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PREFACE

In March, 1972, a team of specialists, Russell Campbell from UCLA, Yehia El-Ezaby from the American University in Cairo, and William Harrison from the Ford Foundation, visited Jordan at the request of the Ministry of Education and the University of Jordan to examine the English-language-teaching situation. After their visit, they prepared a report (Campbell et al., 1972) in which they described the Certification and In-Service Teacher-Training Institute (CITTI), the various English programs at the University of Jordan, a curriculum-development project for the secondary schools, and a proposed English-Language Policy Survey.

In response to this report, the Ministry of Education formally requested Ford Foundation assistance in undertaking a survey of English-language instruction in Jordan. In addition, President Majale of the University of Jordan requested that a section of the survey be devoted to examining the English program at that institution. The Foundation reacted favorably and rapidly to these requests, and survey activities in Jordan began in mid-June, 1972.

We discovered during our initial inquiries that there did not exist any body of facts or documented opinion concerning the actual effectiveness of the English-language program. Therefore, we tried in our investigation to assess critically various aspects of the English program, and the different facets of our Survey are reflected by the chapter headings of this volume.

The first part contains four chapters: Chapter I, a description of the stated and implicit aims of English instruction; Chapter II, a description of the dimensions of English instruction in the country; Chapter III, a description of curricula and instructional materials; and Chapter IV, a description of teacher-training activities.

In the second major part, we describe and present data from a Field Study (Chapters V and VI) that we conducted with a large number of Jordanians of varied educational attainment from a representative sample of occupations. In this study, we examined the relationships among various background characteristics such as respondents' educational attainment, occupation, age, sex and type of English training; and their reported use of English for diverse business and nonbusiness purposes, their reported proficiency in English, and their reactions toward various aspects of their programs of English instruction.

In Chapter VII, we present a critical analysis of the present English-
teaching program in relation to the data collected during the Field Study and in Chapter VIII we summarize the recommendations that we have made throughout the report.

One factor in this rather intensive investigation of English language policy which has helped to make our task easier has been the relative simplicity of the language situation in Jordan. Arabic is the mother tongue of a vast majority of the population and the language most widely used by the people to communicate with other Jordanians or Arabs from neighboring countries. Arabic is the exclusive medium of instruction in government schools through the secondary level, and even private schools offer a core curriculum (e.g., the nature of the Arab homeland, the history of the Arabs, the geography of the Arab states) via Arabic at the secondary level. In addition to this homogeneity of mother tongue, English is, for all practical purposes, the only foreign language taught in the schools. Therefore, the educational system comprises a large number of students who speak the same language at home, who receive the bulk of their instruction via the same language, Arabic, and who study the same foreign language, English, following nationally prescribed curricula. Thus, we have been able to make observations or recommendations which have general relevance for the entire public educational system of Jordan rather than just for one small segment of the system.

We believe that the substance of this report will be of interest and value to local educators, in particular, as well as to educational planners in other countries where English is widely taught as a foreign language.

We view the present opportunity to investigate the more traditional or formal aspects of a country's foreign language-teaching program within the framework of a specially conducted, broadly-based sociolinguistic survey as a unique contribution to the rapidly growing body of data collected by language and educational planners (see, for example, Fishman, Ferguson and Das Gupta, 1968; Ladefoged, Glick and Criper, 1971; Rubin and Jernudd, 1971; Whiteley 1971).

To our knowledge, previous investigators have not used this dual approach. They have typically assessed the success of language-teaching programs by administering some standardized test to groups of students or by visiting a series of classes and by evaluating the performance of the teachers using a checklist specifically prepared to represent one theoretical bias or another (see, for example, Bratton and Lebman, 1972; Brownell, 1967; Jacobs, 1966; Ladefoged, Glick and Criper, 1971).

We believe that it is of limited value to assess the success of a language-teaching program by administering a standardized test of dubious validity. The knowledge that Jordanian secondary-school
graduates score better or worse than their Egyptian or Lebanese counterparts becomes meaningful only to the extent that we possess detailed information about the relative importance or necessity for English in each of these countries, the types of English programs which exist, the background of the students, etc. Likewise, to evaluate a program by relying solely upon classroom visitation could easily produce an incomplete or biased view.

Perhaps the most novel aspect of this Survey was the manner in which the results were officially presented to the Ministry of Education. In early January, 1973 one hundred copies of the pre-publication version of this report were sent to the Ministry. The Ford Foundation then sponsored a two-day Ministry-initiated and coordinated seminar in Aqaba, January 24-25. At that time the Survey report was discussed in great depth by the authors, by key decision-makers from diverse branches of the Ministry of Education and the University of Jordan, and by representatives from various funding agencies. At the conclusion of this seminar, the Minister of Education announced the creation of a National English Language Planning Committee to coordinate the immediate implementation of certain recommendations and the continued study of others. The minutes of the Aqaba conference appear as Appendix A.

We believe that our report will be of interest and value not only to Jordanian educators as they examine their English-language program within the framework of their general educational philosophy, but also to educational planners in other countries who contemplate the systematic evaluation of their language programs. We believe that both the data and the methodology of the present study will interest researchers.

We should like to thank the following individuals who assisted us during various phases of the Survey: His Excellency, Dr. Ishaq Farhan, the Minister of Education; Mr. Hikmat Al-Sakit, Under-secretary of Education; Mr. Izzat Azizi, Director of the Curriculum Directorate; Mr. Abdullatif Arabiyyat, Head of the Curriculum and Textbooks Divisions; Miss Salma H. Jayyusi and Mr. Ahmed S. Tawil from the English Department of the Curriculum Directorate; Mr. Ibrahim Arna'out from the statistics section of the Ministry of Education; Dr. Shuja' El-Asad, Director of the Department of Statistics; Mr. Wasef Azar and Mr. Abdulla Sammour from the Department of Statistics; Mr. Ali Abdel Razek, Director of Teacher Training; Mr. Khalid al-Sheikh, Director of CITTI; Mr. Ahmed Othman, CITTI Associate Director for Programs; Miss May Nabil, CITTI English specialist; Dr. Mohammed Ibrahim, Mr. Charles Hart and Dr. Yahia Abu Rishy from the English Department of the University of Jordan; Mr. Abdel Majeed Mahdi, Head of the Cultural
Services in the Army; Mr. Joseph Awad, Director of the Modern Language Center; Mr. Emile Koro, Director of American Friends of the Middle East; Mr. Kenneth Forster, British Council English-language-teaching advisor; and Mr. James Socknat, Ford Foundation project specialist.

A special thanks is also due Dr. Thomas Gorman who wrote the introductory essay to this volume, which places our survey within the larger context of language planning in general.

W. W. H.
C. H. P.
G. R. T.
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In the past decade language planning processes have attracted increasing scholarly attention. To some degree, this development has been a response to the needs of newly independent and linguistically diverse nations faced by what is considered to be the imperative need to attain economic self-sufficiency, social integration and cultural autonomy. In such nations, the need for directed social change is widely accepted, as is the function of centralized planning as a component and sometimes a catalyst of such change.

In almost all developing states the formal educational system has been deliberately utilized as one of the principle instruments of social change and as one of the primary means through which the goals of national unity and operational efficiency can be achieved. Typically, the system has also been subjected to radical change, both in the direction of overall expansion and with regard to such curriculum reform as is consonant with the value systems of the new nations and their more evident needs. Educational development has also given rise to complex forms of unplanned change, which have resulted in structural changes within the societies in question, of which only the grosser manifestations are generally recognized, or understood.

The formulation of policy regarding the language of instruction to be used at different stages of the educational process is a prerequisite to curriculum change and development. In the last several years, therefore, numerous independent states have been obliged to make policy decisions in this regard, particularly with respect to the selection or allocation of different languages as media or subjects of instruction. These decisions can frequently be interpreted as reflecting prior political decisions that have been taken with regard to the function of the educational system in fostering values associated with communal ethnicity and the wider valuation of nationality respectively; and with the role of education in meeting needs consequent upon the nation's membership in a supranational, technologically-oriented civilization. Where there is not national consensus on the relative significance of such values or needs, allocative decisions concerning educational language policy have frequently become the focus of political activity, to an extent that has prevented or inhibited certain types of long-range planning. In most countries, however, policy decisions have been arrived at which take into account conflicting values and needs so that, in a particular state, instruction might be organized at successive stages in the ancestral language of the students, in a 'national' or
'linking' language with wider communicative functions, and in a foreign language which would provide access to the literature of specialized educational areas.

Numerous scholars have provided descriptions and, in some cases, analyses of the policy choices made in developing states so that the general trends in countries in South and Southeast Asia and Africa, for example, can be readily discerned. The literature concerning the use of English as a subject or medium of instruction in particular states is especially voluminous.

Until recently, however, language specialists have given less attention to the systematic study of policy making agencies or processes than to policy outcomes in particular states. The formulation of educational language policy and other aspects of policy planning has usually been discussed without reference to general planning theory or to a theory of language planning. However, through the collaborative effort of a group of scholars, primarily influenced by the work of Haugen, Ferguson and Fishman, the theoretical framework is now being developed in relation to which such processes can be described with some degree of systematicity.

Other major advances relevant to the study of educational language policy concern the development of conceptual schemes relating to the description of language behavior at the societal level, and the application of techniques of survey methodology to the assembly of data on language use and attitudes in linguistic communities in a number of developing states.

Using the English Language Policy Survey of Jordan as a point of reference and departure, I would like to discuss features of a number of studies that have served to indicate the relevance of such theoretical or methodological developments to the study of educational language policy and refer to procedures adopted by individual scholars concerned with the same issue, when these seem to have particular research potential.

But first, let me define my use of the term educational language policy, as the phrase is open to a number of interpretations. The study of educational language policy is first concerned with the guiding principles that are adopted by those responsible for formulating policy. In many cases, however, such principles are not explicit and have to be inferred from the interacting set of secondary policies and decisions that derive from them. It is not always empirically useful, therefore, to attempt to distinguish policy formulation from policy execution or implementation. These are often best regarded as two stages of regulative activity rather than two different kinds of decision-making. The study of educational language policy then, as I interpret it, encompasses all phases of the regulative process from the statement
of general objectives to an examination of the means by which these objectives are realized.

THE JORDAN SURVEY
At this stage I wish to draw attention to certain features of organization and conduct of the survey which might be considered exemplary, in a literal sense, and subsequently to discuss the relevance of certain of these features to future studies relating to the planning of educational language policy. My observations will concern (1) the definition of the general objectives of the survey, (2) the relationships established between the policymakers and advisers, (3) procedures adopted in policy appraisal, (4) the means employed to collect and process data on language use and language attitudes, and (5) the presentation of the findings and recommendations.

The objectives of the survey were clearly delimited before it was undertaken; they were attainable in the time available for investigation; and they were authorized by the appropriate authorities. An earlier study carried out by Russell Campbell, Yehia El-Ezaby and William Harrison had suggested that there was a need for an information document which would explicitly state the goals of the national English language policy and describe its implementation in the school system and elsewhere (Campbell et al., 1972); and this was the task the survey team set itself. Since the report was intended to serve as one point of reference for future planning, it also contains suggestions for future policy alternatives.

I think it appropriate to refer to aspects of the working relationship between the relevant Jordanian officials and the team of advisers since the 'transactive' relationship between advisor and client is an issue I will consider later in some detail. The authorities of the Jordanian Ministry of Education established guiding principles and priorities for action. Liaison with the Ministry of Education was facilitated by the cooperation and advice of Miss Jayyusi and Mr. Tawil of the English Language section of the Curriculum Directorate, whose general knowledge of the social context and of specific features of the educational system complemented the technical expertise of the members of the team and who made a valuable contribution in the specification of the policy alternatives included in the report. The Department of Statistics provided access to the information obtained in a recent survey of Jordan manpower and made available the services of trained interviewers and personnel who assisted with the design of survey instruments and who had major responsibility for coding and processing the data.

An interim version of the report was presented to the Ministry of Education in December, 1972, and discussed at a conference of senior
personnel at Aqaba in January, 1973. The Jordanian educators then provided a review and analysis of the survey recommendations in terms of their practical, economic and political feasibility, and modifications were made to them in the light of these observations. As a consequence of the report, a policy-making body was established to oversee the implementation of the recommendations that were made and accepted.

The survey involved, firstly, an appraisal of policy statements regarding the aims of English instruction, primarily from the point of view of their clarity, scope and specificity, and their compatibility with other relevant policies, in particular with those relating to the aims of Jordanian education in general. Secondly, the project dealt with the feasibility of these policies; and I would like to elaborate upon this aspect of the enquiry briefly. The team considered the extent to which the aims of instruction were effected in five curricula: the primary-preparatory, and the literary, scientific-commercial, industrial and agricultural streams at secondary level. Two major sets of questions are involved in a feasibility study of this kind. These are a) are the stated goals practicable given such factors as the length and intensity of courses, and the content of the textbooks used? b) are the goals appropriate in terms of the discernible needs of the students both within the educational system and in the society for which school is a preparation?

Chapters I - IV of the Jordan survey report are concerned primarily with the first set of questions. Particular emphasis is given to the question of the pedagogical adequacy of the materials used and to the issue of teacher preparation. The method of textbook analysis and evaluation allows for judgements to be made regarding the adequacy with which language skills are introduced and sequenced. Some such system of analysis is required since an essential concern in an investigation of this kind is the degree to which curricula at different educational levels are integrated. The members of the team drew attention to a lack of integration, for example, in the anomalous position of the students of science in the university, whose courses and examinations are conducted in English, yet who receive less instruction in English both at university and secondary school level than students specializing in literary studies (Prator, 1973).

Chapters V - VI of the report detail the results of a study of the reported language behavior and language attitudes of a section of the Jordanian work force. The evaluation of features of the curriculum in terms of the reported use and expressed need for English by these respondents represents an innovation which has a number of applications, some of which will be discussed later in the paper.

Certain procedures employed in the field survey that served to
expedite data processing and analysis deserve commentary. The questionnaires were developed in collaboration with a systems analyst in the Department of Statistics and they were designed so as to allow for direct transfer of the data to computer cards. Additionally, the form of the tables specifying bivariate or multivariate relationships between the various responses was established before the collection of the data, and the necessary programming was completed while data collection was in progress. Because these measures were taken, the actual data processing was completed in less than one month. The team members would not wish to overemphasize the significance of such rapidity, of course. Clearly, unless the right questions are asked in the first place the speed with which they are processed is of little consequence; but it is equally clear that the practical utility of sociolinguistic data, and in particular data on language attitudes, is likely to increase in direct proportion to its contemporaneity.

The questionnaire used in the field survey was designed so that it could be completed relatively quickly. There were only two open-ended questions, both of which had a checking function and neither of which was processed. The Arabic-speaking interviewers were familiarized with the questionnaire and given appropriate orientation before the field study began.3

The basic findings and recommendations of the team were set out in the form of an interim report which was discussed extensively and jointly by the team members and the educators concerned, as was mentioned earlier. In keeping with its practical purpose the style of the report is relatively free from technical complexity and the method of presentation of the statistical data obtained is correspondingly simple.

OTHER STUDIES OF EDUCATIONAL LANGUAGE POLICY

Certain features of the organization and design of the Joran survey might appropriately be replicated in studies with related objectives. Such studies are likely to become a component of evaluation programs concerned with incremental policy change rather than with basic allocative decisions; that is to say in situations in which decisions regarding the languages and subjects of instruction to be introduced at different educational stages have been taken by the appropriate authorities and generally accepted. But every study will naturally require the development of different investigative approaches for a number of reasons. One of these is the fact that policymakers in developing countries are rarely confronted with linguistic situations of the simplicity of that of Jordan, where Arabic is the first language of practically all teachers and students and English the only foreign language taught extensively in the schools. Again, the research procedures employed in Jordan were determined by such factors as the terms of
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reference of the team and the time available for inquiry; so that, for example, classroom observation techniques were precluded because schools were not in session at the time the data was gathered.

In this section of the paper, therefore, I would like to refer to certain procedures adopted in other sociolinguistically-oriented surveys and field studies that have been carried out in developing countries and attempt to derive from the experience of those involved, as I interpret it, some tentative remarks concerning the conduct of the study of educational language policy generally. I will refer to techniques adopted in studies undertaken in the United States and Great Britain when these seem to be of direct relevance, but the focus of attention will be on activities in developing states. The tenor of my remarks will be directed towards policy advisers—who have typically in the past been non-nationals of the countries concerned with an academic affiliation—both of which factors tend to affect the perspective from which problems are identified and the nature of the solutions proposed to remedy these. Clearly, in an increasing number of studies in the future the senior research workers will be local scholars and this Introduction has been written with this fact in mind. Whether the advisers are foreign or local personnel, however, it seems to be the case that in the successful policy survey the relationship between adviser and policymaker (or, more generally, between the adviser and those who maintain liaison with the policymaker) is likely to be a transactive one; both in the sense that the relationship needs to be characterized by mutual learning and mutual respect (Friedman, 1971) and in the sense that the procedures adopted by the adviser should serve to provide the policymaker with the information most relevant to decision-making at each stage of the planning process. It is in terms of the interaction between the two sets of participants that I would first like to discuss the planning of educational language policy.

For the purposes of discussion I will assume that three putative stages can generally be recognized in the study of policymaking processes, each of which has a number of subdivisions. These stages excluding the stage of orientation might be characterized as follows:

1) policy appraisal;
2) policy formulation and determination;
3) policy implementation, evaluation and review. The generalization will normally apply whether advisers are primarily concerned with language allocation or language teaching, i.e., with the selection of particular languages as media or subjects of instruction, or the selection of the means by which such languages might be taught effectively.

In a conventional planning framework responsibilities would be theoretically distributed among the politicians, who would define objectives and choose alternatives; the advisers or planners, who would analyze problems and propose alternatives; and the bureaucrats,
who would implement the selected programs. The trichotomy can be misleading, however, firstly because the distinction between policy-making and policy administration is by no means complete, as I have argued earlier. And, secondly, because it does not take sufficient account of the need for the adviser to be concerned with the practical, operational consequences of his proposals and with the processes of evaluation and review. The adviser's responsibilities do not end with the production of a plan. I would rather suggest that at each planning stage advisers and policymakers should be regarded as having responsibilities that are in some respects complementary; and I will attempt to delineate some of these.

In doing so, I wish to emphasize strongly that I am not suggesting that the undertakings discussed below in relation to each stage would be appropriately applied in all surveys of educational language policy, or that the sequence of activities is one that should necessarily be adopted in such studies. The range of activities that might be designated as survey-type activities is manifold. The survey in Jordan had very different terms of reference from the surveys of language use and language teaching in Eastern Africa, for example; and each of the five surveys undertaken in that region had distinctive characteristics which derived in part from the different policies of the states in which they were undertaken. I am not, therefore, attempting in the following pages to delineate the components or features of the 'ideal' survey of educational language policy, but to refer to some approaches that have been adopted or that might be utilized in appropriate circumstances.

Because of my primary concern in this paper with the functions of the adviser and with the possible applicability of completed research to future studies, the main focus of the discussion will relate to investigative techniques adopted in the process of policy appraisal. This emphasis does not necessarily reflect the significance of this stage in relation to the overall plan; and indeed it is frequently difficult to convince policymakers of the relevance of certain types of background research, which may appear to them to be inordinately expensive and essentially impracticable unless these are adequately explained.

Adviser Orientation and Background Research

At the initial stage of enquiry I envisage that policymakers will be primarily concerned with the identification of problems and with deciding on the degree of priority to be given to their solution in the light of current needs and resources and with regard to public sentiment or public demands. The development of a tentative planning strategy to take account of such problems may involve the setting up of a policy advisory group, with consequent task definition.
An adviser should ideally have some personal experience in the area or region he is to work in, since much time can be wasted acquiring information about everyday affairs, adjusting to new conditions, and in establishing the kinds of personal contacts that are necessary for research in the field (Curle, 1968).

A great deal of exploratory research needs to be completed before field work proper is undertaken and the documents required at this stage are frequently more readily available in major libraries outside the country concerned than in the research area. The adviser might concern himself initially with the study of available documentary materials relating to educational resources and the educational system, and to such economic, cultural, sociopolitical, historical and geographical factors as appear to be relevant to the subject of study, in the recognition that 'institutional and cultural factors, far more than technological factors set the problems and limit the solutions of our time' (Vickers, 1965:110). The criteria of relevance will be provided by the terms of reference, if any, specified by the policymaker and — if the survey has an explanatory rather than a descriptive purpose — by preliminary hypotheses the adviser may develop regarding the relationship of particular variables.

It would also seem essential to make a systematic review at this stage of available documents relating to language description and language use and language attitudes. An analysis of press content over a period of time is likely to provide insights into prevalent attitudes or opinions among a segment of the population.

Language related policies applied in sectors other than that of education need to be documented and the relationship or lack of it between the decisions taken in various sectors examined (Whiteley, 1972). These may show a high degree of consonance or, as is generally the case, apparent incompatibility at different levels. The interests and activities of agencies and groups concerned with aspects of language policy planning or counterplanning, or with language codification, elaboration or cultivation should be identified (cf. Neustupný, 1970; Haugen, 1970; Fishman, 1973). A graphic depiction of the relative functions of nineteen agencies concerned with educational language planning in the Philippines is given in Sibayan, 1973. It will also be generally relevant to detail the activities of agencies involved directly or indirectly in processes of language dissemination — such as agencies of the press, radio and publishing houses — since their influence or potential impact on patterns of language use may be considerable (Karam, 1914). In some areas the functions of foreign international agencies concerned with language teaching also need to be recognized (Noss, 1967:41).

Finally, a study of documents relating specifically to educational
language policy might be undertaken. Since contemporary educational policies in the majority of developing states are influenced, and sometimes determined by policies previously adopted by colonial authorities, it is generally helpful to study current policy in its historical context. More significantly, such a study can provide a basis for assessing reasons for the success or failure of educational policies adopted in circumstances similar in certain significant respects to those under review. Historical study also often serves to clarify the reasons policy change is contemplated or required at the time of investigation. Each of the reports on the country studies undertaken during the Survey of Language Use and Language Teaching in Eastern Africa, for example, with the exception of the volume on Ethiopia, will contain a brief commentary on the effects of colonial educational language policy; and the Kenya volume contains an extensive review of documents relevant to language education in Africa that were issued by the British authorities (Gorman, 1974b). Reviews of policies adopted by other colonial powers in Africa are given in Spencer, 1971, and Scanlon, 1964, passim. The literature on colonial policies implemented in South and Southeast Asia is voluminous. Myrdal, 1963, contains an overall survey of this area; other significant studies are listed in the bibliography.

**Policy Appraisal**

The historical study of policy development might appropriately lead to an appraisal of current statements of policy objectives, goals and targets insofar as these are explicit, and subsequently to a consideration of the implicit aims of instruction. It is frequently necessary to distinguish statements of policy that are intended to be operationally realistic from those that are essentially exhortatory (Gorman, 1973). For such a distinction to be made the administrative functions and planning authority of the bodies making the statements need to be understood. The advisers also need to have an understanding of the decision-making processes and the planning styles that characterize policymaking bodies at different planning levels (Friedman, 1971).

In particular circumstances, the feasibility of policy objectives might be judged in terms of such factors as 1) the length, intensity and design of courses of language instruction; and the examinations, if any, related to these courses; 2) the size and composition of the classes and the methods and techniques employed to teach them; 3) the qualifications and morale of the teachers and the system of teacher inspection and supervision; 4) the adequacy of texts used and the availability of library resources and of teaching aids, audio-visual and otherwise; 5) other non-instructional factors such as relate to the effectiveness of school and departmental administration, the educational supply system, the physical plant, etc.
Despite the fact that these considerations are central in any appraisal of educational policy, there would seem to be little advantage in itemizing in this paper the criteria that might be used in a study of method analysis and teaching analysis (Mackey, 1965); or in the analysis of the content of courses, since the traditional scholarship in the field of language teaching is concentrated in these areas and in the related area of teacher education. Textbook analysis and evaluation is also a subject to which extensive attention has been given in a number of studies, theoretical and otherwise. The suggestions provided by Murison-Bowie, for example, concerning the adequacy of language texts used in Ethiopian schools and his proposals regarding the preparation of texts in English with regard to other content areas in a secondary curriculum raise issues of general relevance to textbook design in developing countries (Murison-Bowie, forthcoming). I do not propose to discuss these issues further, therefore, or that of the utilization of other teaching aids (such as radio and television) in language instruction, except to comment that an inventory of textbooks available in different languages can sometimes give a useful indication of areas in which materials development is required (cf. Smock, 1970). Prator (1962) and Rubin (1971) contain useful inventories of features that might appropriately be taken into account in the appraisal process.

Field Studies, School-based

Many of the types of inquiry discussed up to this point could be carried out as desk-research; but in order to ascertain the degree to which policy statements are implemented in practice, and to gain additional information about such factors as teacher and student performance, it is necessary to undertake field studies, if this is feasible.

Numerous research workers have used classroom observation techniques to obtain information about teaching methods and teacher attainments (Wingard, 1963; Jacobs, 1966; Ladefoged, et al., 1971; Lebman, et al., 1972; Hemphill, 1974; Ohannessian, forthcoming; etc.). The use of check lists to itemize characteristics of lessons observed according to selected criteria is a common device. In his study in Colombia, Stansfield attempted to formalize his characterization of teacher behavior by utilizing an adaptation of Flander's System for Interaction Analysis adopted for computer processing, and the technique, though complex to utilize and to interpret in the form that was devised, has considerable research potential (Stansfield, 1973). The development of standard techniques for evaluating language teaching programs and developing teacher profiles, such as those elaborated by Hayes, Lambert and Tucker, should provide a basis for the development of more effective methods of classroom
evaluation for use in future surveys (Hayes, et al., 1967). Many investigators have also sought the judgement of teachers or school administrators on aspects of policy implementation or policy change through structured interviews or the use of written questionnaires (Otanes and Sibayan, 1969; Gorman, 1974a; Bowen, forthcoming; Ohannessian, forthcoming); less frequently the judgements of students or their parents have been solicited with regard to these issues (Lehman, et al., 1972).

