or a 'what I do' syndrome. She argues that these characteristics are evident not just in what the speaker says but feels.

(3) Russian grammar has a wealth of constructions which present reality as contrary to human desires and the human will. By contrast, English grammar is rich in constructions which link causation with human will in a positive way (i.e. volition and cause, such as 'I managed to'). Wierzbicka (1992) quotes Peskovskij's descriptive term of the Russian 'avos', an attitude which treats life as unpredictable. This is reflected in the Russian use of impersonal pronouns, therefore focusing on the unknown. In English the reverse trend occurs.

(4) Russian has a greater use of words of moral condemnation. The English speaker, by contrast, tends to understate when expressing a negative evaluation and to overstate in expressing positive values of certain trivial subjects.
Вариант № 5

5. Прочитайте текст и выберите единственно правильный вариант из четырех предложенных.

In Japan, .................................... Employees work hard and do hours of unpaid overtime to make their firms more efficient. If necessary, they give up weekends with the family to go on business trips. They are loyal to their organisations and totally involved with them.

(1) there is a close relationship between the worker and his company.
(2) there are no weekends for employees.
(3) workers go on business trips with their families.
(4) employees are not paid for their work

Выберите единственно правильный вариант из четырех предложенных.

62. He said he ........... never ........ his first day at the college.

(1) would forget     (2) will forget     (3) is to forget     (4) forget

63. The Metropole is ............... hotel in town.

(1) noisy     (2) the most noisiest     (3) the noisiest     (4) noisier than

64. I ............. my friend's calculator this afternoon.

(1) will be using     (2) will be used     (3) use     (4) used

65. The phone rang while Gary .......... lunch.

(1) was making     (2) made     (3) makes     (4) has made
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77. The children can swim, ...........?
   (1) can't they    (2) can they    (3) do you    (4) don't you

78. Cricket is a game ........ in English speaking countries.
   (1) play    (2) played    (3) playing    (4) plays

79. I never meet ........ interesting people.
   (1) some    (2) any    (3) someone    (4) anyone

80. Tony is a keen golfer, but unfortunately he has ........ ability.
   (1) many    (2) few    (3) much    (4) little

76. Mr. Brown is ............. lecturer.
   (1) -    (2) the    (3) a    (4) an

77. ........ you go to the cinema last night?
   (1) Did    (2) Have    (3) Do    (4) Does
Appendix 19 - FLSP Progress Tests

Test 1 year

I. Write in the plural form of the following nouns:

   church   lady   party   mouse   box
   story   foot   sheep   city   tooth

II. Put in the correct form of the pronouns:

1. _____ books are thin.
   a) this  b) these  c) that  d) those

2. What are _____?
   a) this  b) whose  c) these  d) those

3. He has _____ friends here.
   a) many  b) much  c) little  d) few

4. They are busy with _____ lessons.
   a) her  b) there  c) our  d) their

5. Show _____ your drawing.
   a) his  b) them  c) him  d) her

6. These flowers are so nice. I am fond of _____.
   a) they  b) them  c) their  d) its

7. Is there _____ clean water in the bottle?
   a) few  b) any  c) many  d) some

III. Correct the mistakes.

1. Does he got new car?
2. She speaks the Spanish very good.
3. He never wear hat.
4. He's liking a black coffee.
5. I likes listen to the music.

IV. Make up questions about the missing information.

1. Peter has _____ children. (Two? Three?)
2. She works in the _____ shop. (Book Shop?)
3. The supermarket closes at _____ (9 p.m.)
4. I go swimming _____ (Once a week)

V. Put the necessary preposition into each gap. Sometimes no preposition is necessary.

1. She listens _____ the news _____ the radio.
2. I'll see you _____ 9.00 _____ the morning.
3. I'm looking _____ my neighbour's cat while she is on holiday.
4. She usually goes _____ home _____ bus.

VI. Make up all types of the questions.

My sister eats meat every day because she likes it.

VII. Form the degrees of comparison.

Busy, noisy, modern, humorous, funny, little, bad, near.
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III. PUT THE WORDS IN THE RIGHT ORDER

1. Feel it leaves your phone will
2. You feel your pocket if has something
3. They pay you back soon can I ask will
4. A coach during your when you went
5. Some idea about house I can get
6. They seem the friendlier than the people in my old job
7. When you get there you'll let me know
8. I'll never want to crossroads for years
9. We were on the road in the east side this week
10. I'll never find the book while I (read an French was frightful)

II. CORRECT THE SUBJECT

1. The general (washes was washing) was watching the program when (hurtened, was anything is anything) at computer
2. I was going round to see after dinner (have arranged had arranged) twice with had to before
3. I know the county (knows how many) on the names of everyone in the village for I (live has lived, have been living) here all my life
4. I have (am very fond of Alice but I don't see like, I would suggest having been married of her now
5. I do "Oh!" a "conventional" what do I say, but still she doesn't know, why she doesn't know?
6. I come to my room this minute, he said, "are you beating will you hear me?"

I. CHOOSE THE CORRECT FORM

EXAMINATION OR PHRASAL VERB

THE FIRST WORD
1. Do you have horseback riding lessons at your school?

2. Do you have an art class at your school?

3. Do you have an orchestra at your school?

4. Do you have a choir at your school?

5. Do you have a science lab at your school?

6. Do you have a computer class at your school?

7. Do you have a physical education class at your school?

8. Do you have a swimming pool at your school?

9. Do you have a library at your school?

10. Do you have a playground at your school?
EXAMINATION GRAMMAR TEST
THE SECOND YEAR

I. USE THE REQUIRED TENSE-ASPECT FORMS IN THE FOLLOWING TEXT.

One Saturday evening Herbert said suddenly: 'Mum, I (to ask) a young lady to come in to tea tomorrow. Is that all right?'

'And may I ask who she (to be) and how you (to get) to know her?'

'Her name is Betty Bevan, and I (to meet) her first at the pictures one Saturday afternoon when it (to rain).
She (to sit) next to me and she (to drop) her bag and I (to pick) it up and we (to get) talking.'

'And when all this (to happen)?'

'About three months ago, and we (to go) to the pictures about twice a week ever since.'

'What she (to do)?'

'She (to work) in a typewriting office in the City.'

Next day Mrs. Sunbury (to arrange) the tea stylishly. Herbert (to give) the tea-table a glance of surprise as he (to usher) the girl into the sitting-room. Mrs. Sunbury (to cast) a look at Betty's make up and dress and (to take) an instant dislike to her. But she (to decide) to behave like a lady.

She (to pour) out tea and (to cut) the cake. Betty (to take) a bite at if and when she (to put) it in her saucer it (to fall) down to the ground.

'Oh, I (to be) sorry,' said the girl, as she (to pick) it up.

'It (not matter) at all, I (cut) you another piece,' said Mrs. Sunbury.

Betty (to refuse) (to have) more tea. But when Herbert (to light) a cigarette, she said to him: 'to give' me one, too, please. I (to die) for a smoke. Betty (not to be) such a full as not to see that Herbert's mother (to do) all she could to make her uncomfortable and she (to be) offended.

Finally Herbert said: 'Well, Betty, I think it's about time we (to go). I (to walk) back with you.'

'It (be) a pleasure to see you, Miss Bevan, I'm sure,' said Mrs. Sunbury, rising to her feet.

Total - 39.

II. A, an, the or - (nothing)?

1. _____ diplomat is _____ person who can tell you to go to hell in such a way that you actually look forward to _____ trip.
2. _____ dog is _____ only thing on earth that loves you more than you love yourself.
3. _____ Americans like _____ fat books and _____ thin women.
4. _____ accountant is _____ man who is hired to explain that you didn't make _____ money you did.
Total - 11.

III. Choose the right word.

1. As soon as I saw him I was (sure/surely) he had been drinking.
2. Do you think that's a (real/really) diamond in her ring?
3. I read an (amazing/amazingly) thing in the newspaper this morning.
4. The food was (wonderful/wonderfully), but the service was (awful/awfully).
5. The job was (surprising/surprisingly) easy.
Total - 6.

IV. ing or ed?

1. I was surpris____ to see Ann there.
2. I find this work tir____.
3. Her exam results were disappoint____.
4. The news was really shock____.
5. She was exit ____ about her new job.
Total - 5.
V. COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCES.
1. Your dress would look nicer if -----.  
2. If it were not for his family ----------.
3. I'll be grateful if --------------------.
4. I would take her to the party if -----.  
5. In case ----------------- let me know.  
Total - 10.