Many research projects have also involved the collection of data relating to the proficiency with which respondents use or claim to use the languages they 'know'. This has generally entailed the elicitation of proficiency ratings with which students, and in some cases their parents, characterize their use of different languages. As with all self-report measures of this kind, a basic problem that may need to be faced is that of verifying the accuracy of the reports. This has been attempted by such techniques as guided interviews or by asking respondents to complete tests that would allow for approximate attainment rankings to be made. However, research workers concerned with assessing the language skills of school children have tended to rely on the use of written tests involving tasks analogous to those used in school activities, with particular emphasis being given to the assessment of reading skills (Jacobs, 1966; Ladefoged, et al., 1971; Gorman, 1974; Bender, et al., forthcoming; etc.). The use of cloze tests for the measuring of general reading skills in two languages has been found convenient in some cases (Gorman, 1968; Bowen, 1969).

'Indirect' measures of proficiency such as those discussed in MacNamara (1967), which can be generally categorized as tests of fluency, flexibility and dominance have not generally been employed in any of the projects under reference. Factors that might appropriately be taken into account in the measurement of bilingual proficiency and instruments of measurement have been extensively discussed and it is not necessary to attempt to discuss them further here (cf. Cervenka, 1967; MacNamara, 1967a; Cooper, 1971).

A number of studies have attempted to obtain information about preschool acquisition of second languages or dialects by children and, in some cases, to relate this to methods and courses used to teach standard languages (LePage, 1968; Tabouret-Keller, 1968; Craig, 1973; Gorman, 1974a; etc.). The approaches developed by R. B. LePage and his colleagues in their study of the speech of 280 children in the Cayo district of the British Honduras are of methodological interest in that a variety of techniques to obtain speech samples of various kinds including casual conversation, story-telling, reading of prepared texts and word lists was made use of; and they are of considerable theoretical interest, not least in that they may serve to
indicate the linguistic correlates of a child's choice of 'identity' in a multiethnic community in a Creole/contact situation. The work is also intended to have practical relevance to the training of teachers, particularly, one would assume, with regard to the question of their attitude to users of Creole (Tabouret-Keller, 1970/2; LePage, 1972, 1973).

In view of the acknowledged importance of the peer group in establishing or reinforcing patterns of language use, some scholars have made informal attempts to observe processes of student interaction in the classroom and outside it, but the efficacy of such procedures depends on the development of more systematized observation measures, such as those developed by Cohen in his work in California (Cohen, forthcoming). As far as I am aware, no use has been made in sociolinguistic studies carried out in developing countries of observation techniques to obtain information regarding students' learning strategies or communicative styles that appear to be derived from preschool interaction (cf., Cohen, 1969; Maccoby and Modiano, 1969; Brandis and Henderson, 1969). This is clearly an area of inquiry in which local scholars would be in a position to make a more authoritative contribution than visiting research workers.

Studies of the motivational or orientation factors considered to influence students' language learning have frequently been undertaken. The authors of the Philippine survey questionnaires, for example, constructed a 19-item scale for this purpose, which more adequately details the complex motivational factors that might conceivably affect learning in such a situation than do most such scales.

Field Studies, Community-based

The methods of data-gathering mentioned thus far have been methods that would tend to make use of procedures derived from what has been termed 'interactional' sociolinguistics. However, it is in the utilization of the methodological approaches associated with 'correlational' sociolinguistics that the studies of educational language policy in the last decade differ most obviously from earlier investigations. Because of the paucity of data available about patterns of language use in multilingual communities in most developing states, a number of descriptive surveys have been undertaken to obtain information about the linguistic repertoires and language attitudes of community members, and to establish a basis for relating language choice behavior to domains of social interaction. This was one of the aims of the surveys recently undertaken in Eastern Africa. Clearly, if the information provided about the use of different languages and varieties for particular functions and in different societal domains is sufficiently detailed, policymakers are provided with a further set of criteria by which to
INTRODUCTION

judge the degree to which instructional programs relate to broad social needs (Fishman and Lovas, 1970). The need for such information about reported use and expressed needs as is provided in the Jordan survey has frequently been acknowledged (Jacobs, 1966; Holloway and Perren, 1968:33; Gorman, 1970:6; Fishman and Lovas, op. cit.).

The difficulties involved in obtaining information that might be of direct relevance to curriculum design are manifold, however; even when adequate instruments have been devised to obtain information on the use of a specified language for particular communicative functions in specific settings.

G. Richard Tucker draws attention in the Jordan survey to the need for intensive follow-up interviews to determine the specific ways in which English is used in various business settings. If this were undertaken, however, there would still remain the problem of describing with some degree of precision the communicative skill requirements of particular job positions and the job levels to which they pertain. Future investigators will no doubt develop techniques for accomplishing this task, possibly drawing on methods used by specialists in Task Analysis and related fields as suggested in Jacobs, 1966. An alternative approach to the same problem, which the Jordan survey team adopted, was to ask respondents to specify the language skills that they considered requisite to the activities at work and to indicate the degree to which instructional programs had equipped them with the skills they identified.

The investigation of opinions, attitudes and preferences with regard to languages, language groups, and language programs has been one concern of a number of studies relating to educational language policies. Wölk attempted, for example, to employ a rating scale based on the semantic differential technique developed by Osgood, using samples of conversational speech to elicit attitudes towards users of Spanish and Quechua (Wölk, 1973); but most researchers have tended to make use of questionnaires to obtain information regarding preferences that respondents might have between instructional methods employing the use of different languages, or with regard to the use of different languages to teach different subjects (Sibayan, 1971b); or to elicit preference data regarding the relative instrumental value that languages might have.

Because of the lack of congruity that frequently prevails between expressions of attitude and behavior, the use of commitment measures (Agheyisi and Fishman, 1970) which concern the respondent's willingness to perform a particular action or type of behavior would seem to have some advantages over less action-directed inquiries, but I know of no project in a developing country in which these have been utilized.

In the article referred to, Fishman and Lovas advanced the suggestion that attitudinal data collected through the observational method could
be formally processed like data obtained through more formalized instruments, if attempts were made to record the data in more operationalized and 'public' form than has generally been the case (op. cit., 1970). The point brings us once again to the question of the adequacy, or rather the inadequacy, of most of the instruments at present available to us for recording language-related data.

Before concluding these comments on field work and survey methods which have been necessarily cursory, I would like to make a number of observations regarding some of the problems of investigation that might be encountered in the initial stages of inquiry. The problems of attitude assessment and the difficulties in obtaining preference data on complex issues not previously the object of general public discussion are not always recognized (Braybrooke and Lindblom, 1963). This is particularly so when the subject of questioning concerns concepts such as that of "the national language" which are themselves open to a number of interpretations. In such situations, 'provision generally needs to be made for more discussion and contingency questioning than use of questionnaires employing close-ended questions normally permits' (Fishman et al., 1971); but the use of guided interviews or non-directive interviews such as would be needed in these circumstances requires skilled interviewers and these are not always available.

Questions dealing with the appropriateness or adequacy of current policy are particularly open to misinterpretation and are likely to be regarded as inflammatory by those at whom they are directed or officials concerned, unless the purpose of the undertaking is clearly explained and understood (Polme, 1971). This is especially so in areas where policy decisions are not customarily based on a process of participant planning.

The problems involved in obtaining attitude data, however, simply reflect certain of the difficulties faced by language specialists in carrying out survey research generally. Not all investigators concerned with aspects of educational policy in developing states have appreciated the difficulty — or indeed the need — of obtaining stratified probability (random) samples from which to draw inferences regarding the school population as a whole. Indeed, the information needed to select such samples is not generally available with regard to individual students in developing areas (though it is generally feasible to use a form of cluster sampling using the school or class as the sampling unit). Many problems encountered in previous survey research in developing states have stemmed from the relative inexperience of language specialists carrying out research in this field rather than from the unavailability of appropriate data, as I know from my own initial experience. Not all research workers have been aware of the technical difficulties involved in the development of questionnaires.
or interview schedules in terms of such features as layout, length, clarity, and translatability, or of the problems to be faced in the training and supervision of interviewers; or of the need for pre-tests and pilot studies in which to test such instruments as well as to try out data-processing procedures. This relative lack of expertise has perhaps been most evident in the area of data processing and analysis. In the design of tests and questionnaires for computer processing, the need to consult with a systems analyst and programmers before the data is collected has not always been recognized; and this has led to considerable delay in subsequent data coding and processing. This does not mean that it is always appropriate for tabulation plans to be drawn up in their entirety before the data are collected. The initial results will usually indicate the usefulness of additional analyses to those anticipated before data collection. Finally, most studies have not been designed to take full advantage of the methods of data compositing now available and few investigators have subjected data gathered to analysis and evaluation in other than a rudimentary fashion. This is primarily because in situations in which relatively little is known about patterns of language use, language specialists are prone to collect data without regard to a research design that would allow them to take account of the relationship between specific independent, dependent, and interdependent or intervening variables. Primarily through the work of such scholars as Fishman and Cooper, however, there is now more widespread understanding of the applicability of explanatory as opposed to descriptive techniques of analysis in the interpretation of language related data, and one would expect this to be reflected in the design of future surveys.

Policy Formulation and Determination

After a critical appraisal of the features of current policy, and after documentary and field research, advisers in consultation with officials will generally formulate a series of alternative proposals for policy change and development, for consideration by the policymakers. Whenever possible these should be accompanied by projections regarding the human and financial resources required to implement them. An important feature of such planning is the prediction of potential difficulties that might arise in connection with such policies, with suggestions for contingency planning that might be required to take account of these. Policymakers and non-language specialists generally are frequently unaware, for example, of the length of time needed to prepare and test teaching materials, particularly in languages that have not been previously used for the purpose, or of problems involved in training teachers to use such materials and of upgrading the standards of unqualified teachers. Nor do they always recognize the
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limitations of the school as an instrument of language policy — and such issues need to be drawn attention to.

Advisers may find it appropriate to provide their clients with a full explanation of the rationale underlying the different alternatives or approaches suggested and to provide a synopsis of the results of experimentation and research in the areas of interest with which they are concerned, or make available existing research summaries. Such a review should serve to widen the perspectives from which policymakers view the possibilities for policy change and to modify or counter simplistic assumptions about language use and language teaching. I would think it appropriate, also, for the synopsis to give an indication of the numerous areas in which research findings are inconclusive or in apparent contradiction (cf. Paulston, 1973; MacNamara, 1967:133; Jakobovits, 1970:60-61). A full list of references consulted should also be appended. These procedures will enable the policymaker or his assistants to make independent enquiries regarding specific points if they so wish, and help them to better appreciate the point of view or particular bias of the adviser, since his insights and recommendations, like those of the policymaker, are likely to be influenced by his background (academic and otherwise), beliefs and sentiments and, possibly, by ideological considerations. All this information might be provided in the form of a general report which would provide the basis for policy determination.

Presentation

If the information gathered is to be immediately made use of, the results of research need to be presented to the policymakers with the minimum of delay in a form that is intelligible to them. If arrangements are to be made for commercial publication of the findings, an interim version of the relevant findings needs to be prepared and distributed to those responsible for formulating and determining policy — one obvious reason being that the time-interval between the submission of a manuscript and its publication can be considerable. The policymakers themselves may wish to encourage dissemination of the findings so as to help to focus public opinion on relevant issues and to encourage public debate before a final decision is taken. It is not normally the responsibility of advisers to do this unless specifically mandated. Such a process can, of course, complicate the planning process and may even retard it (Rabin, 1971); but it is generally necessary in situations where effective power to implement decisions resides with members of local communities rather than with centralized agencies.

Between the stages of policy formulation and implementation J. Donald Bowen envisages a stage of experimentation (Bowen, 1967); and in ideal situations there is no question that focussed research, in which
the relative advantages of alternative policy proposals might be investigated, is very desirable. For a number of reasons, however, such research is not normally carried out. One reason is that political leaders are generally less concerned with long-term plans than with those that show immediate and tangible results. With regard to the situation in Mexico, for example, Lastra de Suárez has written that the policymaker "seeks to do what he can during his term and there is no time or opportunity for long-range plans which might include pilot projects. . .," etc. (Lastra de Suárez, 1973); and this is not an unusual situation. Secondly, large-scale research projects such as those described by Davis in his account of the Rizal and Iloilo second-language experiments (Davis, 1967) are extremely costly in time and money (Prator, 1967). Because of these factors, and others such as parental concern about the possible adverse effect of experimental programs on their children's attainment, there is a tendency for promising pilot projects to be abandoned before results of any conclusiveness can be obtained, as was the case, for example, with the vernacular medium project described by Fawcett in Kenya (Fawcett, 1970). The observation that Hirschman made with regard to developmental projects generally would seem to hold in these circumstances, i.e., "projects whose potential difficulties and disappointments are apt to manifest themselves at an early stage should be administered by agencies having a long-term commitment to the success of the project. They should be developed as much as possible in the experimental spirit. . . so that they may escape being classed and closed down as failures in their infancy." (Hirschman, 1967:21)

Finally, experiments in which the efficacy of two instrumental methods, or sets of materials, or curriculum structures are compared, invariably present or involve complex problems of research design; and this is also a factor that has generally inhibited research of this nature. Few studies have been so designed as to allow that the results have general applicability, and this is to be anticipated since 'in complex social and educational settings experimental findings are not easily generalizable: the conditions that hold for any particular setting are likely to be quite different, and significantly so, from any other setting' (Jakobovits, 1970:59). Apart from this fact, the factorial design of many experiments has not been structured to control for the effects of the variables that might affect the quality of instruction. Patricia Engle has recently summarized certain of the variables that need to be taken into account in research concerned with methods of introducing reading and subject matter in a second language, and the list is by no means exhaustive but it gives a good indication of the nature of the problems to be faced in this particular field of enquiry (Engle, 1973). It might not be feasible, therefore, or even advisable
in many situations, for advisers to attempt to initiate large-scale projects in an attempt to identify the relative advantages of different methods or curriculum designs; but small-scale projects to test the practicability of different methods, materials or media of instruction for particular subjects are very desirable. It is essential, also, that appropriate time be devoted to the preparation and pre-testing of materials to be used in the schools before these are mass-produced. However, this issue is one that would appropriately be considered under the question of policy implementation.

Policy Implementation, Evaluation and Review

After reviewing the policy alternatives suggested and the results of research carried out, those responsible for determining policies presumably select one related set of policies for implementation. I have characterized implementation, evaluation and review as three components of the final stage of planning, primarily to emphasize the fact that features of the implementation process should be kept constantly under review in the light of evaluative studies and feedback. The process of implementation itself could involve (1) the mobilization of resources and general financial and personnel management; (2) the motivation and supervision of those concerned. (This would involve communication both with the groups towards which the policy is directed and with those immediately responsible for managing it); (3) the sequencing and coordination of related aspects of the research and development programs consequent upon new policies, such as would be involved for example in the preparation of texts in languages not formerly used as media of instruction (Ansre, 1971). Whether or not the adviser is directly involved in these activities, he should have provided instructions or advice with regard to them; and the more specific such advice is in regard to the third set of categories the more useful it is likely to be. 7

Evaluation is here envisaged to include the analysis of trends, and the general monitoring system, as well as more formal studies that might be undertaken to measure the effectiveness of specific aspects of the educational program. 8 If appropriate, a system of recording results should be adopted which allows for longitudinal evaluative studies to be made. If the goals and subsidiary targets of a particular program are explicit, it should be possible for the adviser to specify, in advance, criteria that might be used to subsequently determine whether these have been attained; and to suggest evaluative methods by which such appraisal should be carried out. It is a cause for regret, for example, that despite the numerous English medium programs developed in former British colonial territories in the last two decades, very few studies have been made which can be used as a source of
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reference for subsequent programs; since evidence other than the anecdotal regarding the success or failure of aspects of such programs is generally not available. Nor is information regarding curriculum design or course content easily obtainable since no archival system was established through which such information could be systematically assembled and stored. If possible, then, research instruments and records used at each stage of inquiry need to be assembled, catalogued and stored in such a way as to remain accessible to future investigators.

CONCLUSION

It was suggested at the start of this paper that numerous newly independent states are obliged to deal with problems in determining educational language policy that, in planning terms, can be interpreted as being variations of a limited set of problems relating to the choices that need to be made regarding the use of a restricted number of languages as media or subjects of instruction. This basic set of allocative choices in turn entails the selection of secondary policies relating to the selection of the most effective means to teach these languages. These secondary policies often involve decisions on curriculum design and course structure, teacher education and supervision, teaching methods and teaching materials. I have attempted to indicate some of the ways in which information relevant to policymaking at different stages in such situations might be provided and to illustrate the process with reference to studies undertaken in a number of developing states.

In the last decade, the degree of contact and cooperation between those concerned with research related to the development of educational language policy has greatly accelerated. We can anticipate, therefore, that the recognition of the existence of common planning problems will lead increasingly to the development of collaborative projects, initially on a subregional basis (cf. Larudee, 1970), and that these projects will be concerned primarily with issues relating to the effective implementation of policies. Before common problems can be dealt with systematically, however, they need to be systematically described. A number of scholars have proposed topics for research in particular areas and some have suggested research methods that might be adopted in descriptive or evaluative surveys on a cross-national basis (cf. especially Carroll, 1969). But since example is generally more illuminating than advice, it is hoped that the publication of the Jordan Survey will serve both as a stimulus to and as a model for subsequent research; particularly with regard to the types of cooperative activity undertaken by the members of the survey team and Jordanian officials, and with respect to the efficiency of the means by which information was assembled, processed, and conveyed from one group to the other.
NOTES

1. Mannheim identified the educational system as being one of the principle media of society, in which small changes could give rise to far-reaching effects in the structural relations of a social system (Mannheim, 1950). The literature relating to educational language policy abounds with references, primarily speculative, regarding the effects of the use of non-indigenous languages as media of instruction on characteristics of the social, cultural, and political institutions of particular states (cf. Mrydal, 1963). Such observations, though seldom accompanied by adequate descriptive information, tend to support the widespread assumption that changes in features of the educational system can have extensive repercussions on other aspects of social life.

2. By language allocation I mean 'authoritative decisions to maintain, extend, or restrict the range of uses (functional range) of a language in particular settings' (Gorman, 1973:73).

3. I have dealt briefly with the issue of the structure of the questionnaire, which was repeatedly revised before use; and I have not referred to a number of other issues of significance such as the decisions made regarding the sampling population in the survey. A forthcoming paper by G. Richard Tucker will deal with these and related issues.

4. It might be appropriate at this stage to make the point that the preparation of instruments that might be used on a cross-national basis to measure a variety of communicative skills (cf. Jakobovits, 1970:219) is clearly a research priority. The types of investigation undertaken by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement could provide models for such research.

5. Braybrooke and Lindblom point out that 'it has been shown that it is not possible for a majority to express its preference on more than one issue at once except under specially simplified conditions' (Braybrooke and Lindblom, 1963:35). Public discussion can of course have a major effect on opinions and attitudes: 'We never order all possible total situations according to a system of values, but rather have muddled preferences for aspects and features of a limited number of actual and possible solutions. These preferences change as a result of the discussion and adoption of policies intended to minister to them' (R. Williams, American Society, 1965:408; quoted in A. J. Kahn, 1969:114).
6. She lists the following issues to be taken into account in designing further research. I have changed the order of their presentation somewhat:

1. The relationship of the two ethnolinguistic groups in the larger society;
2. The functions of the two languages in the broader community, and the possible uses of literacy in each language;
3. The cultural context of learning in the community;
4. The linguistic relationship between the two languages;
5. The initial linguistic status of the child;
6. The period of the child's development in which the second language is introduced;
7. Instructional methods and materials used;
8. The ethnic group membership of the teacher;
9. The training and linguistic knowledge of the teacher;
10. The specific subject matter under consideration;
11. The appropriateness of the assessment devices for both languages;
12. The length of time necessary to observe an effect.

7. Two documents produced in 1965 and 1971 by study groups appointed by the Government of India provide examples of reports that combine an analysis of the major problems with detailed operational suggestions for their solution (India, Government of, 1965; 1971).
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I: STATED AND IMPLICIT AIMS OF ENGLISH INSTRUCTION

STATED AIMS OF EDUCATION IN GENERAL

According to the Jordanian Culture and Education Law of 1964, school should aid the child to develop into a good citizen who understands various aspects of his environment; to develop skills of communication and powers of investigation; and to grow physically, intellectually, socially and emotionally in such a way that he contributes to raising the health, recreational and living standards of his community and his nation (pp. 3-4).

Although the law does not explicitly mention the development of communicative ability in a foreign language as one of the general aims of Jordanian education, it can nevertheless be inferred that the development of such a skill is viewed as an integral part of the educational program. In fact, one of the specific aims at the compulsory stage of education is for the pupil to learn "one foreign language which will assist him in the later stages of education, or in the practice of his profession in future or in his life generally" (Law No. 16 of 1964: Culture and Education Law, p. 6). This aim has the presumed purpose and effect of providing Jordanian citizens with a bridge to the non-Arabic speaking world. The study of a foreign language, if continued to the point of thorough mastery, may also aid Jordanians to achieve the explicitly-stated general educational aims. Ever since the introduction of a modern system of education with the establishment of Transjordan in 1921, the designated foreign language has been English. Initially, the result of historical coincidence, the continued teaching of English now appears to be based firmly on need.

STATED AIMS OF ENGLISH INSTRUCTION

Two curriculum guides, one for grades 5-9, the other for grades 10-12, cite the present goals for English teaching in Jordan. At the compulsory stage, "the English course aims at producing a cultured, informed, useful and perceptive citizen, through his ability to understand, speak, read and write, in this case English, with a measure of ease, finesse and discrimination" (English Curriculum: Compulsory Stage, 1969, p. 5).

Furthermore, a knowledge of English should provide Jordanians with a better awareness of the values and traditions of diverse peoples from disparate regions of the world.

These general goals are made somewhat more explicit by a set of specific objectives. By the end of the Compulsory Cycle (i.e., after
studying English as a foreign language for five years from grades 5-9), pupils are expected to be able to:

1. Understand simple English spoken at a normal speed.
2. Communicate sensibly with an English-speaking person, within certain reasonable areas.
3. Read simple English with ease, fluency and understanding.
4. Write a paragraph in English, using the basic structure of the language. (English Curriculum; Compulsory Stage, 1969, p. 5).

These "specific" aims typify the conventional goals so often cited for language study. They lack precision, and fail to make clear precisely what degree of English proficiency students are expected to achieve. Furthermore, it is not apparent whether the same or differential emphasis should be given to each of the four skills.

The development of operationally-defined behavioral objectives (see, for example, the work of Mager, 1962 and Popham, 1970) would appear to be a necessary prerequisite for evaluating the success of the Compulsory Cycle English teaching program in Jordan. For example, objectives might be specified with reference to factors such as the following: with whom should Jordanian pupils be able to communicate (e.g., native vs. non-native speakers); what range of topics should they control (e.g., home life, school, recreation, church, business); what code or style should they be able to use (e.g., formal vs. informal); and what specific sound sequences, what range of syntactic patterns, what basic vocabulary should they have mastered? Thus, it should be possible to state goals explicitly with reference to a number of complementary attributes so that a pupil's progress toward achieving each objective can be easily, reliably and repeatedly observed and measured.

The "specific" goals for the secondary level are somewhat better defined. Pupils, after three additional years of English instruction at the secondary level (grades 10-12), are expected to:

1. Understand English spoken in different contexts and situations.
2. Speak English with accuracy from the point of view of: phonology, morphology, syntax and meaning.
3. Read and comprehend English in different contexts with ease and accuracy.
4. Write English passages that are grammatically correct, properly punctuated, and effectively organized.
5. Acquire the linguistic skills and techniques needed for advanced work at post-secondary levels. (English Curriculum; Secondary Stage, 1971, pp. 9-10).

All secondary graduates, including both Arts and Science students, are expected to achieve these goals while the Arts students are also expected "to develop a sense of appreciation for literature". These
goals suggest that secondary school graduates in Jordan should develop native-like facility in English which will enable them to communicate spontaneously, effectively and confidently, using each of the four skills, with diverse people about a broad range of topics -- a very ambitious level of attainment, indeed.

It is extremely important to emphasize here that the Secondary Stage Curriculum has recently been adopted and that it is now in the process of being implemented. (In Chapter III, we describe the steps being taken, such as the preparation of a series of textbooks specially written for the Jordanian secondary schools, to implement this curriculum.) Until 1971, the curriculum consisted of the "English Language Syllabus for the Secondary Stage" which appeared in the Al Manahij al Dirasiyyeh Lilmarhalat Athawanwiyeh (1967). This syllabus specified the time allotment and the textbooks to be used in each stream during each of the three years of instruction. No general or specific aims were mentioned. We wish to draw careful attention to this change because it will, of course, not be possible to assess adequately, the impact or success of the new curriculum for several years.

The few, briefly-stated, explicit goals of the new curriculum will apply equally to graduates of government as well as private schools although the latter appear to be given somewhat more latitude in devising programs to achieve the goals. In actual fact, the success of the English teaching program in Jordan will have to be examined in relation to several additional factors.

**IMPLICIT AIMS OF ENGLISH INSTRUCTION**

In the first instance, the general English-teaching program must be examined in relation to the ultimate goal for secondary school graduates: "that they acquire the linguistic skills and techniques needed for advanced work at post-secondary levels" (English Curriculum: Secondary Stage, 1971, p.10). This goal implies that Jordanian students should be prepared so that they can compete successfully with Jordanians and non-Jordanians, at home or abroad, in Arabic or English medium institutions. The goal, although ambitious, represents an objective yardstick against which the success of the English program can be evaluated, at least in a limited way, for a portion of the secondary school graduates. Today, for example, many Jordanian students as well as government employees are continuing their education in English-speaking countries. In addition, English is used as the medium of instruction within Jordan for training nurses, air force pilots and all students in the Faculty of Science at the University of Jordan. How successful are these programs? Can students, after completing their secondary education, begin to study and to
absorb advanced content material without a lengthy transitional period? Will students who follow the new curriculum be able to do so? (We shall examine these questions, in greater detail, in Chapter II).