VI. TRANSLATE THE FOLLOWING SENTENCES INTO ENGLISH.
1. Ижевск сильно изменился с тех пор, как я впервые приехал сюда жить.  
2. В то время когда она говорила по телефону, дети начали драться и разбили окно.  
3. Если бы не было так холодно сегодня, я бы сходила куда-нибудь.  
4. «Он работает на этой неделе?» — «Нет, он в отпуске.»
5. Я спросил, почему он не ответил на мое письмо.  
6. В тот день нас встретили в аэропорту и привезли в отель.  
7. Чем больше он думал об этом, тем меньше ему это нравилось.  
8. «Телефон отключили». «Тебе следовало давно оплатить счет.»  
9. «Ты выглядишь уставшим.» — «Я работал в саду весь день.»  
10. Мне сказали принимать таблетки три раза в день.  
Total - 29.

TOTAL - 100.
Reprted speech 2nd year students

Test Paper

I. Convert into reported speech:

1. "What's the time? My watch has stopped."
2. "Have you anything else you want to explain to me, Henry?"
3. "When will Mr. Dobson be back?"
4. "What are you doing here?"
5. "I'm very tired and I want to go to bed early."
6. "Is there anything else on your mind, Erik?"
7. "Why didn't he tell me about it?"
8. "I bought a very interesting book yesterday."
9. "Do you want to leave a message?"
10. "Can you help me to carry these papers, please?"

II. Complete the sentences with the correct form of SAY or TELL

1. He ___ I was wrong.
2. ___ us about your plans.
3. Harris ___ them they could follow him.
4. She ___ she would be later.
5. Did she ___ you what happened?
6. What did you ___ to the police?
7. He couldn't help me. He ___ me to ask Tom.
8. She ___ us a lot of lies.
9. The man ___ he would go and consult his master.
10. She ___ she would ___ us all about it the next time we met.

III. Translate into English:

1. On said, that they work together.
2. We asked him, where he bought this compact disc.
3. She asked me, why we declined this invitation.
4. He said to us, that he had already seen them.
5. He said, that he would help us.
6. She said, that she was sorry.
7. He said to her, that she should not lock the door.
8. She said to them, that she should not call the police.
9. She said, that discussed this question with Semy.
10. We asked them, when they would come.
The Gerund

Test Paper

3rd year students
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Supply the correct gerund form of the verb given in brackets:
1. She was tired of (treat) like a silly child.
2. He denied (speak) to the manager.
3. Your room wants (redecorate).
4. This film is worth (see).
5. Fancy (meet) you here!
6. He didn't mention (meet) her.
7. I don't remember (hear) this story before.
8. I think your hair needs (cut).
9. They must work without (disturb).
10. She complained of not (listen) to.

Insert the correct preposition before the gerund where required:
1. He was accused of having made a mess.
2. He succeeded in persuading us to go there.
3. Fred confessed to having robbed a bank.
4. He agreed to selling his car.
5. It's no use of buying this dictionary.
6. She kept on talking.
7. We are very pleased at your coming.
8. Is there any possibility of meeting them?
9. Tom burst into laughing.
10. We look forward to seeing you.

Translate into English:
1. Он предложил обсудить этот вопрос.
2. Извините, что я вас прерывал, но у нас кончается время.
3. Тётя Полли любила Тома и избегала его наказывать.
4. С ней бесполезно спорить.
5. Я настаивал на том, чтобы вы поехали туда немедленно.
6. Ему совсем не улыбалась мысль вставать так рано.
7. Нет причин так сердиться.
8. У него нет ни малейшего шансa выиграть в эту гонку.
9. Они отложили по купи машину.
10. Мы были удивлены увидев их вместе.
I. Choose the correct form of the participle
1. Jack had never expected to get the job. He was (astonished) when he got it.
2. Why do you always look so (to bore)?
3. Her explanation was very (to confuse). We didn't understand anything.
4. (to stir) by the beauty of the sunset, she strolled along the beach.
5. Dan picked up the (broke) vase from the floor.
6. There was one bright star (to shine) in the sky.
7. They saw Irene (to sit) on a (to fall) tree.
8. I've never seen a man so (to change)
9. Are you (to interest) in buying a car?
10. She cut her foot on a piece of (to break) glass, half (to hide) in the sand.

II. Translate into English
1. Слышал, как Джон плакала в соседней комнате.
2. То услышал, как кто-то позвал его.
3. Когда она шла вдоль по улице, она услышала, как кто-то играл на гитаре.
4. Она сказала, что ей отремонтировали квартиру на прошлой неделе.
5. У тебя очень красивое платье. Где ты его сшила?
6. Мы видели, как он входил в дом.
7. Мне нравилось наблюдать, как дети играют в саду.
8. Ты уже отремонтировали телевизор?
9. Было хочется, чтобы работа была сделана к пятнице.
10. Почему ты не сделаешь стрижку?
1. Change the following singular words into the plural:
car -   
book -   
knife -   
mouse -   
fox -   
mushroom -   
match -   
foot -   
fish -   
ship -   
lynx -   

2. Change the following plural words into the singular:
sheep -   
men -   
wives -   

3. Fill in MUST or MAY or CAN
Coming across the street, you ______ look left. It's urgent, you ______ do it at once.

4. Give the degrees of comparison:
warm -   
good -   
tall -   
funny -   
short -   
expensive -   

5. Fill in the gaps using appropriate form of adjectives:
Hellen is ______ than John.
This dress is ______ (expensive) of all in the shop.

6. Choose the correct form of the possessive pronouns
This is a nice room. ______ (his, her, its) walls are blue.
Tom has a dog. ______ (his, their, her) is very clever.

7. Choose the correct answer by circling the correct form:
Yesterday I ______ a letter to my friend. a) wrote; b) write; c)written
He ______ up at 8 a.m. a) getting; b) get; c)got
They ______ at school last week. a) are; b) was; c)were
she learn this text? a) had; b) did; c) was
We ______ see any movies last month. a) wasn't; b) hadn't; c) didn't

8. Articles
He went to ______ Moscow a) the; b) - ; c) a
This is ______ Peter's book. a) a; b) the ; c) -
 ______ sun is shining. a) the b) a c) -
This is ______ bag, I bought yesterday. a) - b) a c) the
This is ______ table. a) a ; b) the; c) -

9. Complete the sentences
If it were winter, I ______
If you find a horseshoe, ______

10. Choose the correct tense
If he (will not , would not, doesn’t didn’t) call her, she will be disappointed.

11. Report the following
She said: «Lock the door, John»
LIFE IN SPACE

We haven't conquered space. Not yet. We have sent some 20 men on camping trips to the Moon, and the USA and the Soviet Union have sent people to spend restricted lives orbiting the Earth. During the next few weeks, for instance, the US Space Shuttle will take Spacelab into orbit, showing that ordinary (non-astronaut) scientists can live and work in space - for a few days only.

All these are marvelous technical and human achievements, but none of them involves living independently in the same way as ordinary people have lived on Earth. The Russians need food and even oxygen sent up from the Earth. The residents of Sheffield are farther from London than those of the Shuttle or Soviet's Salyut. It is only in space movies, that people spend long periods living more or less normally deep in space.

But in a couple of decades - by the year 2000, say - this could have changed. There could be settlements in space that would house people for periods of time not leading more or less normal lives.

The picture on this page shows where the settlers would live. It seems like fiction - but it is not. It is based on plans produced by people: engineers and scientists, headed by Gerard O'Neill of Princeton University, to a conference by NASA.

They are space enthusiasts, of course, but they are not just dreamers. The settlement is a gigantic wheel, a tube more than 400 ft in diameter bent into a ring just over a mile across. The ring spins gently once a minute. It is this gentle rotation that makes this space station different from the Shuttle and Salyut, and different from the Lunar modules that took man for the first time to any non-terrestrial soil, because the spin is a force that feels like gravity. Every space trip has demonstrated that the human body needs gravity if it isn't to deteriorate, and also makes normal activities possible. Nobody would want to live for long in any settlement where everything - people and equipment and the things they were trying to fry - moved weightlessly around.