In addition, can students who do not continue their education beyond secondary schooling find ready employment in various branches of the government or in private industry where the employees frequently interact with non-Arabic speaking clients?

In a very real sense, the success of the English language program must be measured by the ability of school graduates, both public and private, to obtain suitable employment which will permit them to contribute directly to the social and economic development of their country. The fact that educators generally adopt such a broad view of their responsibilities to the citizenry helps to define the goals for English teaching. The Field Study component of the present survey represents a unique opportunity to examine the actual English needs of a wide segment of the Jordanian work force and to collect information as to whether the present system of English instruction at school adequately prepares graduates to meet these needs.

THE EXAMINATION SYSTEM

One other major factor appears to play an important role in shaping the actual English teaching program -- the examination system. The final English language attainment of each school graduate is evaluated by his success or failure on the secondary certificate examination in English. The form of this required examination obviously affects the manner and the substance of English language teaching. Typically, the examination does not assess pupils' spontaneous oral production or their listening comprehension; but it does attempt to measure their ability to demonstrate a knowledge of formal grammatical relationships and their ability to comprehend written passages. Separate examinations are prepared for students in the scientific and the literary streams although the general format is similar. In 1972, for example, the Certificate of Secondary Education Examination in English Language for Scientific and Commercial stream students in the Third Secondary Class consisted of five parts. In the first section, composition, students were directed to write a composition of approximately 150 words on one of three topics (value = 40 marks). On the second part, comprehension, students were asked to answer a series of questions based on a passage that they had just read, and to explain the meaning of selected words or phrases from the text (value = 40 marks). On the third part, grammar, the students' knowledge of appropriate usage
(e.g., tense distinctions, choice of prepositions, wh questions) was tested by asking them to rewrite or to complete a series of sentences (value = 40 marks). The fourth and fifth sections tested their memory for details from specific stories that they had read during the year (the questions based on their Course of English Study/Third Reader were worth 45 marks, and those from Return Ticket to the Moon worth 35 marks).

The examination prepared for literary students contained sections devoted to: 1) composition (40 marks), 2) grammar (40 marks), 3) comprehension (70 marks); and questions testing memory for fact as well as an understanding of: 4) their Course of English Study/Third Reader (60 marks), 5) a story which they had read, The Citadel (40 marks), and 6) selected poetry (20 marks).

It must be assumed that the lack of correspondence between the specific objectives in the new curriculum guide and the present examination system will yield a teaching program oriented to prepare students to pass the required examination. This orientation does not, of course, preclude the possibility that students who pass the examination can also communicate effectively and confidently using the four basic skills; but this latter hypothesis remains untested. We wonder whether the examination system will be modified to better complement the new curriculum?

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary then, we are faced in Jordan with a situation where an overwhelming majority of the population speak Arabic as their mother tongue and where English, by historical coincidence and by present-day consensus, is taught in all schools in grades 5-12 as the foreign language. The explicit goals for English teaching at the compulsory stage are unfortunately vague; while those at the secondary stage are more precise, but perhaps unrealistically demanding. It is our view that certain implicit goals, as yet not clearly defined, must really shape the language program. We hope that the results of our Field Study (reported in Chapter VI) provide information relevant to this topic.

In concluding this first Chapter, we wish to make the following recommendations:

1. That the explicit aims for English instruction at the compulsory stage be stated in the form of operationally defined behavioral objectives.

2. That these objectives be realistically chosen to reflect the perceived needs of the students as well as the resources available to meet these needs.

3. That the newly-developed explicit aims for English instruction
Stated and Implicit Aims of English Instruction

at the secondary level be critically evaluated and, if necessary, revised in terms of the actual English needs of secondary school graduates.

4. That the aims for English instruction at the secondary level reflect the differing needs of secondary graduates, and at the same time complement the stated aims of Jordanian education in general.

5. That a closer correspondence be developed between the aims for English teaching and the public examination system.
II: DIMENSIONS OF ENGLISH INSTRUCTION

ENGLISH INSTRUCTION IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

In their desire to achieve the stated and implicit aims of English instruction, the Jordanian educational authorities have prescribed that a substantial portion of the total school curriculum be devoted to the study of English. English is required of all students at the levels at which it is taught and, except in three schools, is the only modern foreign language available to students in the public schools.

In these public schools the study of English is now begun in the fifth of the six grades of primary education, is continued through the three years of preparatory education, and is also required throughout the three years of secondary education. Graduates of the public secondary schools have thus studied the language for a total of eight years.

This is by far the most frequent pattern of English instruction since, in Jordan, the great majority of students attend public schools. These include schools operated by the Ministry of Education (which account for about 68% of the total school enrollment), by other ministries (1%), and by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency (18.5%). Foreign and national private schools account for only 12% of the enrollment. The remaining 0.5% of students attend the University of Jordan (Al-Bukhari, 1972, p. 5). In 1968-69, the last year for which a complete statistical report is available, 87% of the schools on the East Bank were public schools, and 87% of the teachers were employed in public schools (Yearbook of Educational Statistics, p. 55).

English classes in the public primary and preparatory schools, the two levels that constitute the cycle during which school attendance is compulsory, meet uniformly for six 40-minute periods per week. In secondary schools the number of weekly periods of English varies by grade level and type of school. Thus students enrolled in the literary stream of academic secondary schools study the language for seven periods per week in Grade 7, eight in Grade 8, and eight in Grade 9. At the other extreme, students in industrial and agricultural schools study it for only two periods per week in each grade. Further particulars are given in Table 1.

The very considerable variation in the time devoted to English in academic and commercial secondary schools, on the one hand, and in industrial and agricultural secondary schools, on the other, is presumably explained by the fact that schools of the former types prepare students for higher education, whereas those of the latter types are regarded as terminal. One wonders, however, if there might not be
Table 1

Dimensions of English Instruction in Jordanian Public Schools in 1968-69
(East Bank Only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
<th>No. of Classes</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Av. Class Size</th>
<th>Weekly Periods of Eng.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>671</td>
<td>5,067</td>
<td>4,344</td>
<td>212,676</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>761</td>
<td>31,116</td>
<td>25,415</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparatory</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 7</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,983</td>
<td>1,408</td>
<td>47,312</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>567</td>
<td>21,561</td>
<td>21,561</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 9</td>
<td></td>
<td>461</td>
<td>15,708</td>
<td>15,708</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>380</td>
<td>9,983</td>
<td>9,983</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>407</td>
<td>16,253</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>5,908</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literary Stream</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>6,431</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3,860</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2,571</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scientific Stream</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>3,914</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1,864</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sec. Commercial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,265</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>694</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>327</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sec. Industrial</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 10, 11, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sec. Agricultural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades 10, 11, 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

justification for including more than the present two hours per week of English in the program of industrial students. It is a general policy of the Ministry of Education to accept into the secondary industrial schools the better students from among those who passed the Public Preparatory Examination held at the end of Grade 9 (Al-Bukhari, 1972, p. 21). In other words, there is a desire to admit to those schools students who may well be capable of rising above the middle-level skilled-worker positions in which they are often initially employed by the government (in the technical departments of the Railway, the Public Works, the Ministry of Communications, the Jordan Broadcasting Station and Television, army workshops, river-dam projects, the Civil Aviation Department, the Meteorological Department, etc.) or by the mixed sector of the economy (in establishments such as the cement factory, the iron and steel factory, and the Jordan Petroleum Refinery) (op. cit., pp. 22-23). A plan has been initiated which will result in introducing into the industrial schools more textbooks in English and a number of expert British instructors (see A Development Project: Industrial Education and Training in Jordan, 1971). Some graduates of the secondary industrial schools eventually leave Jordan to seek employment abroad. May these people not have a greater need for English, both before and after graduation, than do graduates of the secondary agricultural schools? This is the type of question upon which, hopefully, the information provided by the Field Study undertaken as part of this Survey casts some light.

It had been hoped that the Field Study might also give some indication of the relative effectiveness of the current pattern of English instruction as compared with the effectiveness of the patterns which preceded it. Back in the 1930's children living on the east bank began studying English in Grade 3. In 1939 this was changed to Grade 4 and in 1953 to Grade 5, as at present. Until 1953 the Jordanian public-school system provided only 11 years of instruction: seven years of elementary school followed by four of secondary school. That year this 7-4 pattern was changed to a 6-5 pattern, which became the present 6-3-3 pattern in 1961. A twelfth year of instruction was thus added at the top of the education ladder, and the number of years of English instruction, reduced to seven in 1953, again became eight. Whereas five of these years were at the secondary level prior to 1961, only three of them have been taught in the secondary schools since that date. Also in 1961 the length of the standard class period in Grades 5 and above, the span of years during which English was taught, was reduced from 45 to 40 minutes. The most recent change occurred in 1964, when the number of weekly periods of English was reduced from eight to six in Grades 5 and 6, and from seven to six in Grades 7, 8, and 9 (Fifty Years of Education in the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, passim).
Unfortunately for purposes of statistical analysis, there has apparently been a considerable amount of simultaneous variation in several other important factors in the equation of English instruction: the teachers' preparation and knowledge of English, the number and quality of the students enrolled, the average size of classes, and the methodology and instructional materials employed. Since some of these factors cannot easily be quantified, there seems to be no way of sorting out and measuring statistically their separate effects on the quality of English instruction. The authors could only compare the use that older graduates of the system make of their English with the use made by more recent graduates and speculate as to how the several factors involved may have contributed to this result.

The earlier patterns of instruction were probably more favorable to the acquisition of English than is the current pattern in at least four different ways:

1. The students were younger; there is some evidence that those who begin learning a language at an earlier age succeed better than those who begin learning one when they are older, even though the total period of study may be the same in the two cases;
2. The total amount of time devoted to the study of English was considerably greater; almost without exception, each change in the instructional pattern has reduced the amount of time available for teaching English;
3. The pre-1953 patterns meant that drop-outs, at whatever point they stopped attending school, had studied English one or more years longer than would now be the case;
4. Students who followed the older patterns had four or five, rather than three, of their years of English at the secondary level, where teachers are presumably better qualified than they are in primary or preparatory schools.

In terms of the total time devoted to the teaching of English, the current pattern of instruction is not more favorable than the earlier patterns, although it is more favorable in several other respects (curriculum, objectives, textbooks, methods of instruction and teacher-training).

It appears that the progressive erosion in the amount of time devoted to English is destined to continue. The Ministry of Education plans, within the next year or two as new textbooks become available, to reduce the number of weekly hours of English instruction at the secondary level as follows (English Curriculum: Secondary Stage, 1971, p. 3):

In the general year (Grade 10) of academic schools, from seven to five periods per week;
In the literary stream (Grades 11 to 12) of academic schools, from eight to seven periods per week;
In the scientific stream (Grades 11 and 12) of academic schools from six to five periods per week;
In the first year (Grade 10) of commercial schools, from seven to five periods per week;
In the second and third years (Grades 11 and 12) of commercial schools, from six to five periods per week.

These changes will result in a further reduction of about one fifth (19%) in the amount of time devoted to English in the great majority of Jordanian secondary schools. And this reduction will take place, not at the level where the teaching is poorest, but at the level at which it appears to be most effective (Naar, 1967, pp. 41-49). Since time devoted to study is among the factors more directly related to success in learning a language, these changes will inevitably make it appreciably more difficult ever to achieve the aims of English instruction in Jordan.

The motivation for this contemplated further reduction is said to be the belief that the class schedules of secondary-school students are now overcrowded, the wish to give them more free periods for individual study, and the feeling that no more time can be given to English classes than is given to classes in the mother tongue, Arabic, where the number of weekly periods is also to be reduced. Would it not be possible, as an alternative to reducing the hours of teaching, to consider a gradual lengthening of the school day? Languages such as Arabic and particularly such as English, which in Jordan is a foreign language taught by an oral method, seem to be among the subjects that students can least well study without a teacher.

It is to be hoped that the Ministry of Education will have considered all the implications of these contemplated changes before it actually puts them into effect and thus again creates a pattern of instruction that is less favorable to language acquisition than was the pattern that preceded it.

Table 1 reveals one especially important dimension of public-school English instruction in Jordan: classes are quite large. In most grades and types of schools the average class size approached and exceeded 40 students in 1968-69. There was little if any decrease in the number of students per class from the lowest to the highest grades. And if the average size of all classes is 40, then some classes must be considerably larger than 40. In fact, the head of the English Section in the Ministry of Education's Curriculum Directorate reports that classes of 50 students are by no means uncommon, particularly in the primary grades. Unpublished statistics obtained from the Ministry of Education indicate that there may have been some overall decrease in the size of classes in the last three years, but the difference is discouragingly slight.

Obviously, class size is closely related to the type and quality of English instruction than can be offered. It is particularly difficult
in large classes to obtain the participation of all students and to pro-
vide adequate opportunities to use spoken English. The 'Oral Direct
Method' recommended by the Ministry of Education depends for its
success upon giving students a considerable degree of oral proficiency
in the early stages of instruction. It is not easy to see how this could
possibly be achieved in classes of 50 or even 40 students. The orig-
inators of the method thought that it would work best in classes of
around 12 students and that in classes of more than 24 other methods
and goals might be more feasible.

ENGLISH INSTRUCTION IN THE PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Table 2 shows the most important dimensions of the English instruc-
tion given in the private schools of Jordan.

Jordanian private schools are of two basic types: the so-called
'national private schools', which are operated by Jordanians; and the
'foreign private schools', most of them founded by European and
American missionary groups. The ultimate control of both types is
now vested in the Ministry of Education, though both are allowed
certain liberties that distinguish them from the public schools (Law
No. 16 of 1964: Culture and Education Law, pp. 15-17). They may
teach foreign languages other than English, begin the teaching of
English before Grade 5, hire their own teachers and pay them any
appropriate salary (provided that the individuals chosen fulfill Jor-
danian teacher-certification requirements), and select their own
textbooks (with the approval of the Ministry). All of them have chosen
to have their students begin the study of English in kindergarten or in
the earliest grade included in the school's curriculum and to continue
to study it until graduation. The number of periods per week of English
instruction may vary from school to school, but the total number of
instructional hours of English each student receives in all grades com-
bined tends to exceed considerably the hours he would receive in a
public school of comparable level and type.

Jordanians, particularly educators and well-to-do parents, seem
to believe that children learn more English in the private schools than
in the public schools. There appeared to be no statistical evidence,
however, to demonstrate the truth or falsity of this conviction. The
Amman representatives of the several agencies that test the English
of Jordanians who wish to pursue their higher education abroad in
English-speaking countries stated that public-school graduates almost
never pass any of these tests without further study and that private-
school graduates are more often successful, but they were unable to
provide supporting statistics.

Miss Salma H. Jayyusi and Mr. Ahmad S. Tawil, assigned by the
Ministry of Education to work with the authors of this Survey, therefore
Table 2
Dimensions of English Instruction in Jordanian Private Schools in 1968-69
(East Bank only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>No. of Schools</th>
<th>No. of Teachers</th>
<th>No. of Classes</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
<th>Average Class Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>17,005</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>14,489</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2,516</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>6,020</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>5,234</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>5,571</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>5,086</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Levels</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>983</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>28,596</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>24,809</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>5,787</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


analyzed the scores made in June, 1971, by a random sample of students on the Certificate of Secondary Education Examination (Tawjihi). This examination must be taken by students of the public and private schools alike upon graduation. The average English scores made by the various types of students included in the sample are shown in Table 3.

The results do not altogether support the widely held belief that "children learn more English in the private schools." In fact, they show that public-school students made better scores on this particular examination than did private-school students, if students of the two types of private schools are lumped together. The figures further
Table 3
Average Scores in English of 283 Public and Private-School Students Taking the Tawjihi Examination in 1971

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>No. of Students in Sample</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literary Stream</td>
<td>Scientific Stream</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(out of 300)</td>
<td>(out of 200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data gathered by taking the first score at the top of each page of the official register containing C. S. E. E. results for 1970-71.

indicate that the students in foreign private schools, considered separately, succeeded considerably better than those in public schools and far better than those in national private schools. The fact that students in national private schools made the lowest scores of all groups is perhaps explained by the additional fact that this group of institutions includes a number of 'cram schools' that work largely with students who are having academic difficulties.

There would certainly appear to be a number of strong reasons for believing that students in the foreign private schools are most successful in their study of English:

1. They begin their study of the language at an earlier age and devote a far larger total number of hours to it before graduation;
2. In such schools the average class size is considerably smaller (29 students) than it is in either public schools (39) or national private schools (33) (compare Tables 1 and 2);
3. The teachers in foreign private schools include more native or near-native speakers of English;
4. The students in such schools, at least as compared with those in public schools, more often come from families of high socio-economic status who tend to be widely traveled, verbally oriented, and deeply interested in having their children learn English;
5. Most private schools operate in urban areas, where much English is used, whereas a majority of public schools are located in rural areas, where contacts with English are rare (Yearbook of Educational Statistics, p. 69).

If the graduates of foreign private schools really do know more English than do public-school graduates, it is perhaps relevant to note that the proportion of private schools declined from 16% in 1959-60 to 11% in 1968-69 as a result of the necessary expansion of the public-school system. Also, during the same period, the proportion of foreign private schools within the total of all private schools declined even more drastically: from 20% to 9% (op. cit., pp. 141, 167, and 197). Though these figures may not mean that there has been an actual decrease in the number of foreign private schools on the East Bank, the declining proportion of private-school graduates may have contributed to lowering the average proficiency in English of the total group of graduates.²

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Director of the Economic Research Department of the Central Bank of Jordan recently pointed out the very great investment — he thought it was perhaps an over-investment — that Jordan makes in education. No less than five percent of the gross national product is spent on education each year. What this expenditure means is perhaps best seen when certain figures for Jordan are compared with the corresponding figures for other countries. 96% of the primary-school-age population are enrolled in schools, whereas this percentage is 91% for Egypt, 81% for Syria, 69% for Iraq, 33% for the Sudan, 29% for Saudi Arabia, and 8% for Northern Yemen. 39% of Jordanians of secondary-school age are enrolled, as compared with 30% in Egypt and Syria, 24% in Iraq, 6% in the Sudan and Saudi Arabia, and less than 1% in Northern Yemen. In 1970 the number of Jordanian students registered in institutions of higher education (the vast majority of them outside of Jordan) for each 100,000 of population rose to 1,222, while the corresponding number was only 1,156 for Lebanon, 593 for Syria, 565 for Egypt, 419 for Iraq, 348 for Turkey, 170 for Kuwait, 149 for Iran, 1,239 for France, 1,830 for the Soviet Union, and 3,471 for the United States (Jaber, 1972, p. 5).

Faced with a serious lack of natural resources, Jordan is apparently investing in the development of its human capital. This is the only way many economists have been able to explain the country's very high rate of economic growth during the period preceding the 1967 war (op. cit., p. 3).

A large share of this impressive investment has, of course, gone into instruction in English. Few, if any, other Arab countries have
made it possible for such a large percentage of their population to study the language. And almost none devote such a high proportion of the total school curriculum to English. In Egypt and the Sudan, though English is still widely used as a medium of instruction at the university level, students study the language for only six years in the public schools and enter the universities woefully unprepared for what is in store for them (Larudee, 1970, pp. 145-150 and 153-170). English is taught to the almost total exclusion of all other foreign languages in Saudi Arabia, but there too students who graduate from the secondary schools have studied English for only six years (op. cit., pp. 131-144). In Syria and Lebanon, a large part of the foreign-language instruction is in French (op. cit., pp. 123-130). Only in Kuwait, which has so many economic ties with English-speaking countries, does the investment in English approach that made in Jordan (op. cit., pp. 119-122).

Countries in which English is less widely taught than in Jordan, such as Tunisia, usually think of themselves as teaching it 'as a foreign language'. Countries in which it is more widely taught, such as the Philippines, teach it 'as a second language' and make great use of it as a medium of instruction in the secondary or even in the primary schools. The differences between the two points of view toward English are substantial and imply differences in motivation, in the content of teaching materials, and in methods of instruction. The dimensions of instruction in English in Jordan are such as to call slightly more for teaching it as a second language than for teaching it as a foreign language.

At this point, then, it seems appropriate to ask certain basic questions. Has the very considerable Jordanian investment in English paid off in terms of tangible results? To what extent have the policies with regard to English followed in the public schools permitted the achievement of the stated and implicit aims of instruction? Since the major aim of the academic secondary schools is to prepare students for higher education (Al-Bukhari, 1972, p. 17), how well have they done so in respect to English? Though the Field Study provides further information related to the answers to these questions, even at this point some preliminary conclusions can be reached regarding the answers.

If we take the last and most specific question first, it seems that the answer must be that whatever active command of English students acquire in secondary school is definitely needed and used at the University and the other institutions of higher education. According to their instructors at the University, however, most secondary-school graduates have not acquired a sufficient command of English. They may know a great deal about English grammar and be able to translate from English to Arabic with the aid of a dictionary, but their practical ability to read and speak English is said to be insufficient for their needs.
They are largely unacquainted with the vocabulary and structures that are used in their fields of academic specialization and usually deficient in the specific skills — such as rapid reading for comprehension, note-taking, and summarizing — that are needed when English is used as the medium of instruction. The evidence for this is very convincing: the University and post-secondary institutes all find it necessary to teach them more English.

At least a partial answer to the second question, that of the extent to which the policies followed in the public schools have permitted the achievement of the aims of English instruction, can also be given. While the stated and implicit aims have remained high, the means for achieving them have grown progressively more meager. The number of years during which English is studied, the number of weekly periods, and the length of the periods have all been reduced. Yet many students must still receive a substantial part of their higher education in English.

The more flexible policies that the Ministry of Education has followed in the foreign private schools seem to have been more successful, at least in achieving the aims of English instruction.

The first question, that regarding the tangible results of the great Jordanian investment in English, is of course the most difficult to answer. One does get the subjective impression that Jordanians in Amman are on the whole easier to communicate with in English than are, say, Egyptians in Cairo. And the remark of a leading Jordanian educator that the use of English in a country is an important factor in the country's development certainly seems to be true. But the safest conclusion that can be reached at this point is perhaps that the magnitude of the investment justifies giving all possible consideration to any opportunities that may exist for getting more English for fewer dinars.

We hope that at least some of the following recommendations may point the way toward such opportunities:

1. That the Ministry of Education consider the possibility of providing more instruction in English in the secondary industrial schools. (The language needs of the students in these schools seem to justify such a step. Added weekly periods might not be necessary if the extra instruction could take the form of practical vocational activities carried out in English.)

2. That the possibility also be examined of adding two weekly periods of studying 'scientific texts in English' to the present program of students in the scientific stream during their last two years in academic secondary schools. (These students' need for English is particularly great when they reach university level, and they now have less exposure to English than do students in the literary stream. The two periods of studying
scientific texts would parallel the two extra periods of 'literary readings' that students in the academic stream now have.)

3. That all possible alternatives be considered before a further reduction is carried out in the number of weekly periods of English in academic and commercial secondary schools. (Even with the present number of periods, these schools are falling far short of their major aim of "preparing students for higher education".)

4. That an experiment be conducted in one or more academic secondary schools in which at least one year of the mathematics course for students in the scientific stream would be taught in English, and that the achievement in English and mathematics of students in this school or schools be compared with that of students in other schools at the time of their graduation from Grade 12. (Perhaps a precedent for conducting such an experiment in the public schools has been provided by the experiments in the teaching of French that are now being carried out in two schools.)

5. That every effort be continued to reduce the average number of students in English classes.

6. If the attempt to carry out the above recommendations is unsuccessful, that serious consideration be given to modifying the method of English instruction used in the schools in the compulsory cycle so as to put more emphasis on the teaching of reading, and that emphasis on oral activities be postponed until the secondary level. (We believe that such a shift of emphasis would not violate any valid methodological principle and that it might rather, under the conditions of instruction now prevailing in Jordan, result in more effective learning of both written and oral skills.)

7. That the possibilities be explored of using films, radio, and television as means of teaching in English some small portion of the content of courses in various subjects at all pre-university levels. (This should help the public academic and commercial secondary schools to achieve their major aim.)
1. Before 1947, when Great Britain gave up her mandate over what is now the West Bank of Jordan, English was used as a medium of instruction at the secondary level of the Arab College there.

2. The pre-publication version of this report contained here a Section on "English in Higher Education," in which an attempt was made to establish the dimensions and nature of the English instruction offered at the post-secondary level, particularly at the University of Jordan. Because of changes effectuated since the data were gathered, much of the material contained in that Section appears to be no longer accurate. The Section has therefore been omitted from this version of the report.
THE PRIMARY-PREPARATORY CURRICULUM

For the summary of curricular patterns contained in this Chapter, it is convenient to think of the over-all curriculum of English instruction in the Jordanian public schools as being made up of five sub-curricula. These are: 1. Primary-preparatory; 2. Secondary literary; 3. Secondary scientific-commercial; 4. Secondary industrial; and 5. Secondary agricultural.

The primary-preparatory curriculum, then, covers the five years of English that are required during the latter portion of the compulsory cycle, in Grades 5-9. A 30-page teachers' guide to this curriculum, English Curriculum: Compulsory Stage, was published by the Curriculum and Textbooks Division of the Ministry of Education in 1965 and reprinted in 1969. It seems worthwhile to examine this guide in some detail since by far the greater portion of the English instruction given in Jordan is at the primary-preparatory level (see Table 2-1), and also since this basic curriculum must inevitably exert a considerable influence on the character of the later curricula that take up where it leaves off.

The guide begins with a rather brief, general, and ambitious statement of the aims of English instruction at this level (see Chapter 1, Pg. 1 of this Survey). The importance of "effective communication" in English is emphasized, and there is insistence that "speaking (underlining ours) a foreign language is not a luxury but a necessity, in a world where neither space nor time can any longer separate people or countries from the growing force of internationalism." It is assumed that English will be taught so as to enrich directly or indirectly the pupils' "appreciation of art, music, literature, philosophy and life"; to help them keep up with "the rapid expansion of knowledge"; to enable them to contribute to the economic "development of the country at large"; and to promote "understanding between Jordan and other countries" (op. cit., pp. 3-4).

The language is to be taught by the Oral Direct Method, the chief characteristics of which are given as:

1. The actual use of English is stressed. Pupils learn English by using it, not by learning about it.
2. Listening and speaking come first. 'Listen', 'imitate' and 'repeat' are the key words to keep in mind when teaching English to non-native speakers.
3. Reading is intentionally postponed until some basic grammatical patterns or structures of English are grasped.
4. Arabic is avoided as much as possible. It is used when necessary to make sure that pupils fully understand instructions or directions given to them.

5. Translation may be used only for those words that cannot be taught through synonyms, antonyms, definitions or direct association like showing an object or its picture or performing an action.

6. There is no formal grammar. However, some helpful generalizations concerning structures or patterns may be given.

7. The unit of language is the sentence, not the word (p. 6).

It is not necessary to see the footnote, giving Charles C. Fries' *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language* (1945) as the reference for this method, to be able to recognize its source. The seven characteristics add up to Fries' classic version of the 'oral approach', which somewhat later--with some variations--came to be called the 'aural-oral' or 'audio-lingual method'. This seems still to be the most widely championed method throughout much of the world today. Nevertheless, it no longer enjoys the near-universal support from methodologists that it once had. This is a point to which we shall return in the concluding section of this chapter.

The curriculum guide next devotes six pages to a discussion of three levels of language--phonology, grammar and syntax, vocabulary--and how they should be taught. Listening is rather incompletely defined as "distinguishing the significant sound features of spoken English." Pupils are to learn to do this by drill on minimal pairs or words, such as fail and vail, in which occur sounds (e.g., /f/ and /v/) that may distinguish one word from another in English but not in Arabic. Mere mimicry of even a good teacher's pronunciation "is not sufficient in itself to produce significant results in teaching pronunciation." The pupils must become aware of phonetic features such as voicing and voicelessness, and teachers are apparently expected to familiarize themselves with phonetic transcription. Both must also master the elements of stress, intonation, pause, juncture, and rhythm if they are really to understand and speak English. Pronunciation should be taught at a normal conversational speed, and any slowing up "is bound to be detrimental." For further information teachers are referred to Raja T. Nasr's *The Teaching of English to Arabic Students* (1963, pp. 7-8).

Curiously enough though, phonetics--the grammar of pronunciation--is thus greatly stressed, formal grammar is rigidly excluded when the grammatical and syntactic structure of English is being taught. Formal grammar is defined as "the memorizing of grammatical rules, conjugations and declensions, the 'rattling off' of the principal parts of speech, the naming and defining of phrases, clauses and sentences and
their kinds, and the ability to talk about sentences in terms of tech-
ical grammatical rules." Instead of talking about English, teachers
must give their pupils intensive practice in the production of state-
ments, questions, requests, and commands. These are the basic
patterns of word order, and it is mostly the order of words that deter-
mines the meaning of utterances in English. These patterns must
therefore be drilled to the point of automatic mastery (pp. 9-10).

Vocabulary is not to be emphasized at the expense of the other two
levels of language. The two criteria for selecting the words to be
taught are (1) frequency of use, and (2) relevance to the needs and
experiences of the pupils. Since frequency of use is given precedence,
one wonders why no list of most frequent words is included and there
is no reference to any existing frequency count in the guide. Vocabu-
lary is to be taught in context rather than from lists, and new words
should be presented within familiar grammatical structures. Teachers
are cautioned against assuming that English words have exact Arabic
equivalents (pp. 11-12).

There follow six pages of "guiding lines" for teaching the specific
skills of handwriting, reading, composition, and taking dictation.
Because of the great variety of ways in which Arabic can be written,
spelled, and punctuated, children in Arab countries seem to have un-
usual difficulty in mastering the more rigid conventions that charac-
terize writing in English. It is thus gratifying to note that the guide
emphasizes the teaching of handwriting and specifies that an unusually
simple and consistent type of script should be taught. This is a very
legible semi-cursive script that accords well with the semi-cursive
nature of most Arabic writing and makes unnecessary the usual prac-
tice of having children learn both to print English and to write it
cursively. The guide enumerates the following as progressive steps
in learning handwriting: (1) the formation of letter shapes and words,
(2) copying sentences from a pattern, (3) writing from memory some-
thing that has been read, (4) making writing an automatic habit, and
(5) learning such mechanics of writing as punctuation and spacing.
Somewhat surprisingly, it is recommended that pupils practice writing
meaningless combinations of letters before learning to write real words
(pp. 13-14). It seems probable that any language skill that can be
learned as a meaningless motor activity can be better learned by prac-
tice that is meaningful.

The guide does not go so far as Fries did and demand that reading
be postponed until the basic structures of English have been mastered
orally. It takes the more moderate (and realistic) position that:
"Reading material in the early stages should provide the vocabulary,
grammar and structures already learnt in the oral practice." Good
arguments are presented for teaching pupils to read both aloud and
silently. The importance of learning to read rapidly with full comprehension is at least hinted at, and teachers are urged to encourage their pupils "to develop the habit of wider reading" by arousing their interest in stories from supplementary readers. It is not made clear whether this wider reading is to be done within class hours or outside of class (pp. 15-16).

A somewhat limited view is taken of the function of writing, which is defined as "a means of fixing structures, vocabulary and spelling after they have been learnt through oral work and reading." The stages in learning are transcription (copying?), dictation, and original composition (p. 17).

An original feature of the guide is the emphasis it puts on dictation as a teaching device. Orthodox believers in the audio-lingual method tended to think of dictation as only a testing device, and a poor one at that. In recent years there has been a renewal of interest in dictation for teaching as well as testing purposes (cf. Allen and Campbell, 1972, pp. 222-229 and 346-354). In this respect, then, the guide may be said to be in advance of its time, though its authors seem to think dictation can teach no more than spelling. We believe that, flexibly used, it can teach many other elements of language as well. It seems to be a particularly recommendable type of classroom activity in a situation, such as that which prevails in Jordan, where there are many inadequately prepared teachers who work with children who find it especially difficult to learn to write English (p. 18).

Four pages are then devoted to a discussion of audio-visual teaching aids. Various types of pictorial, graphic, optical, and aural aids are listed, and the advantages of each are pointed out. Among the more complicated devices recommended and presumably available are the filmstrip projector, the epidiascope (a sort of opaque projector), the gramophone, and the tape-recorder. No mention is made of the flannel board, a very economical device that can be particularly effective in conveying the meaning of new language items to small children. Nor is there mention of the possibility of utilizing radio and television broadcasts in the classroom. Audio-visual materials tend to be envisioned, not as essential elements in the multi-media instructional program, but as interesting adjuncts to be used when and if obtainable (pp. 19-22).

We would have hoped to see more attention devoted to "co-curricular activities" than the single page which follows. The guide describes co-curricular activities as "interesting situations relevant to the pupils' experiences" which teachers are urged to create outside the classroom. In these situations "the pupils can develop their personalities through using English in different activities." Ten different types of activities are listed, ranging from visiting different places to establishing
curriculum and instructional materials (p. 23). Our questions would be: Why should such activities be called for only outside of class hours? Are they not important enough to be made a basic feature of regular classroom instruction? Activities of the types listed can be carried out in such a way as to provide for real communication in English. The many forms of manipulative drill recommended by the guide have value only to the extent that they eventually lead to communication in the language. Along with an increasing number of methodologists, we believe that even in very early stages of the curriculum real communication can and should be a central feature of instruction in English as a second language (cf. Allen and Campbell, 1972, pp. 139-145).

As is appropriate, the guide ends with a section on evaluation (pp. 24-28) and a list of professional readings recommended for teachers. Unfortunately, neither of these is as helpful as it might have been. The section on evaluation deals with the topic under three headings: the pupil, the teacher, and the curriculum. The references cited date back to the 1950's and are mostly general treatments of the elementary-school curriculum in English-speaking countries. Even so, it is disappointing to find that the only suggestion given for measuring pupils' listening and speaking ability is to note whether or not they are able "to understand the teacher's oral utterance" and "to form an intelligible sentence in English." Equally unhelpful is the suggestion that "reading aloud is tested by the extent to which pupils are able to pronounce and enunciate words or utterances correctly."

The list of recommended readings include 27 items, most of them general manuals on methods of teaching English as a second language. There are two books on English phonetics, one on the grammatical structure of English, one on contrastive analysis, and none on vocabulary or language acquisition. The average date of publication of the 27 items is exactly twenty years ago, and the most recently published appeared in 1961. Apparently no new titles were added when the guide was reprinted in 1969 (pp. 29-30).

A serious defect in the guide is the lack of attention to the content, other than linguistic, of the English curriculum. Just what are the pupils to talk, read, and write about? What are the interests of Jordanian children between the ages of 10 and 14? What subject matter is best calculated to lead toward the aim of developing in them an "appreciation of art, music, literature, philosophy, and life"? Is there nothing their study of English can do at this stage to help them keep up with "the rapid expansion of knowledge?" What can a teacher do to make sure that his instruction really does promote "understanding between Jordan and other countries"? In short, how can the study of English be made to contribute to the achievement of the general aims of education in Jordan? None of these questions is really answered in the guide.
THE SECONDARY CURRICULUM

Until 1971 the curricula for English instruction at the secondary level could only have been inferred from an examination of the textbooks prescribed for use in Grades 10, 11, and 12. There was no curriculum guide worthy of the name describing the English program to be followed in either of the streams or any of the types of secondary schools. A teacher interested in finding out why and how the authorities wished the subject to be treated could only have been referred to the general School Curriculum for the Secondary Stage (1967), which in a couple of pages stated the number of weekly periods allotted to English and listed the textbooks.

Then in 1971, to meet the obvious need, appeared the 50-page English Curriculum: Secondary Stage. It covers both the secondary literary and the secondary scientific curricula. Interestingly enough, this guide describes hopes for the future rather than current reality. The decision has already been made to discontinue the use of all the English texts now prescribed for academic secondary schools just as soon as new textbooks, specially planned to meet the needs of students in these schools, can be prepared. A contract for the preparation of the new series was signed in the summer of 1972 with the Oxford University Press. This contract calls for a first version of the texts for Grade 10 to be ready for the beginning of school in the fall of 1974. In 1974-75 this version will be tried out on a nation-wide scale, and feedback will be systemically gathered for the use of the authors in preparing a definitive version, which hopefully will be finished by the fall of 1976. At one-year intervals texts for Grades 11 and 12 will be developed on a similar schedule. Instead of describing the work to be accomplished through the use of the existing texts, then, the English Curriculum: Secondary Stage lays down specifications for the new books and attempts to tell teachers how best to use them.

This Survey thus seems to come at a particularly appropriate moment in relation to the development of the secondary-school curricula in English. There has perhaps never been a time when suggestions for improving the curricula stood a better chance of being given careful consideration. We have examined the new curriculum guide with particular care with the hope that whatever insights our examination and our figures on the use of English may give rise to can be passed on to the O. U. P. authors as part of the feedback they are expecting to receive.

Favorable as the situation may be in this respect, however, there is one element in it that does not call for optimism: the plan for further reduction in the amount of time devoted to the study of English as the new textbooks become available. It seems too much to ask of the authors of the series, however much care and imagination they may
put into their work, that they should produce a set of books so superior to the old set as to compensate for a 19% reduction in weekly periods of English.

The curriculum guide specifies that the new textbook series shall include 16 books: four for Grade 10, six for Grade 11, and six for Grade 12 (p. 6). We understand that in discussions with O. U. P. representatives the total number has been reduced to 11 by combining several items for reasons of economy. The series now contemplated would be called the Oxford Secondary English Course for Jordan and would include:

Grade 10: 1) Course book, covering language drills, text analysis, and controlled writing; 2) Anthology, covering broad reading; 3) Teacher's handbook covering methodology, oral comprehension material, dictation, key to exercises, and tests;

Grade 11: 4) Course book; 5) Anthology A, for literary and scientific students; 6) Anthology B, for literary students only; 7) Teacher's handbook;

Grade 12: 8) Course book; 9) Anthology A, for literary and scientific students; 10) Anthology B, for literary students only; 11) Teacher's handbook.

The first and perhaps the most significant fact that emerges from an examination of this list of contemplated texts is that literary and scientific students will to a large extent be studying the same English. Classes for scientific students now meet for six periods per week in Grades 11 and 12. Literary students have two extra weekly periods of English in Grades 11 and 12, and it is only in these two extra periods that their program — to be contained in the two volumes of Anthology B — will differ from that followed by scientific students.

The secondary curriculum guide has little to say about theoretical questions of methodology, stating that methodological matters will be dealt with in the three teacher's handbooks included in the new series. There is also no attempt, such as that made in the primary-preparatory guide, to give teachers a brief introduction to a theory of linguistic analysis. One gets the impression that the authors of the secondary guide are fully aware of the sweeping changes in methodological and linguistic thinking that have taken place since the heyday of the audio-lingual method. Rather than questioning overtly the concepts of method and language formulated in the earlier guide (which still has official backing), the authors seem to have quietly developed the new guide around concepts that are more pragmatic, more eclectic, and less doctrinaire. This appears to be a wise decision.

The new guide, then, proceeds to enumerate the important features that should be incorporated in the three teacher's handbooks. First, they should be very simply written for teachers whose classes are
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large and whose English is limited. Second, they should provide ways of teaching students to use an all-English dictionary. Third, they should guide teachers in the choice of appropriate methods, particularly in regard to using teaching aids, developing co-curricular activities, and achieving precision in the mechanics of writing. Fourth, they should develop a specific methodology for teaching literary materials. Fifth, they should include sample tests that would show the extent to which immediate objectives have been realized. And sixth, they should include lists of recommended readings on all aspects of language teaching (pp. 4-5).

This eminently practical list is accompanied by a very few down-to-earth comments on method. Language is an organic whole, and any division into water-tight compartments can be harmful. The authors of the textbooks are urged "to emphasize the unity of language by combining several skills and processes wherever possible" (p. 4). Content, which was hardly referred to at all in the primary-preparatory guide, is here declared to be "a matter of prime importance." All material for classroom use, even language drills, should have content that is "a judicious combination of Arab and foreign themes." The latter will be mostly English but should include themes drawn from other cultures (p. 6). Formal translation is not to be taught as a skill, but occasional translation of a passage is commendable if done in such a way as to clarify the differences in range of meaning between Arabic and English words (p. 7). It would be difficult to reconcile such statements with an orthodox audio-lingual approach, or indeed with any other methodology based on a single theory of language. Nonetheless, we are willing to believe that they are justifiable recommendations intended to overcome instructional problems that have been observed in the past.

As was pointed out in Chapter I, the secondary guide does a more adequate job of formulating instructional aims than the primary-preparatory guide. This is accomplished largely by listing separately, in relatively specific terms, the immediate objectives of each major type of classroom activity. Even in the secondary guide, however, the stated aims sometimes betray a certain amount of wishful thinking. This is particularly evident, for example, in the affirmation that the curriculum is intended to serve both as a terminal course, equipping students with all the basic skills needed to use English as a practical tool, and as an introduction to more advanced work, providing them with the guidance and information that would "enable them to analyze and discuss English materials on a wide range of subjects in different styles" (p. 3). Undoubtedly the curriculum must try to serve both purposes, even though the two aims are to some extent mutually exclusive. But nothing is gained by ignoring the conflict of interests
rather than stating clearly which of the two aims is to be given prece-
dence in cases where the question of relative importance arises.
Four major types of classroom activity are distinguished. There are
to be language drills, both phonetic and grammatical, to which some
40% of class time will be devoted in Grade 10, 30% in Grade 11, and
20% in Grade 12. There will be text analysis occupying 30%, 30% and
40% of the time. An unvarying 20% will go to controlled writing. And
10%, 20%, and 20% will go to broad reading (pp. 11-12). As at the
primary-preparatory level, no class time is set aside specifically for
oral or written activities of a truly communicative nature and not
directly-related to the textbooks.
The section on language drills begins with some rather questionable
advice: "In all oral language drills, special emphasis should be placed
on pronunciation. In all written language exercises, special emphasis
should be placed on spelling, handwriting and punctuation" (p. 12). If
taken literally, the first sentence could mean that even when drilling
grammatical structures teachers should correct each and every mis-
pronunciation—a procedure guaranteed to insure that even the bravest
students will have trouble in mastering the grammatical structures.
The second sentence could lead teachers and students to conclude that,
in writing English, it doesn't really matter what you say so long as
you spell and punctuate it correctly. This is almost certainly not what
the authors intended to say or imply.
Perhaps their intention with regard to pronunciation would have been
clearer had they advised the teachers to set aside brief five or ten-
minute periods when attention was focused exclusively on pronunciation
and when students would make every effort to achieve a perfect
imitation of an authentic model. Drills on minimal pairs, strongly
recommended here as in the primary-preparatory guide, along with
written pronunciation exercises may sometimes be helpful to some
students (pp. 13-14). But it is hard to believe that such drills can
possibly be as important an element in the teaching of pronunciation
as is the opportunity for students to imitate in a meaningful context the
best available model.
The discussion of grammatical language drills, or 'pattern practice',
includes a useful and apparently accurate list of some of the features
of English structure most difficult for Arabic-speaking students to
master. The increasingly complex forms that such drills can take as
students advance in their command of the language are spelled out
clearly in terms of generative-transformational analysis. We only
wish that, somewhere in this section, the authors had taken advantage
of the opportunity to reiterate their earlier declared conviction that
content is a matter of prime importance and had explained how this
could be achieved in language drills (pp. 14-15).
Text analysis (TA) or intensive reading is to be given more time in the three-year span of the curriculum than any other type of classroom activity. Indeed, if the time allotment for broad reading is added to that for text analysis, the total proportion of time to be devoted to reading is seen to be 40% in Grade 10, 50% in Grade 11, and 60% in Grade 12—or half of the entire curriculum. This progressively more generous allotment seems to be an accurate reflection of the Jordanian secondary-school graduates' needs for English.

One way of approaching the question of how well this large amount of time is spent is to examine, in juxtaposition, the immediate aims of text analysis and those of broad reading. Text analysis is expected to enable the student at the end of the secondary curriculum to:

1. Comprehend the central idea expressed or implied in a passage whether spoken, read or written.
2. Analyze the contents of individual paragraphs.
3. Analyze sentences into their components of structure and meaning.
4. Analyze individual phrases, words and idioms.
5. Reproduce the central idea of the passage.
6. Move towards independent comprehension of English materials at a reasonable speed (pp. 15-16).

Throughout the curriculum, broad reading (BR) aims at:

1. Consolidating the structures learned orally and in writing and combining these structures to produce units of reading.
2. Training the students to look for the meaning of a passage rather than to analyze individual words and sentences.
3. Training the students to proceed from guided towards independent reading and to develop reading into a habit.
4. Exposing the students to different styles and subjects.
5. Exposing the students to different cultures (p. 21).

The first two objectives of text analysis (for ease of reference, TA-1 and 2) seem clear and appropriate, if the analysis referred to in TA-2 is thought of as a way of allowing students to demonstrate that they have understood the meaning of individual paragraphs. But TA-3 and 4 are much less clear. How are sentences to be analyzed into their components of structure and meaning, particularly into their components of structure? And how does one analyze individual phrases, words and idioms other than by labeling them or translating them? Is the guide recommending parsing, or diagraming, or dividing sentences into immediate constituents, or giving technical names to various structures? The primary-preparatory guide excluded formal grammar—"the naming and defining of phrases, clauses and sentences and their kinds, and the ability to talk about sentences in terms of technical grammatical rules." Are these activities to be an important
part of the secondary curricula? The description of the process of text analysis which follows the list of objectives in the secondary guide answers none of these questions. It merely prescribes, as the third step in the process, "questions and answers on vocabulary, meaning, punctuation, etc." (p. 17). If a teacher were inclined to spend a major portion of the three years of secondary-school English translating, talking about grammar, and having her students label words and structures, there seems to be very little in the guide that would discourage her doing so.

If objective TA-6 is carefully considered along with BR-3 (the third objective of broad reading), another series of questions arises. Both specify that students shall move toward independent reading—presumably reading that is unfacilitated and unchecked by the teacher—but it appears that not even broad reading is actually to be done independently in most cases. The total amount of reading material for each year, says the guide, is to be determined by the allotment of class time to broad reading and text analysis (p. 22). In other words, both types of reading are to be done primarily in class rather than outside of class. And at examination time students are tested on the reading of both types that they have done. A note is added, stating that additional reading that is not covered in any formal test or examination may be provided, but this is only for the better students in the class (p. 23). Why should all students not be encouraged to do as much independent reading as possible? Are most students still incapable of independent reading even after seven or eight years of English instruction? If so, could this be because they have never been given sufficient inducement to read independently? Could ways not be found to give them credit, other than by formal examination, for all the extra reading they do? Is it realistic to expect students to develop the habit of reading in English (BR-3) before they have ever done any independent reading? How can the reading habit ever be formed by students who have no experience with reading for the sheer pleasure of reading?

BR-2 seems to imply that being able to understand the meaning of a passage is a more important and advanced objective than learning to analyze individual words and sentences. If this is true, might it not be well to increase the proportion of class time set aside for broad reading more rapidly than the proportion devoted to text analysis?

BR-4 and 5 certainly seem to be legitimate objectives, though one might hope to do more than simply 'expose' students to different styles, subjects, and cultures. The guide specifies in some detail just what styles and subjects are intended. All broad reading and most texts for analysis should be selected from contemporary writings, though in Grade 12 pre-twentieth-century literary passages may be
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analyzed. The variety is to be provided by the inclusion of texts in narrative, descriptive, expository, argumentative, and poetical style for analysis, as well as essays, biography, magazine and newspaper articles, short stories, plays, novels, and poetry for broad reading. A significant proportion of the subject matter must be drawn from the natural and social sciences, which seems to be an excellent proviso for Jordanian secondary-school students (pp. 16 and 21-22).

The suggestions regarding cultural diversity are less specific. Perhaps because it is assumed that English culture will be dealt with since the language being taught is English, the special opportunity for becoming well acquainted with the culture of which the language is a natural expression is not mentioned. Nor is there any mention of specific varieties of English culture such as the American and the Australian. It is stated that the material read should include translations from other languages and that special attention should be paid to topics bearing on Arab culture, history, society, and institutions (pp. 21-22). One wonders if it might not be advisable to arrange the cultural content of the English curricula in the form of a natural progression from the known to the unknown, beginning with a heavy concentration on Arab themes in the primary grades and shifting gradually to an emphasis on English themes in the secondary grades. Such a progression would seem to be in harmony with the psychology of human development, with the usual shift in general educational aims from familiarizing the child with his immediate environment to broadening his horizons, and with the well attested need of Jordanian secondary-school graduates to be able to use English as a bridge to the outside world.

One also wishes that the guide's section on reading dealt more specifically with several other important matters. At what level of difficulty and speed are students supposed to be able to read when they graduate from Grade 12? As well as we can determine, the texts now being read in secondary school include no unsimplified material, no English as written for native speakers of English except a small number of poems. One of the current Grade-11 readers, Man against Nature, is written at the 1,500-word vocabulary level, and the version of The Citadel used in Grade 12 has been simplified to the 2,000-word level (see Pg. 41 of this Chapter). It should be remembered that students go directly from Grade 12 to the University, where those who major in science are expected to do all of their work in English. It seems regrettable, then, that the guide does not specify that the new textbook series should include some material in unsimplified English for all students, an appreciable increase from year to year in the number of pages read, and some provision for increasing the speed with which students can read material that does not need to be mastered in detail.
As was pointed out earlier, literary students have two extra weekly periods of English in Grades 11 and 12. It is only the reading they do in these two periods that will distinguish the new secondary literary curriculum from the secondary scientific curriculum. The guide does require that the extra reading material, to be contained in the two books of Anthology B, shall consist of original literary works unsimplified and unabridged. But this will only affect literary students. The material in Anthology B is to be treated as a combination of broad reading and intensive analysis, and it may include a small number of passages written before 1900. Though some literary analysis will be done, "every effort should (also) be made to reinforce the language skills and habits already acquired" (pp. 24-25).

The guide's section on controlled writing deals with the work to be done by all students: literary and scientific. In it the tendency that was noted earlier to emphasize form at the expense of content again becomes apparent. Helpful hints are given regarding the way in which free composition can be approached through pre-composition activities involving the systematic modification of different types of model sentences. The various methods of organizing a paragraph around a topic sentence are discussed. And there are suggestions, sound ones, as to how students can be trained to achieve coherence of ideas and structures in connected paragraphs. But little or nothing is said about how students can be motivated to write, what they like to write about, or how they can be given credit for expressing interesting ideas even if they do still have trouble with spelling and punctuation. Nor is there a clear indication of how composition can be related to reading or of how much free composition is to be done (pp. 17-21).

Like the primary-preparatory guide, the secondary guide devotes its last four sections to a consideration of co-curricular activities, teaching aids, evaluation, and professional readings for teachers. In fact the first three of these four sections in the primary-preparatory guide are reproduced textually as appendices in the secondary guide (pp. 39-50).

To the primary-preparatory guide's one page on co-curricular activities the secondary guide adds four more pages. The objectives of this type of activity are explained in considerable detail, and the explanation shows full appreciation of the great value students can derive from informal, meaningful, well motivated group work that is very different from the drills and question-and-answer sessions that now characterize their English classes. The specific co-curricular activities suggested seem imaginative and very feasible: dramatizations, book reports, news bulletins, debates, explanation of hobbies, visits, learning songs, etc. (pp. 26-29). More than ever one wonders why the guide gives no indication that such very valuable activities can and should be an important part of the work done in the classroom rather
than being left to be carried out exclusively outside of class hours, by teachers and students who may already be overburdened by their regular assignments. True, it is not always easy to measure by examination the direct benefits of real communicative activities. The value of the latter can therefore be greatly underestimated by teachers and students who are overly impressed by the importance of examinations. Will it be necessary to change the examination system before communicative activities in English can be encouraged in Jordanian classrooms?