With gravity, in space can be based on our experience on Earth. We can have factories and houses and meeting-places that are not guesswork. The need for gravity is one of the reasons for building a space colony, rather than sending settlers to an existing planet such as the Moon or the planets. The Moon is tiny - and any one place on the moon has 14 days of day followed by 14 of night, which makes agriculture impossible. In the settlement, which floats in permanent sunlight, the day-length is controlled. A gigantic mirror about a mile in diameter floats weightlessly above the ring of the settlement. It reflects sunlight on to smaller mirrors that direct it into the ring, through shutters that fix the day length.
### Рабочая программа для студентов 1 курса
факультета социальных коммуникаций
на II семестр 1996-97 г.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>недели, часы</th>
<th>Reading \ Speaking \ skills</th>
<th>Grammar and writing skills</th>
<th>Listening skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. 10h.</td>
<td>&quot;On education&quot; by F.P. Dunne. 4h.</td>
<td>Future Continuous Future Perfect Unit 10. 4h.</td>
<td>&quot;Headway&quot; по выбору преподавателя</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 10h.</td>
<td>&quot;On education&quot; by F.P. Dunne. 4h.</td>
<td>Past Continuous Unit 12. 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 10h.</td>
<td>&quot;Let's have a picnic&quot;, (From &quot;Humour Variety Stories, Jokes, Cartoons) 4h.</td>
<td>Present Perfect Unit 13-14 4h.</td>
<td>Video films &quot;Follow me&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. 10h.</td>
<td>&quot;Let's have a picnic,&quot; (From &quot;Humour Variety Stories, Jokes, Cartoons) 2h. &quot;On not knowing English&quot;. 2h.</td>
<td>Present Perfect Unit 15 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. 10h.</td>
<td>&quot;On not knowing English.&quot; (From &quot;How to be an Alien&quot; by G.Mikes) 4h.</td>
<td>Present Perfect Continuous Unit 16-17 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. 10h.</td>
<td>&quot;Many Moons&quot; by James Thurber. 4h.</td>
<td>Present Perfect Unit 20-21 Past simple. 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. 10h.</td>
<td>“The match-maker” by H.Munro. 4h.</td>
<td>Past Perfect. Unit 22. 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. 10h.</td>
<td>“The match-maker” by H.Munro. 2h. “Perhaps we shall meet again” by H.E.Bates. 2h.</td>
<td>Past Perfect Continuous. Unit 23-24 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. 10h.</td>
<td>“Perhaps we shall meet again” by H.E.Bates. 4h.</td>
<td>Passive Voice. Unit 42-43 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. 10h.</td>
<td>“Seeing people off” by Max Beerbohm. 4h.</td>
<td>Passive Voice. Unit 44-45 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. 10h.</td>
<td>“Seeing people off” by Max Beerbohm. 4h.</td>
<td>Passive Voice. Unit 46 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. 10h.</td>
<td>“A man in the way” by Scott Fitzgerald. 4h.</td>
<td>Auxiliary Verbs in short answers and questions. Unit 51-52 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. 10h.</td>
<td>“Peter Two” by Irwin Shaw. 4h.</td>
<td>АРТИКЛЕ Unit 71-73. 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. 10h.</td>
<td>“Peter Two” by Irwin Shaw. 4h.</td>
<td>АРТИКЛЕ Unit 74-75. 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. 10h.</td>
<td>“Peter Two” by Irwin Shaw. 4h.</td>
<td>АРТИКЛЕ Unit 76-77. 4h.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>The Dinner party.</td>
<td>The Infinitive.</td>
<td>Units 22-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>4h.</td>
<td>2h.</td>
<td>2h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>Caged.</td>
<td>The Infinitive.</td>
<td>Unit 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-65</td>
<td>4h.</td>
<td>2h.</td>
<td>2h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>Caged.</td>
<td>The Infinitive.</td>
<td>Units 25-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66-70</td>
<td>4h.</td>
<td>2h.</td>
<td>2h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10h.</td>
<td></td>
<td>constructions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Revision.</td>
<td>Revision.</td>
<td>Units 27-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71-75</td>
<td>4h.</td>
<td>2h.</td>
<td>2h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>REV IS ON</td>
<td>TEST PAPER</td>
<td>Units 29-30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76-80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2h.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10h.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Revision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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