The new section on teaching aids adds to the list of recommended devices the flannel-board and several types of projectors which were overlooked in the primary-preparatory guide. Perhaps the most significant part of the section, however, is the passage that deals with radio and television, also unmentioned in the earlier guide:

Motion pictures, language laboratories, radio and television are obvious teaching aids with very wide application. They can only be used, however, on a central or sharing basis on account of the high cost of equipment and programmes. Should television or any other educational medium be introduced on a wide and centralized basis, it becomes imperative the the material utilized be an integral part of the present curriculum (p. 31).

These more complicated types of audio-visual aids are thought of as a hope for the future, and the new textbook series is apparently to be developed on the assumption that they will not be generally available.

The new section on evaluation seems to be considerably more helpful and relevant than the earlier one. It focuses on evaluating the achievement of students and offers suggestions that may be useful both to classroom teachers and to those who prepare official national examinations. The important point is made that examinations "are not an end in themselves and should never be allowed to determine the aims of the course." There is at least a strong implication that it may be desirable to test both students' ability to perform complex language skills such as composition and their knowledge of discrete linguistic items such as words and grammatical structures. In other words, there seems to be a welcome flexibility in the attitude toward testing which suggests the possibility of useful experimentation (pp. 32-33).

The list of professional readings for teachers is also much better than the corresponding section in the primary-preparatory guide. It includes 36 items, more than half of them published within the last ten years. The titles are on the whole well chosen, and the coverage is broad: five books on linguistic theory, thirteen on methods, seven on phonetics, five on grammar and two each on poetry, teaching aids, and testing. It is true that generative-transformational grammar and psycholinguistics are underrepresented, and no titles by Noam Chomsky
or recent methodologists appear. Nevertheless, the list is a very serviceable one, and one hopes it has been made available to teachers in the primary and preparatory schools as well as to those in the secondary schools.

It is said that a curriculum guide is now being developed for English in the secondary industrial schools. At the moment, however, no more complete description is available of either the secondary industrial or the secondary agricultural curriculum than a list of the textbooks used along with a few brief comments on each text. We have therefore attempted no evaluation of these two minor curricula apart from the examination of textbooks in the next section of this Chapter.

TEXTBOOKS USED

There follows a complete, partially annotated list of the English textbooks prescribed by the Jordanian Ministry of Education for use in the public schools in 1971-72. For ease of reference, individual items are referred to by a double number; thus 6-3 would indicate the third title listed for Grade 6.

Primary-Preparatory Curriculum

Grade 5


Most of the work of Grade 5 is not contained in the pupil's book, 5-1, but is described in considerable detail in 5-2. The book enumerates specific objectives for the first year of instruction. 5-2 gives the teacher step-by-step instructions as to how to conduct each of the 38 lessons. These instructions, if followed, would insure close conformity with the seven characteristics of the Oral Direct Method enumerated in the primary-preparatory curriculum guide.

Systematic attention to pronunciation; minimal-pair drills in most lessons; all words transcribed in symbols of the international Phonetic Alphabet at end of 5-2. None of the attention to intonation and rhythm that the guide calls for.

The lessons built around a carefully sequenced series of structural items (see Appendix B) which, like minimal-pair drills, reflect the most common difficulties of Arabic-speaking students learning English. No grammar rules or technical terminology included.

About 350 well chosen vocabulary items are taught. Very meager vocabulary and structure for an entire year of study.

Models for handwriting are presented in 5-1 in carefully planned sequence of letters, words, and complete sentences. Repetitive exercises in forming elements of letters, which were prominent in
Earlier versions of book, have been eliminated in this version.

Another change from earlier versions involves beginning reading somewhat earlier and substantial increase in amount read. 5-2 recommends using special 'sound-alphabet' names for letters which make it easier to sound out unfamiliar words in reading.

Lessons 35-38 of 5-1 include exercises to be written out without reference to a handwriting model. Lessons 26-38 include dictations in handwriting with which pupils can compare their own handwriting.

5-2 recommends that school or teacher make a recording of an English voice doing minimal-pair drills. Publishers provide three pairs of wall-pictures and a box of double-sided flash-cards for use with texts.

What subject-matter content there is deals exclusively with things to be found in a Jordanian schoolroom and its immediate environment.

Grade 5.

For pupils:

For teachers:

6-5 is much less detailed than 5-2; the teacher unfamiliar with 5-2 would have difficulty using 6-5. Again there is no statement of objectives of the year.

Good suggestions for use of gestures, miming, and objects to teach meaning are included. A careful review is provided of material taught in Grade 5.

Phonological drills are not continued and few suggestions are offered that would help the teacher set a good model of pronunciation.

Structural sequencing is good, but a surprisingly small number of new structures are taught. Lessons 12 and 16 of 6-1 require students to produce negative structures which they have not previously been taught.

Only about 275 words are added to active vocabulary. There is an ingenious grouping of vocabulary items by opposites and by theme.
Drills in handwriting continued on a reduced scale.

Total amount of reading is about 130 pages, many times more than in Grade 5. Stories in 6-2 and 6-3 are modern and interesting and use structures and vocabulary taught in basic textbooks. 6-4 seems dull and childish and includes many structures pupils have not been taught: shall/will, conditional sentences, past perfect tense, etc. In all three readers the language is somewhat stilted and unnatural; authors have not been able to overcome limitations of vocabulary and structure. Silent reading passages in 6-1 are too short to be of value.

There is no writing done that could be called composition, but the current version of 6-1 contains many more structural drills to be written out than did earlier versions of same book.

The dictations in 6-1, which can be regarded as an approach to composition, are extremely brief and seem to be related exclusively to developing handwriting.

Three pairs of wall-pictures used in Grade 5 continue to be used and must be entirely too familiar to pupils by now. Suggestions made in 6-5 regarding audio-visual aids refer only to blackboard.

Material dealing with British culture in earlier versions of 6-1 has been replaced in current version by material dealing with Arab culture. Stories in 6-2 and 6-3 seem to take place in an English-speaking country and those in 6-4 in Pakistan.

Very few suggestions are made regarding informal activities such as songs and games.

Grade 7

For students:

For teachers:

There is no formulation of objectives in 7-4. Increased emphasis on reading and perhaps less opportunity for students to speak than in earlier grades. For teaching pronunciation, complete reliance is put on students' imitation of model set by teacher. Hardly any reference to pronunciation in 7-4. Progressively less attention to grammatical structure and more to vocabulary. Conventional unrealistic presentation of shall/will with insufficient drill provided in 7-4 (pp. 18-19).
Good series of drills in which structures learned earlier are reviewed in 7-1 (pp. 53-61).

Even though about 410 new words are taught in 7-1 and 7-4, as compared with only 275 in 6-1 and 6-5, the total number of words taught in this entire series, which is about 1035, falls farther and farther behind the number taught in comparable series of textbooks used in other countries.

One-sentence models of handwriting are provided in first six lessons of 7-1. These models were not included in earlier versions of same book, so a need for them must have been felt.

Readings in 7-1 presented in short segments, which would make it difficult for students to appreciate any continuity in them. 7-2 is badly simplified and illustrated, with short monotonous sentences bearing little relationship to structures taught in 7-1 and 7-4. 7-3 is more readable stylistically and because of its subject. About 170 pages read in year.

Pre-composition activities included in 7-1 program progress very slowly toward composition. Dictations continue but contain only two or three sentences and are apparently planned in relation to handwriting only. Aside from pictures in 7-1, 7-2, and 7-3, almost no attention is paid to teaching aids. 7-1 deals with Arab culture, 7-2 and 7-3 with British culture.

Except for a crossword puzzle in 7-1 (p. 78), activities of an informal or communicative nature are seldom suggested. A few verses and proverbs at end of 7-1.

Grade 8

For students:

For teachers:

It appears that 8-1 and 8-4, as well as 9-1 and 9-4, are to be replaced in 1972-73 by the corresponding books of the **New Living English for Jordan** series. The latter have just been published and were not available to us for examination. In the case of Books 1, 2, and 3, the Jordanian authors who have replaced Ralph Cooke seem to
have redistributed in the new series the material that was included in the old series and to have eliminated most of the material dealing with British themes, substituting for it material dealing with Jordanian and Arab themes. There has been little or no variation, however, in the newer versions that have superseded them. Since the new 8-1, 9-1, and 9-4 will probably resemble the ones listed here in many ways, it seems worthwhile to annotate the latter in this Section.

Like preceding teacher's books, 8-4 contains no formulation of objectives. Chief objective seems to be reading, almost to the exclusion of all other skills.

The method used has gradually come to have fewer audio-lingual features such as pattern drills and to resemble more closely a traditional European direct method. Essence of the method now seems to be to use words orally a few times, then to read them. There is practically no attention to pronunciation in 8-4.

Lessons in 8-1 and 8-4 still center around a carefully arranged sequence of grammatical principles: past continuous tense, conditionals, indirect speech, etc. But relatively few if any drills are provided to aid in the active mastery of structures studied.

There is a sudden great increase in number of new words taught: some 600 for active mastery plus several hundred more for passive recognition. Some desirable attention to word formation. There is no further attention to handwriting.

Readings in 8-1 still done in short segments accompanied by questions which focus on details rather than purport of what is read. No notable increase in volume of material read. 8-2 is probably most interesting 'supplementary reader' yet included. But both 8-2 and 8-3 appear to be written at a simpler level than should be necessary in fourth year of study: they are at the 1000-word vocabulary level, whereas students are supposed to have learned an active vocabulary of well over 1,500 words.

Hardly any further references to composition. The only practice given in writing is presumably a number of grammatical exercises to be written out. No dictation passages in 8-1. No systematic attention to spelling. Fewer pictures and almost no reference to teaching aids.

8-2 has a Western setting and 8-3 a Creek setting. Most of the material in 8-1 refers to Jordan. Proverbs and verses included, but songs, games, informal communicative activities almost never suggested.

Grade 9

For students:

1. Living English for Jordan: Pupils' Book Five, same authors.


For teachers:


Like 8-1 and 8-4, 9-1 and 9-4 are to be replaced in 1972-73 by the corresponding books of the New Living English for Jordan series.

"At this stage of the course we should aim at bringing the four skills—Understanding, Speaking, Reading, Writing—more closely together in the classroom by teaching new grammar and words not only orally, but by reading and copying from the blackboard" (9-4, p. iv). This is the nearest any of the books comes to stating objectives.

No methodological innovations, except that students seem to meet with more and more new words in their reading for which they have no oral preparation. Pronunciation appears to have been forgotten, except for phonetic transcription of all new words at end of 9-4.

Grammatical sequencing continued (see Appendix A). Drills in 9-1 offer little variety and appear quite insufficient in number to provide an active command of the large amount of new material that is being taught. 9-4 very helpful to teacher as far as it goes.

About 1,500 new words taught, including 200 for passive recognition only. By now students should have acquired an active command of some 3,000 words from their basic texts. Word-building exercises on compounding, etc.

It appears that hardly any silent reading is done; silent-reading passages omitted from most of 9-4. 9-3 is at 1,500-word vocabulary level. Too easy? Most lessons in 9-1 end with a series of questions the answers to which constitute a very brief composition related to material read. No use of summaries or precis.

No dictation or spelling. Teachers told to "use sketches and diagrams on the blackboard, and pictures and maps, wherever you can" (9-4, p. iv). No other reference to teaching aids.

Content of 9-2 and 9-3 well suited to interest students of this age group. But 6-2, 6-3, 7-3, 8-2, 9-2, and 9-3 all involve criminals and police; too much attention to this one theme. In 9-1 Jordanian children visit Great Britain. Other readings reflect a wide variety of cultures. More poetry included in 9-1, but students are given no preparation for coping with its difficult structures and vocabulary. No occasions provided for free communication that is not directly related to the material in the texts.
Secondary Literary Curriculum
and
Secondary Scientific-Commercial Curriculum

With some exceptions, the textbooks prescribed in 1971-72 for these two curricula were the same. The texts for the two curricula are therefore here listed together. If no letter follows the number by which a text is referred to (10-1), the text is required for both curricula. An L after the number (11-3L) indicates that the text is for literary students only, and an SC (11-5SC) means that it is for scientific and commercial students only.

Since all the books listed under these two curricula are to be replaced by the 11 books of the Oxford Secondary English Course for Jordan within the next few years, it does not seem worthwhile to annotate the individual titles listed here in any detail. Instead a few general comments on the entire group of texts are offered at the end of this part of the list. We hope that they may be relevant to the questions that must be answered in the course of the development of the new series.

Grade 10

For students:

   Book 1, 39 pp. (Exercises on present and past tenses)
   Book 3, 36 pp. (On gerund, infinitive, and participles)
   Book 5, 43 pp. (On auxiliary verbs)


For teachers:
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Grade 11

For students:
1. A Practical English Grammar for Foreign Students: Exercises (continued from Grade 10).
   Book 2, 37 pp. (Future and conditional tenses)
   Book 4, 37 pp. (Two-word verbs, verbs plus preposition)
   Book 6, 31 pp. (Indirect speech and passive voice)
3L. The Battle of Valhame Dam, by John and Alison Tedman. Oxford University Press, first published 1965, 1968 edition used, 121 pp. (New Oxford Supplementary Reader, Grade 6, 3,500-word vocabulary level)
5SC. Man against Nature, by Norman Wymer. Longmans-Green, first published 1964, 1968 edition used, 97 pp. (Stories of great engineering achievements, 1,500-word vocabulary level)

For teachers:
6. A Practical English Grammar for Foreign Students (continued from Grade 10).

Grade 12

For students:
5SC. Return Ticket to the Moon, by Harvey Hall. University of London Press, first published 1970, 1970 edition used, 77 pp. (Stories of the exploration of space, structurally controlled)

(There is no separate teacher's book for Grade 12.)

These textbooks contribute only by implication to clarifying the objectives of English instruction at the secondary level in Jordan. They seem to be related only in the most general way to the needs...
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for English (in terms of structures, vocabulary and very specific skills) that graduates will experience at the university and thereafter.

The methodology built into the texts is rather closer to a traditional grammar-translation method than to a direct or an audio-lingual method.

The grammar the teacher has access to in 10-5 is of a very formal, prescriptive type. 12-1 was first written in 1938! Drills are few in number and show little variety in form. Teachers must often be tempted to spend more time in talking about grammar than in helping their students to develop an active command of grammatical structures.

The vocabulary level at which all the materials are written is disconcertingly low, never going higher than 3,500 words in 11-3L. The levels are also inconsistent from grade to grade: the last book read by literary students in their senior year, 12-3L, uses 2,000 words though the same students read at the 3,500 level a year earlier in 11-3L; scientific students retrograde from 2,000 words in Grade 10 (10-3) to 1,500 in Grade 11 (11-5Sc).

Though a total of some 250 pages were read in Grade 9, no more than 115 are covered in Grade 10, and there is no detectable increase in difficulty. Students may graduate and go to the university having done no more than 1,000 pages of very simplified reading in their eight years of studying English.

So far as we can determine, none of the secondary-school texts—not even the teacher's book—contains information on the writing of compositions or suggestions as to how composition can be related to the materials read.

A substantial portion of the reading material provided for scientific students in Grades 11 and 12 (11-5Sc and 12-5Sc) treats subject matter of special interest to future engineers and scientists. There is material dealing with a wide variety of cultural backgrounds, but hardly any with Arab themes.

This series of texts does even less than the primary-preparatory series to encourage the use of audio-visual aids and of informal communicative activities.

Secondary Industrial Curriculum

No separate teacher's books are included among the texts prescribed for use in the industrial schools.

Grade 10: 1. The Practical Reader: Stages 1 and 2, by G. C. Thornley, Longmans-Green. (Not available for examination)


Classes meet for only two 40-minute periods per week, so only very limited objectives can be achieved. The aim of 11-1 is "not to teach science, but to introduce foreign students to the use of scientific words and expressions in English" (p. vi). 12-1 is designed to help students, some of whom "may wish to take a degree in science at a university where all instruction is given in English," to acquire "the ability to read scientific works in this language at a later date" (p. vii).

Neither in 11-1 nor in 12-1 are the reading selections accompanied by exercises or questions of any sort. The typewritten list of texts, which is the nearest thing to a guide for this curriculum, says readings are to be translated into Arabic. A grammar-translation method, but with only such references to grammar as teacher may care to make.

Both 11-1 and 12-1 are written at 3,000-word vocabulary level, a considerably higher level than that at which scientific students in academic secondary schools read. No attempt at a systematic coverage of basic vocabulary of technology or science.

If all selections are actually read, volume of reading is comparable to that done in academic schools.

Typewritten guide says composition is to be done as well as reading: personal letters to be written in Grade 10 and paragraphs based on readings in Grades 11 and 12. Apparently no further guidance available as to how composition should be taught or what specific forms of writing should be done.

For a book that deals with the progress of modern science and technology, 11-1, written in 1950, is very much out-of-date. These books make the world of science sound very, very British. Typical topics dealt with: coal, mass production, the telescope, city transport, safety at sea, the earth's crust, electricity in the home.

Secondary Agricultural Curriculum

Grade 10

For students:
1. A Practical English Grammar for Foreign Students: Exercises: Books 1, 3, and 5; by Thompson and Martinet. (See full listing under secondary literary curriculum.)

For teachers:
3. A Practical English Grammar for Foreign Students, by Thompson and Martinet. (Full listing under secondary literary curriculum)
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Grade 11

For students:
2. A Course of English Study: First Reader, ed. by Mackin. (Also used in Grade 10 of academic and commercial secondary schools).

For teachers: 3. A Practical English Grammar for Foreign Students.

Grade 12

For students:
1. Self-Help Exercises for Practice in English: Book 1, by French. (Also used in Grade 12 of academic and commercial secondary schools)
2. A Course of English Study: Second Reader, ed by Mackin. (Also used in Grade 11 of academic and commercial secondary schools)

(There is no separate teacher's book for Grade 12.)

These texts concentrate on reading and writing in view of fact that classes meet for only two periods per week during each of three years of curriculum. 10-4 is almost only book in any curriculum that indicates need to make English teaching contribute to general objectives of education: solve problems, express self, develop character, enjoy life, etc. (p. 7). 10-2 written specially to help "children who cannot, for various reasons, hope to have a full secondary course" extend their knowledge of English (10-4, p. 5). No obvious relationship between any of these books and agriculture or rural life.

Methods are very close to those that have been used to teach English to children who speak the language as their mother tongue.

10-4 alone gives systematic attention to pronunciation: drills on contrasting sounds, relationship of spelling to pronunciation. Stress and rhythm often spoken of, but no technical help offered students or teachers who have not mastered them. Viewpoint is rather that of speech correctionist (tongue-twisters) rather than linguist (transcriptions, scientific descriptions).

Particularly in Grade 10, grammar often normative rather than functional: children learn to distinguish between concrete and abstract nouns (a distinction which has no structural relevance in English) but not to tell difference between count and mass nouns (a distinction that affects structure at many points). Teacher selects drills in 11-1 and 12-1 which students seem to need most. No structural sequencing. Drill types very limited in both 11-1 and 12-1.

Vocabulary of 10-2 probably considerably larger than that of 11-2 and 12-2. 10-2 contains many African terms that would have to be explained to Jordanian children. Very useful exercises in word-building in 12-1.
Silent reading an integral part of method embodied in 10-2 and 10-4, but not thereafter. Though time limitations make extensive reading difficult, both 10-4 and typewritten list of texts are very insistent that students must do extra library reading and that teacher must talk to them about what they have read.

In addition to listed texts, some students apparently use a workbook written to supplement 10-2 and 10-4. This requires more real composition than do any of the texts used in academic secondary schools but mixes elementary pre-composition exercises haphazardly with free composition.

Apparently no reference to dictation in any of books and no particular concern with teaching aids. 10-2 contains well known stories for children from many different countries. 11-2 and 12-2 present episodes from novels and some expository passages on such topics as water, the wheel, and rubber. There is no material dealing with Arab culture.

10-4 again differs from all other teacher's books in that it goes to some length to suggest ways in which informal, purposeful, communicative activities can be developed within the classroom: impromptu dramatizations, telling classmates about experiences, asking real questions, discussions, short talks, news bulletins, letters to real people, etc. (pp. 9-10).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The preceding analysis of curricula and instructional materials is admittedly sketchy, but the dimensions of the Survey have not permitted a more elaborate evaluation. Nor has it been possible to visit classrooms and see teachers using the materials, a procedure that would have given us a greater degree of confidence in our judgments. It does seem to us, however, that enough evidence has been gathered to justify asking those who bear the ultimate responsibility for English instruction in Jordan to consider certain tentative conclusions and recommendations.

Recommendations for the improvement of a program tend inevitably to center around what are judged to be its weaknesses. In order to avoid giving the false impression that we see no strengths to match the weaknesses in these programs of study, we would like to begin this Section by pointing out a few such strengths.

Perhaps the most obvious is the great effort made in recent years by the Ministry of Education to upgrade the major curricula. On the Ministry's initiative the basic textbook series for the compulsory cycle has been revised several times in the light of experience. The most recent revision involves changes that are sufficiently far-reaching to justify the new title given to the series, New Living English for Jordan. Especially notable has been the Introduction of a
great deal of new material dealing with Jordanian and Arab themes for which the two Jordanians who have been added to the writing staff may have been largely responsible.

An impressive first step in improving the curricula for academic secondary schools has also been taken. The preparation and publication of the English Curriculum: Secondary Stage prepares the way for replacing the entire rather ill-assorted congeries of textbooks now prescribed for those schools. The specifications laid down by the curriculum guide, the authors selected to write the new texts, and the plans to revise the series promptly in the light of feedback from teachers all give reason to hope that the new texts will be appreciably more effective than the old ones have been.

Apparently the two curriculum guides have been printed in large numbers and are easily available to all teachers. When one remembers how difficult it is in many countries to find any official description whatsoever of the program of study in English, the significance of these guides becomes obvious. Whatever shortcomings they may have, they can be seen as assurance that the Ministry will continue to formulate the curricula in over-all general terms and to set up guidelines against which textbooks and teaching can be measured.

Among the technical strengths of the present program of study, the most notable seems to be the effectiveness with which the sequencing of the features of English grammar to be taught in Grades 5-9 has been done. Two candidates for the M.A. in Teaching English as a Second Language at the American University in Cairo, Mona R. Iskander and Hoda R. Iskander, prepared for this Survey an analysis of the structures introduced in New Living English for Jordan (Books I, II, III) and Living English for Jordan (Books IV, V), which was included in the Preliminary Report. It is always possible to take issue with some of the myriad decisions that textbook authors must make in working out a very long sequence of teaching points such as that around which these books are built. A careful examination of the Iskander analysis, however, leaves us with the clear impression that the decisions made by W. Stannard Allen and his co-authors were, on the whole, very sound. The structures that are likely to be most needed for purposes of basic communication are introduced first. Simpler structures generally precede more complicated structures of which the former are elements. The degree of difficulty a given structure may involve for an Arabic-speaking learner seems sometimes to have been taken into consideration in determining how much drill to devote to that structure. Our only significant misgiving regarding the grammatical coverage of the books has to do with the pace at which new items are introduced rather than with their sequencing. The rate of entry, especially in Books I and II, seems
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to be unnecessarily slow in comparison with that maintained in successful textbooks developed for some other countries.

The third strength we should like to point out might have been widely regarded as an unforgivable weakness a few years ago. We refer to the fact that in most cases the theories advanced by linguists and psychologists to explain the nature of language and language learning appear not to have been given undue weight in the methodological decisions embodied in the program of study. Doctrinaire adherence to a theory has not been allowed to stand in the way of decisions for which there seemed to be a strong practical justification. There are thus elements of what could be called methodological inconsistency at various points in the programs. As has been noted previously, the primary-preparatory guide calls for the use of an Oral Direct Method and lists as guiding principles the tenets of an early form of the audio-lingual approach that was based largely on the theories of American structural linguistics and behavioral psychology. The corresponding textbooks sometimes make concessions to audio-lingual theory (e.g., the minimal-pair pronunciation drills for Grade 5 only), but at other times ignore it (the early emphasis on reading, the considerable reliance on dictation). The secondary guide reveals the influence of generative-transformational linguistics in its description of the grammatical patterns to be taught, but it assumes no theoretical position regarding the nature of language and language learning, contenting itself with calling for the forthcoming texts to guide teachers in the choice of the methods best suited for achieving specific goals. Traces of other methodological influences have also been noted in the preceding Sections.

Today this relative freedom from dependence on any one theoretically-based methodology can be regarded as an advantage rather than a disadvantage for a number of reasons. Changes in linguistic, psychological, and methodological theory during the past decade have been so radical, so numerous, and have come with such rapidity that it has become quite impossible for curriculum makers and textbook writers to keep pace with them in developing instructional materials. The comfortable and widespread orthodoxy among methodologists that characterized the 1950's and early 1960's and that the Jordanian primary-preparatory curriculum to some extent reflects has been shattered. But no one new widely accepted and well implemented method of language teaching has emerged to take the place of the audio-lingual or Oral Direct Method. Instead, a number of different 'cognitive', 'rationalist', or 'eclectic' approaches are being recommended with varying degrees of authority and persuasiveness (see Rivers, 1968; Jakobovits, 1970; Lugton, 1972; Chastain, 1971; Diller, 1971; Allen and Campbell, 1972; Politzer and Politzer, 1972).
Jordanian English teachers ought by all means to be aware of this ferment of new and conflicting ideas regarding methodology, but it is perhaps just as well that they are not yet committed with regard to the issues involved. Until the current situation has been considerably clarified, those in the Ministry of Education who are responsible for English instruction would probably be well advised to maintain their present non-committal attitude toward methodology. This seems to be a time for pragmatic flexibility, for trying to find out what works best, rather than for rigid adherence to any one set of methodological tenets.

If there is one over-all weakness in these programs of study that strikes us most forcibly, it is that the demands they make on students tend to be very light. This appears to be true at all the levels of language and with regard to all four basic language skills. It has been noted that the phonology of English, including its patterns of intonation and stress, are nowhere presented to students in a systematic, analytical way. Grammatical structures are covered systematically, but the number of them that students are expected to master is surprisingly small in the earlier grades. In view of the simplified nature of all the reading material included in the currently prescribed texts, it seems clear that most students graduate from secondary school without ever having come in contact with hundreds of the more complicated structures that characterize natural expository prose written for educated adults. Expectations with regard to the number of vocabulary items students will learn and the amount of culture of English-speaking countries they will become familiar with appear to be even lower. The basic skill to which most attention is paid is reading, yet students may come to the end of their program in English having read no more than 1,000 pages in eight years and having read nothing solely for the pleasure and information that can be derived from reading. Little writing is required beyond the pre-composition level. The official aims of instruction include development of the oral skills of understanding and speaking, but examinations do not attempt to measure these skills, and because of the emphasis on reading it must be hard for students to feel that teachers' expectations with regard to speaking and understanding are really very high (see Chapter I, Pg. 4).

We believe, then, that the authors of the secondary curriculum guide are fully justified in requiring that more advanced and challenging reading material be incorporated in the new textbooks. In fact, this willingness to expect more of students could well be extended to other skills and grade levels. Students do rise to challenges, and it has been abundantly demonstrated that low expectations can become a self-fulfilling prophecy.
A second pervasive weakness is the lack of a well thought-out, consistent policy with regard to the subject matter that students are asked to read and talk about. As has been pointed out, the primary-preparatory guide refers hardly at all to content; its authors seem to have been much more concerned with the linguistic elements to be taught than with the ideas to be dealt with. Much of the subject matter of the corresponding textbooks is unnecessarily trivial, and it is difficult to see how any of it could contribute substantially to the achievement of such important general educational goals as increased understanding of one's surroundings, better health habits, or more worthwhile use of leisure time.

Those who prepared the secondary guide may have had this weakness in mind when they declared content to be a matter of prime importance and insisted that even the themes dealt with in language drills should be judiciously chosen. But the guide goes on to specify only that particular attention should be paid to topics bearing on Arab culture, history, society, and institutions. Should this insistence on the importance of content not also provide a reason for believing that a degree of differentiation would be desirable in the materials read by literary and scientific students? In this respect the current texts soon to be abandoned actually go further than the new series of textbooks will go: the Oxford Secondary English Course for Jordan will apparently include no material to be read by scientific students only.

The last weakness that seems general enough to be singled out for special comment here is shared by language programs in so many other countries as to be almost predictable. It is the extent to which the official examination system has been allowed to influence the content and methods of instruction. That the Ministry of Education is aware of the problem is evidenced by the declaration in the secondary guide that examinations are not an end in themselves and should never be allowed to determine the aims of the course. The authors of that exhortation would probably agree, however, that under present circumstances it is the expression of an ideal to be sought after rather than the statement of an actual achievement.

There is much obvious evidence that the problem is as yet far from having been solved. Though every available formulation of objectives states that all four of the basic language skill are to be developed, it is clear that much more attention is paid to reading and writing than to listening and speaking, which latter the examinations make no attempt to measure directly (see Chapter I, Pg. 1. and Pg. 4). Extensive outside reading is not easy to evaluate by examination, and apparently almost none of it is done in the public schools. The fact that the guides recommend that informal communicative activities be carried on only outside of class hours is probably attributable largely
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to the inability of teachers and students to envisage this type of activity as suitable preparation for the oncoming C. S. E. E.

It would seem that a solution of the problem might be sought in at least two different ways: (1) changes in the type of examination given, and (2) changes in the method of determining whether or not students have completed their work successfully. If sub-tests for which no direct classroom preparation was possible but which measured aspects of the examinees' ability to understand spoken English were included in the official examinations, then teachers might feel justified in calling for more spontaneous oral work in their classes; true-false questions on an unfamiliar passage read aloud or the use of a tape-recorder to dictate unfamiliar passages for students to write out might serve the purpose. Among specialists in language testing is much current interest in 'cloze tests' as a way of measuring general language skills such as those developed by communicative activities (see Oller and Inal, 1971). The alternative (or additional) approach might involve such measures as allowing teachers to rank the students in their own classes—say, from 1 to 40 if there were 40 students in a class—and then converting each student's ranking by a suitable formula into a part-score that would be added to his score on the final examination. It should not be difficult for teachers to take extensive outside reading, for example, into consideration in determining the rank-order of their students.

In concluding, we offer a number of recommendations based on specific points discussed in the previous Sections of the Chapter.

1. That adequate guides for the secondary industrial and agricultural curricula be provided at the earliest possible date, and that all curriculum guides be updated as often as may be feasible. (The guides could become one of the most effective means of upgrading English instruction.)

2. That the programs of study for literary, scientific, commercial, industrial, and agricultural students should include reading material of two distinct types: (a) a central core of material to be read intensively by all students in common, and (b) particularly relevant supplementary material for each of the five groups of students, which would be read by each group alone. (There are increasingly strong reasons for believing that the vocabulary and even the structure of one special-purpose variety of English differ from those of English used for some other purpose. 'Relevance' seems to be very highly valued by most of today's youth.)

3. That future curriculum guides should specify the minimum number of pages to be read by students each year, the level of difficulty at which they should be able to read, and the speed
Curricula and Instructional Materials

with which they should be able to read silently with a given degree of comprehension. (As a means of making the programs more challenging and avoiding the inconsistencies and retrogressions from one grade to the next which occur within the present courses of study.)

4. That any new instructional materials to be chosen or prepared should be of such a nature as to contribute significantly and directly to the achievement of the non-linguistic objectives of English instruction and the general objectives of education in Jordan at each grade level. (Much of the current material seems to be related only to short-range linguistic objectives.)

5. That a systematic effort be made to improve the pronunciation of students at all instructional levels, but especially during the secondary cycle. This effort might involve the provision of superior recorded models for imitation, of reading passages with stress and intonation markings, of various types of phonetic drills, or even a limited amount of information about the sound system of English formulated in non-technical language. (As present the only systematic approach to pronunciation is made in Grade 5, the level at which students are least capable of profiting from analytical instruction.)

6. That first drafts of all new versions of textbooks be carefully checked in order to insure that the sections on grammatical structure deal only with functional aspects of grammar, provide sufficient drill material on each structure to enable students to acquire an active mastery of it, and state the grammatical principles involved succinctly and accurately. (None of the present textbooks entirely fulfills these three criteria.)

7. That the data on language use provided by this Survey be examined with care for the information it gives regarding the specific skills in English that graduates of the Jordanian schools have need of, and that this information be taken into account in determining the priority to be assigned to the teaching of each skill. (It may well be that a disproportionate amount of classroom time is now devoted to analyzing reading texts.)

8. That no complete curriculum in English should fail to provide students with a moderate amount of unsimplified reading material written in the language normally used by educated adults to express themselves in print. (See Lugton, 1971, pp. 191-230).

9. That the Ministry of Education initiate a strenuous effort to eliminate the obstacles that now stand in the way of requiring all students to complete a substantial amount of extensive reading outside of class. (See Allen and Campbell, 1972, pp. 178-184.)
10. That no complete curriculum in English should fail to provide students with an appropriate amount of experience in writing which serves a real communicative purpose or fills a real need and in the preparation of original full-length compositions. (It appears that at present the writing done by students hardly ever goes beyond the modification of model paragraphs that have no real communicative function.)

11. That plans for encouraging the greater use of teaching aids might well center around increasing the availability of transistor radios and individual tape-recorders and exploring the many and varied instructional advantages that can be derived from such relatively inexpensive equipment. (A great opportunity will be missed if various types of professionally recorded tapes are not prepared as an integral part of the Oxford Secondary English Course for Jordan. With a single tape-recorder at his disposal, a teacher can enable his students to enjoy most of the benefits that can be derived from a full-scale language laboratory.)

12. That the great value of informal communicative activities not directly related to the textbooks be recognized in future curriculum guides and that teachers be urged to provide their students with such experiences both inside and outside of class. (Students are unlikely to begin using English spontaneously after graduation if they have rarely so used it earlier.)

13. That attempts of two types be made to discourage the practice of allowing examinations to determine the nature of instruction: the inclusion in the examinations of sub-tests for which no direct classroom preparation is possible, and experimentation with ways of taking students' performance both in the classroom and on examinations into consideration for promotion and graduation. (Fortunately, the Jordanian public schools are no longer dependent on external examiners.)

14. That the lists of recommended professional readings for teachers be omitted from future curriculum guides and be replaced by separately printed or mimeographed lists that would be updated and distributed to teachers annually. (Outside agencies interested in strengthening English instruction within a country are often open to well thought-out requests for assistance in the form of professional books for school libraries, radios, and tape-recorders.)

15. That the Ministry of Education call on the University of Jordan and any eventual Training College for Teachers of English for aid in gathering much needed information about common errors in Jordanian English (a practical alternative approach to contrastive analysis), the abilities measured by various types
of examination questions, the particular interests of students of different ages, the specific reading and writing skills needed by university students, and other questions of special relevance to the development of the national programs of English instruction. (The day may be near when the University of Jordan will wish to consider establishing a post-graduate course of study that would prepare TESL specialists capable of carrying out research as well as training teachers of English.)

NOTES

1. We have been informed that, as from 1969/1970, National English Television programs have been used in Grades 10 and 11 and English by Radio programs in Grades 6, 9 and 11.

2. As from 1972/73, New Living English for Jordan Books 4 and 5 have been introduced.
IV: TRAINING OF TEACHERS

As the most important implementer of the Government's English-language policy, the English teacher is a central figure to this Survey, and it is therefore essential to describe in some detail the situation, background, and training of the teacher of English in Jordan. Like many other countries of the world, Jordan has experienced rapid growth in its educational system and now offers educational opportunities to a large number of its young citizens. A system which has undergone such rapid change in both policy and size always carries with it the remnants of an older policy, both in the types of students it produces and the types of teachers it retains, and it is to some of these issues that this Chapter addresses itself.

NEED FOR AND SUPPLY OF ENGLISH SPECIALISTS

In this Chapter we attempt to describe the dimensions of present need for trained specialists according to current qualifying standards. In so doing, we have necessarily attempted to ascertain the present supply of officially qualified teachers. Training programs of both a pre-service and in-service nature are described. An effort was made to poll unqualified teachers as to their teaching situations, educational background and attitudes toward their profession, and the results of this limited survey are also described. Certain active proposals with implications for teacher training and certification are presently before the Government; we have included as many of these as possible in order to show their relevance in our opinion to the basic task at hand.

1. Who is an English Specialist?

Who is presently officially qualified to teach English in Jordan? The Law of Education of 1964 answers this question in some detail, and we here excerpt the portions of the law dealing with the qualification of compulsory and secondary-cycle teachers:

"Compulsory Cycle: A qualified teacher in the compulsory cycle is one who has satisfactorily completed the Public Secondary Education Certificate (Tawjihi) and has attended two years in a post-secondary institute for teachers which has included professional education courses, general education courses, and a specialization.

Secondary Cycle: A teacher in the secondary cycle is certified as a qualified teacher when he has completed a B.A. degree or its equivalent and a one year professional education course or its equivalent in in-service training in education and psychology (Al-Bukhari, p. 27)."
The 1970 Supply of Qualified English Specialists

Referring to an earlier study of the teachers presently working in the system who consider themselves English specialists, Table 4 indicates that in 1970 there were approximately 739 such teachers in the compulsory cycle. At the secondary level, the number was 161. These figures include both public and private schools. Of those in the compulsory cycle, 294 were officially qualified by virtue of being graduates of a teacher-training institute, and 183 had completed university or other post-secondary training, though it is unclear from these figures if they were technically qualified by having completed the required courses in education and psychology stipulated by the 1964 Law. It is also unclear whether those qualified persons who consider themselves English specialists have in fact completed their training with a specialization in English or whether they are simply fulfilling this role for the school in which they teach. It is quite conceivable that some of these persons are qualified in some other specialization such as science, mathematics, or Arabic. For the purposes of this Survey we are assuming that persons considering themselves English specialists who have finished a teacher-training institute are qualified English-language specialists in the compulsory cycle. For secondary-cycle teachers, qualification is dependent on a B.A. degree and a special course of study in education and psychology. We were unable to ascertain how many of the secondary-school teachers with a B.A. had also satisfactorily completed this special course. Our data on officially qualified secondary school teachers are therefore incomplete.

The Demand for Specialists in the Compulsory Cycle

Table 5 assumes that all English classes in the compulsory cycle in the Kingdom are to be covered by English Specialists. These figures are for Ministry of Education schools only. We realize that in practice it is unrealistic to think that such comprehensive coverage would be possible, but as an illustration of the dimensions of the need, we find it a useful index. By multiplying the number of classes in each year of the compulsory cycle by the number of periods of English required and dividing by the full-time load of one teacher, a figure of minimum need is derived which assumes that all English specialists teach full-time in their English specialization (e.g., for Primary 5: 761 x 6 = 4566 ÷ 30 = 152). This formula indicates that the 1968-69 requirements for English specialists in Ministry of Education schools were 569.

The 1970 supply of qualified specialists, taken from figures in Table 4, was 294 in both private and Government schools. Allowing for an increased enrollment between 1968 and 1970 and also allowing for the fact that some specialists included in the 1970 figures were not teaching in Government schools, the net figure of need would have been somewhat over 300 teachers.
### Table 4

**Teachers of English Language and Literature in Jordanian Public and Private Schools**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary</strong></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>116</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preparatory</strong></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>235</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elementary</strong></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>207</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from Table 40: **Classification of Occupations** (1970)

### Table 5

**Projected Need for English Specialists 1968-1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1968-1969 Level</th>
<th>Total Classes</th>
<th>Total Hours Devoted to English</th>
<th>Total Needed English Specialists</th>
<th>Presently Qualified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary 5</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>152)</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary 6</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>135)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory 1</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>122)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory 2</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>99)</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory 3</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>81)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from our Tables 1 and 4
Two tables presented in a recently published study on the Jordan School Building Development Program are of special relevance to the problem of making maximum use of the English specialists' time.

### Table 6

Ministry of Education Schools (East Bank), by Enrollment Size, Rural or Urban, 1968-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Size</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 or More</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 to 499</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 to 399</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 to 299</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 199</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99 and Less</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>695</strong></td>
<td><strong>979</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from Table XVIII, *Jordan School Building Development Program*, Section Four, p. 36.

### Table 7

Ministry of Education Schools (East Bank), by Cycle and Location, 1968-1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grades</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - 6</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>284</strong></td>
<td><strong>695</strong></td>
<td><strong>979</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taken from Table XVIII, *Jordan School Building Development Program*, Section Four, p. 37.
It becomes abundantly clear from reading these tables that Jordanian schools can be typified as being rural and small. Table 7 indicates that of the total of 979 Ministry of Education East Bank schools in 1968-1969, 695 or roughly 70% were rural. Of these rural schools over half enrolled less than 100 pupils and almost 80% enrolled less than 200 pupils. For the purposes of this Survey we are assuming that many Jordanian schools, especially at the lower levels, are single-stream (i.e., they do not have more than one class for each grade). In single-stream primary schools it is impossible to have more than 12 periods per week devoted to English classes, six in Primary Five and six in Primary Six. The English specialist teaching at the primary level must necessarily teach other subjects in order to fill out his timetable. If every single-stream primary school in the Kingdom were to have one English specialist to cover the 12 periods available, the need for English specialists at that level alone would be considerably greater than our earlier calculations suggest. We therefore assume that a realistic figure of actual need would fall somewhere between the 589 who are presently teaching English in the compulsory cycle and the total number of compulsory cycle schools. From Table 7 we see that this total number would be slightly over 900.

In a single-stream preparatory school, an English specialist has the opportunity to teach 18 English periods per week, and Table 7 indicates that roughly one-third of the schools in the compulsory cycle include the first nine years of schooling, a situation which would allow a specialist to teach thirty periods of English per week. For the immediate future, then, it seems to us that the Government might consider the following placement patterns for qualified English specialists in the compulsory cycle, thus enabling placement of English specialists in school situations which are likely to make maximum use of their time.

1. Available qualified English specialists should be placed first in schools which have combined primary and preparatory levels, thus enabling a teacher to fill his full-time load with English classes.

2. Available qualified English specialists should be next placed in preparatory schools with more than one stream, again enabling the specialist to fill his timetable with English classes.

3. Available qualified English specialists should be next placed in primary schools with more than one stream, enabling the specialist to come nearer to filling his timetable than in single-stream primary schools.

4. Last priority should go to single-stream primary schools, where the specialist is least likely to fill his timetable in teaching his specialty.
2. The Demand for Specialists in the Secondary Cycle

At the secondary level, as explained in Chapter II, there are a variety of different types of schools. A review of these schools and a count of the classes in them was made by personnel of the Curricula and Textbooks Division of the Ministry of Education. The table below indicates the number of classes in each type of school in 1971-72.

**Table 8**

Number and Type of Ministry of Education Secondary School Classes in Jordan, 1971-1972

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Agricultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary First</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Second</td>
<td>Arts (142)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science (72)</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Third</td>
<td>Arts (89)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science (53)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are an additional 250 classes at the secondary level which are administered by private concerns, the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Health, though we have not included these in our calculations on the dimensions of need.

If we apply the same basic formula at the secondary level as we applied in the compulsory cycle, for all Ministry of Education secondary schools, the need for qualified specialists to teach English language would be approximately 175. From the 1970 figures found in Table 4, we can see that in both public and private schools there were 98 who held the B.A. degree or beyond. Of these, it is not known how many had attended special courses in education and psychology to become officially qualified. And it is not likely that all of the 98 were holders of the B.A. in English. At the secondary level, then, we find a similar problem to that of the compulsory cycle, that of too few qualified teachers to cover the English classes. We would recommend that the Government entertain a similar placement schedule to that suggested for the compulsory cycle to assure that maximum use is made of those who have a qualification in English language. This may be somewhat simpler at the secondary level because there are relatively few secondary schools, and the burden of administering a placement scheme would therefore be considerably lessened.
SOURCES AND TRAINING OF SPECIALISTS

There are now three main suppliers of officially qualified specialists in Jordan, the four teacher-training institutes, the Department of English at the University of Jordan, and the Certification and In-Service Teacher Training Institute (CITTI). The teacher-training institutes are located in Amman, Hawwara and Ajloun. The Department of English at the University of Jordan is also located in Amman. The CITTI program is headquartered in Amman and has a series of subcenters in other districts. Table 9 below, compiled by the Curricula and Textbooks Division of the Ministry of Education, summarizes the number of qualified teachers who will be graduating from these various institutions over the coming eight years.

Table 9
Projected English Graduates of Qualifying Institutions
1973-1980

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Teacher-Training Institutes</th>
<th>CITTI</th>
<th>University of Jordan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1070  630  635

The indication of new supplies of English specialists in the next eight years is indeed a good omen for the teaching of English. There will be 1700 new English specialists for the compulsory cycle and 635 for the secondary cycle. These figures do not take into account normal attrition rates or delegation to other countries so they in fact are not 'net' figures of the gain to the system. It is interesting however to study an additional table which indicates the pattern of retention of newly-trained teachers in the system over the past seven years.
Table 10
Retention in the System of Newly-Graduated English Specialists from Teacher-Training Institutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Graduation</th>
<th>Number of English Specialists Graduating in Jordan</th>
<th>Number Working in the System</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>100+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

362 300

Compiled by the Curricula and Textbooks Division of the Ministry of Education from Official Government Registers

The data which are shown in Table 10 indicate that over the past seven years the retention of new graduates has risen to 100%. The percentages above 100 might be explained by the fact that some newly-graduated trainees may have come from abroad. The high percentages in more recent years might be interpreted to mean that new graduates work in Jordan for a few years before taking other jobs, either out of the school system or in another country. In fact this is normally required by law. We have therefore chosen to use the retention figures of those qualified graduates in the mid-sixties as most realistic for the purposes of this Survey. This would mean that approximately 1000 of the 1700 projected graduates in Table 10 would remain teaching in the compulsory cycle over a relatively long period of time.
When we compare this with the expected need, as expressed in Table 5 above, it becomes apparent that the present rate of output of qualified English specialists in the compulsory cycle should be sufficient once the current gap is filled. The immediate need is being rapidly filled at the rate of 120 per year in 1973. From then onwards to 1980 the annual flow of qualified specialists will be near 200. The expected increase in new graduates from a 1971-72 high of 92 is a favorable indication of both concern for the need and plans for a solution to the problem.

Table 9 shows that there will be approximately 45 graduates of the Department of English each year for the three years between 1973 and 1975 and approximately 100 each year for the following five years. What percentage of these graduates become teachers in the system cannot be precisely determined at this point. Table 4 indicates that 98 of the 161 English teachers at the secondary level held at least the B.A. degree. A review by the Curricula and Textbooks Division of the Ministry of Education, taken from official Government records, indicates that there were 143 who held the B.A. or M.A. in English working in the system in 1972. The increase of over 40 graduates holding a B.A. qualification or beyond would indicate a high rate of retention of English graduates at this level. A further corroboration of this number was found when we looked at records in the Ministry of Education which indicate that there are 145 teachers of English who receive a scarcity allowance of 30% of their salary, though this number includes some who are working in the Ministry of Education in other than teaching posts. This scarcity allowance is given to teachers who hold a B.A. degree in English, and it is intended as an incentive to keep teachers working in Jordan. Again, given the apparent high rate of retention in the system of new English graduates from the University it appears that future supplies of English teachers at the secondary level will considerably reduce the need which exists there.

Pre-training Programs for English Specialists: The Compulsory Cycle

The training program for English specialists in the four teacher-training institutes is presently summarized in a seven-page document which has been produced by the Curricula and Textbooks Division of the Ministry of Education. This document is an unofficial guide to the institutes, and it is to be officially adopted in the near future. We are told that all four institutes are now following these suggestions.

Table 11 indicates that the two-year course followed in the teacher-training institutes is organized on a four-semester basis, the first being a general course followed by all new trainees. Selection to the institute requires that a student has satisfactorily passed the Tawjihi examination, though it is not known to us just what score or percentile
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>First Semester</th>
<th>Second Semester</th>
<th>Third Semester</th>
<th>Fourth Semester</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Arabic Language</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English Language</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>1/2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Islamic Culture</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Arab Homeland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>General Maths (for Arts)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>General Science (for Arts)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9 1/2</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 1/2</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 1/2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5 1/2</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) Science (Boys)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Science (Girls)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Arts (Boys)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Arts (Girls)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction to Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>General Psychology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Develop. &amp; Educ. Psychology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Teaching Aids</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Special Methods</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Science Specialization</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Specialization (Boys)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arts Specialization (Girls)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>20-1/2</strong></td>
<td><strong>21-1/2</strong></td>
<td><strong>23-1/2</strong></td>
<td><strong>13-1/2</strong></td>
<td><strong>80-91</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is required for entry. The members of this Survey team have been told that trainees of the institutes are generally taken from those who have not had sufficiently high scores to secure a university place. The trainee of the institute, then, generally has chosen the institute as his second priority for post-secondary education.

During the first semester all arts trainees take four credit hours in English language, two credit hours in Arabic language, one-half credit hour in physical education, one credit hour in art education, and two credit hours in Islamic culture. They also take five credit hours in math and science and four credit hours in introductory courses in education and general psychology. Two additional credit hours are taken in arts specialization. Female trainees are expected to take an additional two credit hours in home economics. The total first-semester load is therefore 20-1/2 credit hours for boys and 22-1/2 for girls.

The four-hour weekly English course in the first semester is made up of two hours of language work, one hour of comprehension and one hour of writing skills. At the end of the first semester, selection of arts students into their various specializations takes place. Selection of English specialists is based on their general performance in English language during the first semester, their English score on the Tawjihi and the personal appraisal of their English tutor.

During the second semester, the English specialist undergoes a second four-hour course in English language comprising two hours of language, one hour of reading and comprehension and one hour of writing skills. An additional six-hour course given in the second semester is devoted to study of the "language textbooks prescribed." It is unclear to us which textbooks are intended, the New Living English for Jordan series or the Longman's series, New Concept English. During each of the third and fourth semesters, the students are expected to undergo six-hour courses of English study, five hours of which are devoted to textbook study and one to the methods of teaching.

The Longman's series, New Concept English, a four-unit set which the publisher claims "leads the adult and secondary-school student who is an absolute beginner to fluent English ...." is used by all arts trainees. The curriculum calls for an English specialist to complete this series through the first half of Book III by the end of his two year course. In addition, he is expected to do 'broad reading' on his own time during the first year. This includes eleven selections from the Longman's Structural Readers Series which comprise short stories, plays and novels. During the second year, two further selections from this series are to be read, though these selections are covered in class time. We find it puzzling that the pattern for broad reading would change in the second year.
The English specialist, during his last three semesters, takes six additional hours of Arabic Language, required physical education, art education and Islamic culture of six and one half credit hours. In addition, four credit hours of a course called "Arab Homeland", two in community development, and two in general science are undertaken. Professional education courses in the last three semesters include four in developmental and educational psychology, one in methodology, two in teaching aids, five in teacher training, four in special methods and three in curriculum.

This two-year course, then, offers the English specialist ample opportunity to become familiar with the broad outlines and principles that will assist him as a teacher. It appears to us, however, that an inherent weakness in the program is the lack of time devoted to English language.

The general aims for the training of English specialists are stated on page one of the guide mentioned above. The Ministry expects the graduating specialist to be able to:

1. Understand spoken English of normal conversational speed and content.
2. Speak English with reasonable fluency; with accuracy as far as the basic structures of the language are concerned (especially all the structures of the New Living English for Jordan) with acceptable pronunciation, particularly with regard to the phoneme structure of English and to stress.
3. Read English with reasonable speed and comprehension.
4. Write English of a non-technical nature, with accuracy and in legible handwriting.

The specific objectives for the English specialists are summarized on pages one and two as follows:

1. Oral comprehension - The TTI graduate must be able to discriminate between all the phonemes of Southern Standard English utterances of a conversational nature.
2. Oral Expression - The TTI English specialist is expected to speak English of a non-technical nature with accuracy and acceptable pronunciation. He should also be able to provide a good oral reading model.
3. Reading - The new graduate English specialist is expected to read at least 350 words per minute with at least 80% comprehension.
4. Writing - The TTI graduate English specialist must be able to write in a legible cursive script with correct punctuation, a high standard of grammatical accuracy and a logical progression of ideas.
Other skills which should be learned by the English specialist include the correct use of a dictionary, including familiarity with phonetic scripts and other guides to pronunciation. Correct use of a library is also noted as an important skill. Note-taking and broad reading, with special reference to these two skills in giving the English specialist access to works in his field, are also included as important targets in the two-year course.

The methods section of the guide indicates that the Ministry wishes all to become practitioners of the aural-oral method, though, as is noted elsewhere in this Survey, the actual teaching materials which the specialist is to use do not follow this orthodoxy in its strictest sense.

The guide states on page two that the specialist should be trained in "the principles of the aural-oral method", which is typified as follows:

a. The importance of placing the language skills in logical order, i.e., listening, speaking, reading and writing.

b. The importance of habit formation, especially in the early years, with particular reference to:
   i. Aural discrimination;
   ii. Pronunciation (especially of those sounds affected by mother-tongue interference);
   iii. Structure recognition and comprehension;
   iv. Structure formation;
   v. Reading skills with emphasis on speed and comprehension;
   vi. Writing skills with emphasis on penmanship and correct structure formation.

The second major section on methodology, on page three of the guide, is called "Application of the Aural-Oral Method", and the first part is well worth quoting in full:

The primary importance of training pupils to listen and to speak before attempting to teach them to read and write. This implies a certain sequence in the teaching method: i.e., every new word or structure must be heard before it is spoken and must be spoken before it is read or written. (underlining ours)

It seems to us that this particular expression of orthodoxy is no longer as indisputable as it seemed at one time, and that the curriculum might be somewhat weakened by such a definite statement on the teaching method. As mentioned elsewhere in this Survey in view of the weakness of the spoken English of teachers in the compulsory cycle, a strict adherence to this method might in fact not be in the best long-term interests of the pupil and his teacher.

The guide further details on page three "methods of inculcating sound language habits" which entail daily practice on sound
discrimination and structure drill for both recognition and formation. Specifically the guide mentions that the specialist should be taught techniques such as "dramatization, contextualization, use of situation techniques, pattern practices, substitution drills and substitution tables." Techniques for the teaching of reading are also listed, and they include the use of flash cards, model oral reading, silent reading, comprehension questions and eye movement. Writing skills in the early stages are to emphasize penmanship, correct practice in shape formation, and correct hand movement. In later stages various techniques of pre-composition — dictation, slot filling, question answering, summarizing — are prescribed.

A very helpful proposal, which we endorse, has been made by Miss Salma Jayyusi, Head of the English Section of the Curriculum Directorate, Ministry of Education. This proposal — a plan for a training college for teachers of English — appears as Appendix B. We think it deserves full and serious attention from Government leaders. Miss Jayyusi identifies two important weaknesses in the present system — an erratic pattern in the annual flow of English specialist graduates and insufficient English-language training in the syllabus. The plan would separate English specialists from others and train them in a special institution. Furthermore, English would be used as the medium of instruction for almost all subjects. It is this latter feature which we feel represents the greatest opportunity for the student to learn English. There is strong evidence (Lambert and Tucker, 1972) to suggest that a student learns the language best when he studies other subjects through the target language medium, a point which Miss Jayyusi strongly and correctly puts forth.

The proposal further states that there would be an emphasis on language training, both in the classroom and in the language laboratory. Time would also be given to "basic insights into phonology, linguistics and comparative Arabic-English studies." A further advantage is presented when Miss Jayyusi suggests that "...the daily life and routine of the Institute, its social life and activities, and all co-curricular functions would be conducted as far as possible in English." The proposed institute would be co-educational, and the location would be in Amman, thus enabling more flexible and better quality staffing and better library facilities. Miss Jayyusi points to certain advantages in staffing, claiming that less staff would be required than at present.

The intake would be between 120-200 students per year, slightly less than present projections indicated in Table 9.

Miss Jayyusi points out that the Institute could eventually become a resource for English language teaching and research for the entire country, serving a variety of important functions other than that of training. We strongly concur on this point, and we feel that better
incoming students could be attracted with the development of such a training and research institute. This leads us to ask questions which were not answered in Miss Jayyusi's proposal. Where will the students come from? How will they be selected? When will they be selected? As they finish secondary school or at the end of their first semester in another teacher-training institute?

We suggest that, if such an English-medium institute is organized in Jordan, it would be best to select students at the end of their secondary schooling, after they have successfully completed the Tawjihi. Selection might be based not solely on Tawjihi English scores, but, among other considerations, on a language aptitude examination which would be devised especially for the institute. A further testing instrument would be an English-language proficiency examination which would be devised along different lines from those of the Tawjihi. These two instruments would help select students on the basis of their present language ability as well as innate linguistic capacity, thus enabling the institute to select those who may not have had an opportunity to learn English better because of a peculiarity in their environment, location or school situation.

The implementation of Miss Jayyusi's proposal would substantially change the nature of the existing English departments in teacher-training institutes. These departments, in addition to their job of training specialists, are also responsible for the service course for non-specialists. The need to maintain this service course at a high level of quality should be kept in mind when considering Miss Jayyusi's proposal.

Until such a college can be organized there are several measures which would incorporate the important considerations in Miss Jayyusi's proposal while maintaining a strong English Department at each of the existing teacher-training institutes. If English specialists, selected after the first semester in a teacher-training institute, could be given an intensive summer course in English language which would be followed by a standardized proficiency examination, there would be greater likelihood of establishing a higher language proficiency among English specialists. The purposes of the proficiency exam would be to aid final selection of specialists and to plan the remaining language program in the last training year. The use of English as a medium of instruction for all courses taken by the English specialist could still be accomplished by making this official policy for the English Departments of the various teacher-training institutes. The combination of an intensive course of English in the summer after selection and the use of English as a medium of instruction within the English Departments could help the Government succeed in its desire to create a higher proficiency in English language for the English specialist.
If a way could be found to select the English specialist at the end of his secondary schooling it would allow the additional semester for intensive language instruction and would perhaps avoid the necessity of a summer intensive program. This would involve some use of the Tawjihi scores as well as the administration of both a proficiency test and a language aptitude test in the summer after secondary school completion. Carrying out this suggestion would entail, of course, a complete restructuring of the curriculum for English specialists in the teacher-training institutes, but might facilitate their acquisition of a higher competence in English language. The use of English as a medium of instruction by only the English specialists would require that they be separated from the other students in the institutes, thus causing a somewhat less efficient use of the periods presently devoted to core courses in psychology and education which are taught in Arabic.

IN-SERVICE ACTIVITIES

The Certification and In-Service Teacher Training Institute (CITTI) was established in 1971 to "...improve the quality of education in Jordan through the establishment of a project designed to raise the academic and professional qualifications of teachers in the compulsory cycle." (Campbell, et. al., page 5). CITTI graduates, then, are given a certificate which is equivalent to that of the teacher-training institutes, thus providing the unqualified teacher an opportunity to enter a formal education institution while still maintaining full-time employment. When CITTI is in full operation, in 1973, there will be between 90 and 100 English specialists graduating each year. The CITTI scheme requires a summer orientation of two weeks followed by a one-semester core curriculum which includes English language for all new trainees. At the beginning of the second semester, all trainees choose a specialization. The language work is carried out in a self-study residential format. Trainees meet under the supervision of a tutor once weekly. During these contact sessions they review material from the previous week and new material is introduced. Each English specialist has a tape recorder for home-study purposes. The central CITTI headquarters in Amman is responsible for lesson design and writing (Campbell, et al., pp. 5-11).

As a model for large-scale teacher upgrading the CITTI program is seen as a very unique program. The close supervision and evaluation of the program being carried out by the Ministry of Education are highly commendable. The home-study program, in our opinion, requires especially close evaluation as it is a major departure from normal language-teaching practice. If trainees significantly improve their English during the two-year program, the implications for both a secure CITTI program and projects which might be modeled
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The program of upgrading which is represented in CITTI is indeed an important development for English-language teaching in Jordan. Not only will CITTI be the major single supplier of qualified English specialists in the Kingdom but it occurs to us that the juxtaposition of training and probable every-day application of skills learned in training will assist in bringing about a more effective over-all result.

The 30 English specialists enrolled in the CITTI program in the summer of 1972 were administered a questionnaire (reproduced as Appendix E) in English to discover their backgrounds, interests, and attitudes. Some of the results to this questionnaire are summarized as follows:

1. All have at least a secondary-school education, a CITTI prerequisite;
2. Twenty-five percent had either some university or teacher-training education;
3. All had come from literary streams in secondary schools;
4. More than half had attended other intensive courses;
5. All were teaching in government schools;
6. Half had been teaching between six and ten years; 40% had been teaching less than six years;
7. Forty per cent are teachers at the primary stage;
8. Forty per cent teach 28 periods or more each week;
9. Sixty per cent teach less than 75% of their classes as English periods;
10. Overwhelmingly, the English specialists also taught Arabic classes;
11. All considered their reading ability in English either "good" or "excellent";
12. All but two of the 30 considered their spoken English either "fair" (10) or "good" (18);
13. Two-thirds thought their writing ability "good";
14. Over 80% considered their understanding of spoken English either "good" (23) or "excellent" (2).

The CITTI curriculum is based on a course and credit format. The students are expected to cover 23 credit hours of work over four semesters and two summers. Language practice occupies a large portion of the two-year course. It represents 14 of the 23 credits. Four credits are devoted to teaching methodology while three credits are devoted to linguistics and two to phonetics.

The language component of 14 credits includes two credits in the first semester, three in the second, two in the first summer with an emphasis on oral work, three in each of the semesters of the second year and one in the last summer school. The language course is
based entirely on the New Concept English series which is also used in the pre-service course. Given the unique approach being employed by CITTI, it is not possible for us to give opinions on the appropriateness of this distribution. The fact that 14 credit hours of the 23 are devoted to direct language instruction strikes us as strongly justified on the basis that language skill is essential to the future effectiveness of the teacher.

The remaining nine credit hours of the certification scheme for English specialists are distributed as follows:

**Semester II:**
- 1 credit hour of phonetics

**Semester III:**
- 1 credit hour of phonetics
- 1 credit hour of methods
- 1 credit hour of linguistics

**Semester IV:**
- 2 credit hours of methods
- 2 credit hours of linguistics

**Summer III:**
- 1 credit hour of methods

The phonetics course, representing two credit hours, impresses us as a practical approach to this subject area. Pronunciation problems incorporating contrastive points of probable difficulty are emphasized. The three credit hours in linguistics include considerations on the nature of language, morphology, phonetics, phonemics and syntax. Again, contrastive points are emphasized.

The methodology component of four credit hours comprises considerations as to the role of the teacher, various approaches to the teaching of English as a foreign language, teaching of specific points of pronunciation, grammar, writing and reading, testing and self-evaluation of teaching, audio-visual materials and other classroom aids (Campbell, et al., Appendix II).

Co-curricular activities, an especially important element in a scheme of this nature, include the use of radio and television programs and recordings which are distributed to the trainees on a weekly basis. The objectives for methodology are to acquaint the trainee with modern techniques of language teaching, use of professional reference materials, the selection, production, utilization and evaluation of teaching aids.

It is interesting to note that the CITTI curriculum does not advocate any specific method of language teaching, though English specialists working in the CITTI headquarters did tell us that they concentrate in their methods training on the New Living English for Jordan series which is used nationally in the school system.

The University of Jordan; Department of English

The major institution in Jordan which supplies qualified teachers of English for the secondary cycle is the Department of English at the University of Jordan. Established in 1962, the Department has
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produced a relatively stable number of 45 to 50 graduates annually. The annual number of graduates is expected to rise to 100. The faculty has grown and diversified in recent years, and in addition to a highly professional staff with a strong interest in literature, there are also several faculty members whose primary interest is linguistics and language teaching. Faculty from the Department serve as advisors to the Ministry of Education, especially as regards curriculum planning, and are also responsible for the service course for non-specialists which is offered university-wide.

The broad involvement of the faculty in planning and implementation of English-language programs both for the university and the country as a whole is indeed an important positive factor in the future development of a strong and viable English-language policy in the country. We have included a very useful statement on teacher training as Appendix D which was prepared by one of the faculty of the Department, Dr. Mohamed Hasun Ibrahim. This paper, "The Training of English Teachers in Jordan", represents an excellent over-all view of teacher training for English specialists for the future and it offers as well some excellent suggestions on the role which can be uniquely played by the University. We refer to the document more specifically at a later point in this chapter, but wish to make it known that we find it a comprehensive and very useful document in its entirety.

During the recent general university changeover to a credit system, the Department of English took the opportunity to reorganize its program offerings for English specialists. Before this reorganization, it had been impossible for a student in the Department to have a language specialization. With the more structured approach offered by the credit system such a specialization is now possible, and it has taken several forms, all based on the specific future needs of the student. The course offerings of the Department are included in this Survey as Appendix K. Essentially, they now make it possible for an undergraduate student to choose among three specializations in the Department — language, literature and language education.

Under the new scheme in the Department, in addition to the University Faculty of Arts and ancillary requirements amounting to 48 credit hours, the English major in both language and literature must undertake 54 hours of compulsory subjects offered by the Department. These compulsory subjects cover both literature and language, and they may be found in Appendix K. Among these compulsory subjects are five in literature which provide a survey from the year 1370 to the present time. The language courses are four in number, and they include these courses: Language Skills, Study Skills, Pronunciation and Speech, and Reading and Writing. There are two required courses in Shakespeare and two in linguistics. Additional course requirements
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are criticism, Greek and Roman Mythology, Homer to the Reformation, Reformation to Modern Times, and Translation of Arabic Texts.

The specialization in either language or literature is achieved through the choice of electives in either language or literature (see Appendix J). A student choosing a literature specialization must undertake five courses from Schedule B. For those who wish to undertake a specialization in language, a selection of five courses from Schedule A must be made.

For those pursuing a specialization in language and education, most of whom will become teachers of English in secondary schools, 33 credit hours of University and Faculty of Arts courses are required. Instead of 54 hours of departmental compulsory subjects, there are 45 hours of such requirements. These include the same courses in language and literature which are detailed above, with the exception of the three courses in the cultural backgrounds to literature comprising Greek and Roman Mythology and the two surveys of Homer to Modern Times. The language-education major, then, is given a choice of fifteen hours of departmental electives in language and literature taken from Schedules A and B. He has the additional option of taking as electives any or all of the three courses from the cultural backgrounds to literature component. The language-education major also undertakes 33 credit hours of education and psychology courses offered by the Faculty of Education, thus enabling him to become officially certified upon the completion of his B.A. degree.

This new program at the University is a very important step toward relating the training of students to their future careers. It demonstrates the logic of combined courses of study which include language, literature and linguistics and optional degree programs for undergraduate students. There will be great advantages for students who will be teachers of English language in the secondary school. It is our opinion that the Department could have taken no better decision to serve its students and the needs of the country.

One possible rearrangement of courses which we feel could strengthen the preparation of the future English language teacher comes to mind. In the list of elective subjects which are offered to the language specialist there are two which we feel are essential to any teacher of English as a second or foreign language. At least one course in methodology of language teaching would be a considerable help to the future teacher. Since language teaching is a specialized skill and there are techniques which can easily be learned to benefit both the teacher and his future students, it occurs to us that a methodology course might be required of all English majors because even the literature specialist may have some occasion to use this information in later years. At least, we feel that a language-teaching
methodology course should be required of the language specialist. A
similar suggestion, though this would apply only to those specializing
in language, would be to require at least one course in the structure
of modern English. In the present course structure, it would be
possible for a student to choose a number of combinations of courses
which would prevent him from taking any descriptive grammar. If a
way could be found of altering the requirements for specialists, we
feel that the inclusion of a course on English structure would be very
useful.

In-Service Training

There are several regular in-service courses offered to unqualified
teachers in Jordan. They are sometimes given during school holidays,
though they are most commonly given during the summers. Summer
courses are from four to six weeks in duration.

Holiday and mid-year courses may last from one day to one week.
It was unfortunately impossible for us to obtain detailed information on
the in-service courses traditionally offered to English specialists,
though we were told that there is no particular sequencing pattern
which would allow trainee teachers to group several such courses over
a given period of time to allow a focused effort at upgrading.

We feel that the very useful suggestions in this regard which are
contained in Ibrahim’s proposal (attached as Appendix C) are well
worth consideration for the future. Ibrahim states that "...any
effective training program for the teachers of English must include
two broad types of activity: (1) improving the teachers' grasp of
English, and (2) improving the teachers' professional adequacy" (page
4). He then sets forth a plan for the organization of a training program
which would help realize these goals.

Ibrahim’s first suggestion is that the Ministry offer language
courses for those who have obtained different levels of proficiency.
Interested teachers would be given a proficiency test which would as-
certain the level at which they would begin their training. Those who
have more than an adequate command of English would take courses
in pedagogy and psychology.

He suggests that there be three levels of English courses offered -
elementary, intermediate, and advanced. A practicing teacher would
be given the opportunity to undertake these courses after school hours.
Once he had satisfactorily completed the advanced course and proven
his ability by passing a proficiency examination, he would then be
eligible for a second group of courses. The list of courses suggested
in his proposal (Appendix C) includes the following:

(1) English usage and varieties of English;
(2) Introduction to general linguistics;
(3) The structure (grammar) of English;


(4) English phonetics and phonology;
(5) Contrastive analysis of English and Arabic;
(6) Teaching and testing English as a second language (two courses).

Ibrahim suggests that both sets of courses be offered during the summers as well as during the school year. He does not mention any incentive measures for trainees and we feel that some such measures might be considered (e.g., the sequencing of courses to lead to a Certificate or Diploma).

Though the CITTI program was established to help upgrade and certify teachers already working in the system, it is not possible for CITTI to include in its program all who need such training. Since the Ministry does offer in-service programs in addition to CITTI, we would suggest that a systematic organization of those courses might be achieved at minimal cost to the Government and with great gain to the teaching of English in the country.

THE UNQUALIFIED TEACHER

In an attempt to get some idea of the background, attitudes and current teaching situation of unqualified teachers who are expected to teach English in the compulsory cycle in Jordan, a questionnaire was administered in English to 146 such teachers who enrolled in a special summer course in August, 1972, sponsored by the Ministry of Education. This questionnaire appears as Appendix E. The average age of the 146 teachers whose responses were tabulated was 25. The average number of years of teaching experience was slightly less than four. Both of these general characteristics of the group are considered to be very important because of the long period of service ahead of them.

The breakdown of educational attainment among the group is as follows:

1. Five, or slightly over 3%, had completed a Bachelor's degree;
2. Thirty-three, or about 22%, had some university training;
3. Seven, or about 5%, had finished a teacher-training institute, but had specialized in something other than English;
4. Four, about 3%, had attended a teacher-training institute but had not completed their work;
5. Eighty-four, just under 60%, had completed satisfactorily both secondary school and the Tawjihi examination;
6. Three, about 2%, had completed secondary school.

As implied above, the common characteristics of all groups were their youth and their average of from four to five years of teaching experience. When one considers the proposal for formalizing these in-service efforts in the manner described above, in Ibrahim's proposal, there will certainly be an appreciable return on the
Government's investment by focusing efforts on young experienced teachers.

1. Unqualified Teachers with Secondary Education and Tawjihi

While it was useful to have however small a sample of teachers with different educational attainments, for the purposes of this study, it is from those teachers in group five above that some detailed information would be most useful. Not only does this group make up the majority of our sample, but, from what we have been told, it is this group which typifies unqualified teachers as a whole and which would therefore certainly represent future focused upgrading efforts.

Of the 84 respondents in our sample at this educational level 60% were female, an atypical phenomenon, we are told, relative to the teaching profession as a whole. The average age of the entire group was just under 26, with only seven persons being older than 25. Seventy-two had been enrolled in a literary stream at the secondary level, and all but two were native speakers of Arabic.

The average years of teaching experience among the group, all but six of whom teach in government schools, was five and one half years. Forty-one, or about 49%, teach solely at the elementary level. Of these, ten, or about 12%, teach only one elementary class and the remainder teach English in several elementary classes. A further 28 teachers, a third of the total, teach English in combined preparatory elementary schools. Thus, somewhat over 80% of the respondents in this category of our sample report that they teach English in more than one class.

A further point of interest is that 75% of the teachers in this portion of the sample report teaching a full-time load of 28 periods per week or more. All reported teaching more than 24 hours. Of the respondents, one reported teaching more than 28 periods of English. A further 11 teachers, or 13%, teach between 21 and 27 periods of English per week. Twenty-two teachers, or 26%, teach between 14 and 20 English periods per week. A further 30 respondents teach between seven and 13 periods of English per week. A trend toward filling the hours of the English specialist with English classes can be seen, though it is not possible to determine from these data whether this is a trend set by circumstances or convenience. The questionnaire did not ask respondents to list the number of periods devoted to other subjects and therefore yields somewhat ambiguous findings since obviously some teachers do teach more than two subjects. It is important to note, however, that only six respondents reported that they teach all subjects in one elementary class. This leads us to assume that there is some tendency to specialize in one or two subject areas. Arabic was indicated by over 40% of the respondents as the subject most often taught after English. Over 30% of the respondents reported
teaching science and mathematics. Seventeen, or just over 20%, reported teaching physical training, though this is most often a routine subject in the primary and preparatory cycle, with each teacher taking some periods in the week to supervise physical education. The remaining subject periods were fairly evenly distributed over the curriculum.

The self-rated proficiency in English, question 20 of the questionnaire, revealed that in understanding spoken English, reading and writing, a majority of the respondents in this portion of the sample felt their ability in these areas to be either "Good" or "Excellent". Ninety percent, 78%, and 81% reported such proficiency in the three respective areas. In spoken English, 9% rated themselves "Excellent", 49% rated themselves "Good", and 42% rated themselves "Fair". As has been stated earlier in this Survey, these self-rating scales are not necessarily meaningful in absolute terms, though they do have high reliability in relative terms. The respondents in this particular sample therefore seem to be well chosen relative to their peers, against whom they are rating themselves.

Only three of the respondents reported that they felt their English was adequate for their needs. The remainder wished to improve their skills in the following order of priority: Speaking (73%); Understanding (45%); Writing (38%); and Reading (35%). It is interesting to note that, with the exception of understanding and writing, the felt need for improvement is a mirror of their self-rated proficiency. The inversion of the skills of understanding and writing is probably a function of the small sample size.

Sixty respondents reported that they attempt to improve their English by attending summer courses and/or by private study. Fifty-five felt that there were insufficient opportunities to improve their English, and they felt overwhelmingly that they would like to be given further courses.

On question 25, relating to changes they would like to see in the number of periods allotted to English or the number of years in which it is taught, the results were as follows:

1. thirty-one would adopt the status quo;
2. nineteen would increase the number of periods of English by an average of eight;
3. thirty-three would increase the number of years in which English is taught, though this question was so ambiguous as to preclude any serious attempt at analysis;
4. six would decrease the number of years in which English is taught.

Forty-nine of the respondents reported that they enjoyed English teaching but felt inadequately prepared for the job. Six reported that they did not like English teaching but thought they would like it better
had they had appropriate training. Only one reported a preference to teach another subject.

Question 27 asked if the respondents felt they had enough guidance from the Ministry of Education. Thirty-nine out of 69 answered negatively. Fifteen thought that additional courses would help and 21 felt a need for additional audio-visual materials, including radio, wall charts, tape recorders and records. Sixty-one of the 79 respondents answering question 28 regarding the pupils' texts thought that they were adequate. Ten thought them too easy and seven thought them too difficult. One found them unsuitable because they did not relate to Jordanian society. Fifty of the respondents to question 29, relating to attitudes about the teachers' books used in the schools, found them adequate. Seventeen thought they gave too much guidance to the teachers, while 15 thought they were not structured enough.

Question 30, relating to pupils to whom this group teaches English, revealed that 34 thought their students were adequately prepared for the English class, while 38 thought that they were ill-prepared for the English class. Sixty-seven of the 80 teachers answering question 31 thought their pupils would be adequately prepared for the next grade. This shows a healthy self-respect among the group regarding their own ability as teachers.

Seventy-three of the 79 respondents answering question 32 felt that their pupils needed a good knowledge of all the skills of English. Two felt that only a good reading ability was important, while four thought that only a speaking ability was important. Again, the attitude of the teachers is overwhelmingly positive about the goals of their pupils. It seems to us, then, that this particular group of teachers have a number of very important positive factors in their favor. They have a generally high regard for their own ability in English, they are young and experienced, they tend to have a desire to improve their teaching ability and their general ability in English language; many feel the Government policy regarding English should allow more time to be spent on its study; they are generally satisfied with teaching materials; they have healthy self-esteem for themselves as English teachers and for the need for a general ability in English among their pupils. By virtue of their attendance in this summer course, and, for some, in previous ones, it seems that there is a genuine desire among the group to seriously pursue their interest in improvement.

2. Unqualified Teachers with some Post-secondary Training

Among those respondents who had undergone some university or other post-secondary training, the responses showed similar trends though there were some responses which are worth noting. The average age of the group was slightly over 26. There were 21 male and 12 female respondents in the group. Twenty-six of the 29 who
responded to question five, on secondary-school experience, claimed to have been enrolled in the literary stream. In response to question seven, relating to in-service courses, 15 of the respondents had attended two or more such courses of study.

Of the 31 respondents answering question nine, seven had attended neither a TTI nor the University, five had specialized in English at either a TTI or the University and 19 had specialized in various fields related to arts, commerce and law. Thirty of the 31 were teaching in Government Schools. The average teaching experience of the group was five years.

The same pattern of teaching specialization emerges among this group as it does for the group with only secondary and Tawjihi. Twenty-two of the respondents teach English in several classes. Fourteen, slightly under 50%, teach more than 14 English periods per week. Only eight teach less than five periods. Again, Arabic is the subject most often taught in addition to English, with ten respondents listing this subject. Science and mathematics are listed by seven respondents. Physical training, again, is high on the list with ten respondents.

The results on the self-rated proficiency scale show an interesting trend in that these 32 respondents consider their abilities in English higher in all categories than those with less education. Ninety-six per cent claimed a reading ability of either "Good" or "Excellent". Eighty per cent considered their speaking, writing and understanding of spoken English as either "Good" or "Excellent". This result appears to corroborate the theory that respondents rate themselves accurately relative to their peers.

The same trends appear in this group in answer to questions on attitudes toward English teaching and increasing the number of periods and/or years in which English is taught. Again, this group feels that it prepares its students well for the next class and they feel quite strongly that a thorough knowledge of English is a necessity for their pupils.

In remarking on the background data on this group of unqualified English specialists we do not wish to give the impression that all unqualified English specialists in the country would respond similarly. The sample was not scientifically selected, and it cannot therefore be said to be representative. The manner of selection of this group is not known to us in fact. We do feel, however, that the administration of this questionnaire served as a beginning to collecting information about unqualified teachers.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In Chapter IV we have ascertained that, while there is presently a shortage of qualified teachers in both the compulsory and secondary
cycles of Ministry of Education schools, there are also plans already being implemented which should rapidly fill this shortage. The change in the training of secondary-school teachers at the University of Jordan and the various proposals to improve the training of compulsory-cycle teachers are very encouraging indications of a likely general improvement in the quality of linguistic and pedagogical skills among the expanded group of specialists entering the teaching professions.

We offer for consideration the following recommendations which appear relevant to the ongoing process of improving the training of the English specialist.

1. That the Government consider a placement scheme for English specialists which would enable them to teach English during as many as possible of their working hours.

2. That the teacher-training institutes consider softening their stands of strict adherence to any particular method of language teaching.

3. That the Government consider various ways in which the English specialist might be given a greater command of the English language, whether through an English-medium teacher-training institute or through intensive instruction in English during the summer.

4. That a standardized English proficiency examination be devised to aid in the selection of English specialists at the teacher-training institutes.

5. That a language aptitude examination be devised to help select trainees on the basis of their innate linguistic capacity.

6. That every effort be made to assist the CITTI program in monitoring the language progress of its trainees in order to determine the efficacy of this unique approach to teacher training.

7. That certain alterations be considered in the course requirements for the Department of English of the University of Jordan in order to assure that all graduates have a special course in the methodology of language teaching.

8. That in-service courses be organized in a way to allow an accumulation of linguistic and pedagogical skills.

9. That a further attempt be made to carry out field work related to the unqualified teacher. (We feel that such information will be very helpful in any of the various in-service efforts presently in progress and for similar efforts in the future.)
FIELD STUDY—BACKGROUND AND METHODOLOGY

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

The Field Study was conducted to collect information for a large group of Jordanians about their patterns of language use. Specifically, we wanted to obtain a detailed description of the extent to which they use English in a wide variety of situations, for both business and non-business matters; and then to assess the relationship between their actual use of English and factors such as educational attainment, occupation, location of business, age, sex and salary. Furthermore, we wanted to collect reasonably complete information about their educational history, their language training, and their reported English proficiency.

In this way, we hoped to be able to provide a body of facts and documented opinions for Jordanian educators concerning the extent to which English is actually used by various groups of Jordanians and the extent to which the formal program of English-language teaching in the schools meets the respondents' needs.

Thus, one important purpose of our Field Study was to complement the other phase of our Survey. In the first phase, described in Chapters 1-4, we have examined the aims for English-language teaching in Jordan, the dimensions of the English teaching effort, and the various resources available to implement this program. Having done this, we can legitimately ask a series of questions such as whether the teaching materials reflect the curricula, whether the teachers appear to be adequately trained to implement the curricula, etc. Many investigators have utilized the approach that we have taken in the first phase of our survey. It is our feeling, however, that such information becomes more meaningful when it is examined within the context of the actual needs which Jordanians or any other people have for English in their daily activities. This implies that people's needs for English should be allowed to influence the scope and design of the English-language program.

METHODOLOGY

At the request of the Ministry of Education, the Field Study was formally conducted by the Jordanian Department of Statistics. Staff from the Department, collaborating closely with the authors and with a liaison committee from the Ministry of Education, assumed responsibility for selecting the sample of respondents, hiring and training the enumerators, printing the questionnaire, and for collecting,
coding, punching and analyzing the data. This work was expertly conducted under the direct guidance of Mr. Wasef Azar.

The Sample: The respondents were chosen to represent a sample of the Jordanian work force stratified by level of educational attainment. We drew representatives from five levels: 13% had completed less than preparatory education; 15% had completed preparatory, but not secondary schooling; 30% had completed secondary schooling; 13% had completed post-secondary institute training; and 29% had completed university training (B.A. or beyond). At each of the five levels, we selected a sample of respondents randomly with respect to occupation. Respondents were chosen from both the public and the private sector. The size of the sample was 4804.

We wish to state clearly that our sample does not reflect the present distribution of the Jordanian work force by level of educational attainment. We have overrepresented in our sample the percentage of highly-educated respondents. We have done this intentionally. By doing so, we believe that we can provide the Ministry of Education with a more meaningful and useful set of data upon which to base their educational decisions for the next decade. The Ministry, for example, anticipates an increased enrollment of 300% at the secondary level over the next eight years, and it is clear that the percentage of Jordanians proceeding to higher education will increase drastically in the near future. Furthermore, it has been our experience with previous language surveys that the reliability of the information has increased with the respondents' level of educational attainment.

The Questionnaire: A 47 item, three-part questionnaire was designed by the authors in collaboration with the liaison committee from the Ministry of Education. The questionnaire is reproduced in Arabic as Appendix E and in English as Appendix F. We collected basic demographic information (questions 1 to 9 and 19 to 22), sociolinguistic information concerning the respondents' use of the various English skills with a variety of interlocutors in diverse situations (questions 10 to 18), and information about topics such as their subjective impressions of their English-language proficiency, and satisfaction with various aspects of their formal English-language training at school (questions 23 to 47).

The original questionnaire was prepared in English and then translated into Arabic by specialists at the Department of Statistics. The liaison committee from the Ministry of Education verified the accuracy and appropriateness of the final form of the questionnaire.

A system's analyst, Mr. Abdulla Sammour, working with us, developed a coding format to be incorporated into the questionnaire to facilitate data processing. The final, pre-coded questionnaires were then printed in Arabic by the Department of Statistics.
The Enumerators: Enumerators were hired and trained thoroughly by the Department of Statistics personnel. Their training included an introduction to survey techniques and an intensive familiarization with the questionnaire. They also conducted a series of supervised "practice" interviews. After the one week training program and a written examination, thirty-four university graduates were selected as enumerators for the Field Study. A member of the liaison committee from the Ministry of Education attended all training sessions and acted as one of four supervisors during the Field Study. All interviewing was conducted in Arabic.

Duration of Study: The formal interviewing began on July 8 and all field work was completed by August 7.

METHOD OF ANALYSIS

As the questionnaire was being developed, we worked closely with system's analyst Mr. Abdulla Sammour to make certain that questions and response alternatives were stated in a manner amenable to rapid, unambiguous coding, punching and processing. This meant that a majority of the questions had a series of forced-choice response alternatives (i.e. they were not open-ended).

Specification of Output: As the final form of the questionnaire was being prepared, we developed simultaneously the complete set of 93 "dummy" tables to specify explicitly the anticipated form of the data. The analyses, in general, take the form of tables summarizing the frequency and proportion of respondents choosing each alternative for each question as well as a series of bivariate or multivariate distributions examining the relationship among response patterns and demographic characteristics such as educational attainment, occupation or sex.

By specifying completely the desired form of the output before the data were collected, we accomplished two purposes: first, we were able to eliminate redundant or meaningless questions from our questionnaire; and second, the programming necessary to analyze the data was completed while the interviewing was in progress.

Coding and Punching of Data: The questionnaires were precoded, and data were punched directly from the documents. This was done by regular employees of the Department of Statistics.

Processing of the Data: The data processing began on August 17 and was completed on September 9. The data took the form of three copies of the 93 specified tables.

Availability of Data: The raw data are available on tape at the Department of Statistics. They may be used for further analyses with the permission of the Ministry of Education and the Department of Statistics.
Cost of Field Study: The cost of the Field Study, excluding senior consultants' salaries was approximately US $12,000.

NOTES

1. This liaison committee consisted of Miss Salma Jayyusi, Mr. Ahmad Tawii and Mr. Ibrahim Arna'out.

2. We have included as Appendix G the list of initial questions around which we developed our questionnaire. Although we could neither include nor answer completely every one of these questions in our Survey, we felt that they would interest future researchers.
VI: FIELD STUDY—PRESENTATION OF DATA

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

The 4804 respondents were selected to represent a random sample of public and private-sector employees at each of five levels of educational attainment. All were Jordanian citizens. The sample comprised 88% males and 12% females. Eighty per cent of the respondents were employed in Amman; 16% in various towns with a population greater than 5000; and 4% in villages with a population less than 5000. An overwhelming majority (98%) reported Arabic to be their mother tongue. Likewise, the majority (80%) were Moslems although a sizeable minority claimed to be Christian (20%). Apparently, the actual percentage of Christians in Jordan is somewhat less than 20%. By our deliberate selection of many highly-educated respondents (see Chapter V, Page 82), we may have overrepresented in our sample groups of individuals who tend to be Christian such as teachers in private schools.

The mean age of the respondents was 29.8 years (standard deviation = 8.2). They had attended formal schooling for an average of 12.6 years (standard deviation = 3.3).

Thirty-eight per cent had received their entire education in government schools; 11% had attended only private schools (either foreign or national); while 2% had attended only schools located outside Jordan. Forty-nine per cent of the respondents had attended a combination of schools for varying portions of their training (16%, government and private schools; 20%, government and schools outside Jordan; 5%, private and schools outside Jordan; 9%, government, foreign, and schools outside Jordan). In summary, then, 82% of the respondents had received at least some part of their education in Jordanian government schools, 40% had received some portion of their education in Jordanian private schools, while 35% of the respondents received some of their education in schools outside Jordan.

As we indicated in Chapter V, respondents were selected to represent a random sample of public and private-sector employees. A detailed summary of the distribution of respondents by occupation using the Jordanian adaptation of the International Standard Classification of Occupations (1970) system with two-digit specification is presented as Appendix H. In our analyses, we have used only one-digit specificity, which permits the division of respondents into seven occupational categories. Table 12 summarizes the distribution of respondents by level of educational attainment and by occupation. It
Table 12
Distribution of Respondents by Level of Educational Attainment and by Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Less than Preparatory</th>
<th>Preparatory</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>B. A.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupationb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-9</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Throughout this chapter, abbreviated titles have been used to refer to the five levels of educational attainment specified in question 6 (see Appendix E or F).

b. The code numbers refer to the following general occupational classifications. We have followed the practice of the Department of Statistics by combining categories 0 & 1 and 7, 8 and 9.

0-1 Professional, technical and related workers
2 Administrative and managerial workers
3 Clerical and related workers
4 Sales workers
5 Service workers
6 Agricultural, animal husbandry and forestry workers
7-8-9 Production and related workers, and transport equipment operators and laborers

A more complete listing of the occupations actually represented in each of the 7 categories appears in Appendix H.
is apparent that the jobs in categories 0-1, 2 and 3 tend to be held predominantly by highly-educated respondents while those in categories 7-8-9 are held by poorly-educated respondents.

Furthermore, respondents who have completed the most formal schooling earn the highest average salaries per month (B.A. = JD 71.2; institute = JD 39.7; secondary = 37.0; Preparatory = 35.8; less than preparatory = 26.0). Respondents with a B.A. or beyond, employed as administrative and managerial workers (category 2), reported the highest average salaries (X̄ = JD 84.4) while those with less than preparatory completion, employed as service workers (category 5), reported the lowest (X̄ = JD 19.7). We were very surprised to learn that the average salaries earned per month by respondents who had completed preparatory, secondary or institute training differed so little. In addition, the salaries reported by respondents from the villages (X̄ = JD 31.1) were substantially lower than those reported by people from Amman (X̄ = JD 46.3) or the various towns (X̄ = 45.4).

We believe that our respondents do, in fact, represent one important sample of the Jordanian population. They represent a diverse group of citizens whose viewpoints and experiences will surely become increasingly important and sought after as the country continues to move rapidly to expand its educational facilities and to broaden and strengthen its base of economic growth. Although we have over-represented highly-educated respondents in our sample, it should be remembered that we did select subjects randomly at each of the five educational levels.

It is also important to note that our sample does not include any representatives from the armed forces, other security personnel, or self-employed farmers. These groups of people do comprise a substantial segment of the Jordanian citizenry and of its work force. Although we can speculate that farmers, as a group, have relatively little need for formal English training; we do feel that the needs of military and other security personnel should be considered by the government when reviewing its various programs of English-language instruction and the role of English instruction in the total curriculum.

RESULTS OF THE FIELD STUDY

In this section, we present the results from our Field Study. For each question, we summarize the general responses and then, when appropriate, examine the answers to a particular item as a function of the respondents' level of educational attainment, occupation, location of work, or sex. Since it has been impossible to interpret or to present, in their entirety in this monograph, all of the data collected during this Study, we have included as Appendix I a listing of the 93
output tables (comprising 212 pages of computer printout) from which we drew our information. Copies of the tables are on permanent file at the Ministry of Education and at the Department of Statistics in Amman.

1. Language Use at Work

In answer to the question "What languages (including Arabic) do you use in your work" (See Appendix E or F; question 10), Arabic was listed as the language most frequently used by 93% of the respondents (7% listed English) while English was listed as the language used second most frequently. Sixty-three per cent of all respondents (3023 of 4804) indicated that they use English at work. Conversely, 37% of all respondents (1781 of 4804) reported that they do not use English at work. Of those who do use English, 10% reported it to be their most frequently used language, while 89% reported it to be the language which they used second most frequently. Other languages such as French and German were reported by fewer than 1% of the respondents.

What factors characterize the 3023 respondents who report using English at work? In Table 13 we have summarized the distribution of respondents who report using English at work by occupation and education. Respondents employed in administrative or managerial jobs, including government administrators, report the highest use of English at work (85%), followed by sales people (74%), professional or technical workers, including teachers, (70%), and clerical and related employees (62%). Far fewer respondents in other occupations report using English at work -- service workers (36%), production and related employees (27%) and agricultural and forestry workers (23%). As might be expected, a relatively small proportion of those with little education report using English (e.g., 26% of the respondents with less than preparatory completion) while 80% of the respondents with a B.A. report using English.

There appears to be relatively little variation in English usage among respondents who completed preparatory education (57%), secondary education (64%) or institute training (66%). Overall, the respondents who report using English most are administrative or managerial personnel with university degrees (87%) while those who report using English least are production or related employees with less than preparatory completion (14%).

Additional information was obtained about the usefulness and necessity for English from question 31, "Is a knowledge of English necessary for success in your job?" Fifty-four per cent of all respondents replied "Yes, definitely"; 24% answered "It helps, but it's not necessary"; while 22% replied "No". Seventy-eight per cent of the respondents, then, regard English as being either helpful or necessary for job success. By comparing this figure with the 63% who actually
Table 13
Proportion of Respondents Who Report Using English at Work by Occupation and Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Less than Preparatory</th>
<th>Preparatory</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>B. A.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>20/37=54(^b)</td>
<td>78/113=69</td>
<td>256/435=59</td>
<td>166/268=62</td>
<td>630/797=79</td>
<td>1150/1650=70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8/13=61</td>
<td>43/64=67</td>
<td>114/126=90</td>
<td>76/91=84</td>
<td>236/276=87</td>
<td>477/564=85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>48/107=45</td>
<td>140/251=56</td>
<td>399/653=61</td>
<td>162/245=66</td>
<td>183/246=74</td>
<td>932/1502=62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12/28=43</td>
<td>75/105=71</td>
<td>101/121=83</td>
<td>12/21=57</td>
<td>41/50=82</td>
<td>241/325=74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29/119=24</td>
<td>27/61=44</td>
<td>14/23=61</td>
<td>3/3=100</td>
<td>2/4=50</td>
<td>75/210=36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0/0=0</td>
<td>0/0=0</td>
<td>1/6=17</td>
<td>1/4=25</td>
<td>1/3=33</td>
<td>3/13=23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-9</td>
<td>41/303=14</td>
<td>56/142=39</td>
<td>38/74=51</td>
<td>9/18=50</td>
<td>1/3=33</td>
<td>145/540=27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158/607=26</td>
<td>419/736=57</td>
<td>923/1438=64</td>
<td>429/650=66</td>
<td>1094/1373=80</td>
<td>3023/4804=63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. See footnote to Table 12 for an explanation of this entry.

b. This indicates that 20 out of the 37 (or 54%) respondents from occupational category 0-1 who had less than preparatory completion reported using English at work.
Field Study: Presentation of Data

report using English at work, we can draw the tentative conclusion that an additional 15% of our respondents might be able to utilize English profitably in their jobs. On the other hand, only 54% of the respondents did indicate that a knowledge of English was definitely necessary for job success.

Which respondents report a definite necessity for English? Those employed in administrative or managerial positions report the greatest need for English (73%), followed by professional or technical employees (65%), sales people (64%), clerical or related workers (48%), agricultural or forestry workers (38%), service personnel (27%), and, finally, production or related workers (25%). Thus, a high proportion of the "white collar" workers (occupations 0-1, 2, 3, 4) do seem to require a knowledge of English for job success. We find it extremely interesting, however, that even among the other occupations which traditionally require less formal education as a precondition to employment (categories 5, 6, 7-8-9), at least 25% of the respondents report a need for English. Likewise, there exists a positive relationship between level of educational attainment and the need for English for job success (B.A. graduates = 73%; institute = 55%; secondary completion = 54%; preparatory completion = 48%; less than preparatory completion = 23%). Presumably, these data reflect in part the fact that those occupations which require the type of special training that may be acquired by advanced education also require a knowledge of English.

In general, it seems as though respondents at the lower levels of education who use English at work hold relatively better jobs than their counterparts with similar educational backgrounds who do not report using English (see Table 14). However, the nature of this relationship remains open to further investigation.

In addition, we found that female respondents reported a greater need of English for job success (61%) than did males (54%). This apparent discrepancy may be a statistical artifact resulting from our relatively small and perhaps atypical sample of females or may simply reflect the fact that females more often choose occupations which require a knowledge of English. Lastly, a knowledge of English seems to be a much more important criterion for job success in Amman (56%) and in the towns (52%) than in the villages (38%).

2. Use of English at Work for Specific Purposes

Questions 11, 12 and 13 probed the frequency with which respondents use English for a variety of specific purposes at work with diverse interlocutors. We wanted to find out what percentage of the respondents who had reported that they use English at work (63% of our sample) actually do so on a daily basis. Grouping together the responses of those who indicated that they use English many times daily
and those who reported that they use English at least once every day, we found that 41% (of the 3023 respondents identified above) use English to discuss business or technical matters at least once every day with their colleagues; 32%, with their superiors; 26%, with clients; and 21%, with subordinates. We then examined, in detail, the relationship between the respondents' use of English with colleagues and their level of educational attainment and occupation. Daily use of English is associated with both a high level of educational attainment (B.A. = 50%; institute completion = 44%; secondary completion = 36%; preparatory completion = 31%; less than preparatory completion = 27%) and a relatively high status job (e.g., professional and technical workers = 57% but service personnel = 20%). These data are summarized in Table 15.

The relative frequency of using English on a daily basis did not vary between Amman (41%), and the towns (43%); but only 28% of the villagers report using English daily. It appears, then, that relatively few villagers use English at work, and furthermore that they do so less frequently than their urban counterparts.

The responses to questions 11 and 12 permit us to compare the percentage of respondents who report using English at work for business versus non-business purposes. These data may be examined by comparing the entries in Tables 16 and 17. The data indicate that the respondents do not, for the most part, use English at work for informal communication. Except for a relatively small number of respondents, English is used at work for business purposes.

With question 13, we attempted to examine, in more detail, how Jordanians actually use English at work. The data, summarized in Table 18, indicate that they use English most frequently to read for professional advancement (39% of those who use English do this on a daily basis) or to read instructions or directions (32% daily). We presume that people who read for professional advancement have relatively higher status jobs; but we did not specifically investigate this relationship. We found it interesting that 29% of the respondents report filling out forms in English on a daily basis while 20% write daily English business letters. The responses to questions 11 and 13 reveal that a substantial number of Jordanians do use English regularly for business purposes, particularly to communicate orally with their colleagues (26% of all respondents) or their superiors (20%), and to read for professional advancement (25%), to read instructions, directions or orders (20%), or to fill out forms (18%).

Thus, we wish to draw the tentative conclusion that there does exist, at the levels of Jordanian society which we have sampled, a demonstrated need for English.
Table 14
Relationship between Distribution of Respondents by Education and Occupation and Distribution of Respondents who Use English at Work by Education and Occupation

<p>| Occupation | Less than Preparatory | | | | Preparatory | | | |
| | Total | F | % | Use English at Work | F | % | Total | F | % | Use English at Work | F | % |
| 0-1 | | 37 | 6.1 | | 20 | 12.7 | | 113 | 15.4 | | 78 | 18.6 |
| 2 | | 13 | 2.1 | | 8 | 5.1 | | 64 | 8.7 | | 43 | 10.8 |
| 3 | | 107 | 17.6 | | 48 | 30.4 | | 251 | 34.1 | | 140 | 33.4 |
| 4 | | 28 | 4.6 | | 12 | 7.6 | | 105 | 14.3 | | 75 | 17.9 |
| 5 | | 119 | 19.6 | | 29 | 18.4 | | 61 | 8.3 | | 27 | 6.4 |
| 6 | | 0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0.0 | | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0.0 |
| 7-8-9 | | 303 | 49.9 | | 41 | 25.9 | | 142 | 19.3 | | 56 | 13.4 |
| Total | | 607 | 100.0 | | 158 | 100.0 | | 736 | 100.0 | | 419 | 100.0 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Use English at Work</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>Use English at Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>268</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-9</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1438</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Use English at Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>630</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>236</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>183</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1373</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15
Respondents Using English at Work Every Day to Discuss Business with Colleagues by Level of Educational Attainment and Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Less than Preparatory</th>
<th>Preparatory</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>B.A.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Na %</td>
<td>F N %</td>
<td>F N %</td>
<td>F N %</td>
<td>F N %</td>
<td>F N %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>10 20 50.0</td>
<td>36 78 46.1</td>
<td>103 256 40.2</td>
<td>79 166 47.6</td>
<td>360 630 57.1</td>
<td>588 1150 51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0 8 0.0</td>
<td>14 43 32.5</td>
<td>54 114 47.3</td>
<td>35 76 46.1</td>
<td>102 236 43.2</td>
<td>205 477 43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 48 22.9</td>
<td>47 140 33.6</td>
<td>137 399 34.4</td>
<td>63 162 38.9</td>
<td>70 183 38.2</td>
<td>328 932 35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 12 16.7</td>
<td>10 75 13.4</td>
<td>24 101 23.8</td>
<td>3 12 25.0</td>
<td>13 41 31.7</td>
<td>52 241 21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 29 20.7</td>
<td>2 27 7.4</td>
<td>3 14 21.4</td>
<td>3 3 100.0</td>
<td>1 2 50.0</td>
<td>15 70 21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0 0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0 0.0</td>
<td>0 1 0.0</td>
<td>0 1 0.0</td>
<td>1 1 100.0</td>
<td>1 13 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-9</td>
<td>13 41 31.7</td>
<td>22 56 39.3</td>
<td>13 38 34.2</td>
<td>5 9 55.6</td>
<td>1 1100.0</td>
<td>54 145 37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42 158 26.6</td>
<td>131 419 31.2</td>
<td>334 923 36.1</td>
<td>188 429 43.8</td>
<td>548 1094 50.1</td>
<td>1243 3023 41.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. This entry refers to the number of respondents in each category who had previously reported that they use English at work. It does not refer to the total number of respondents in each category. The marginal percentages for the number of respondents, out of the total possible in each category, who report using English daily are as follows: Occupation 0-1 = 36%; 2 = 36%; 3 = 22%; 4 = 16%; 5 = 7%; 6 = 8%; 7-8-9 = 10%; Total = 26%; Education less than preparatory = 7%; Preparatory = 18%; Secondary = 23%; Institute = 29%; B.A. = 40%.
Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Superiors</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Subordinates</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Customers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>1232</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>1476</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per week</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per day</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many times daily</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (Not Applicable)</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>(1781)</td>
<td>(1781)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The category "Not applicable" was used to identify people who intentionally skipped over a question or a portion of a question because they did not use English for one of the purposes specified.

b. The category "Not applicable" was used to identify people who intentionally skipped over a question or a portion of a question because they did not use English for one of the purposes specified.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>1939</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>1881</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>1708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per week</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per day</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many times daily</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2532</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not Applicable)(^a)</td>
<td>(1781)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1781)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2272)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1858)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The category "Not applicable" was used to identify people who intentionally skipped over a question or a portion of a question because they did not use English for one of the purposes specified.
Table 18

English Use at Work for Diverse Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Listen to Instructions</th>
<th>Give Instructions</th>
<th>Read Directions</th>
<th>Read Journals</th>
<th>Complete Forms</th>
<th>Write Letters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1426</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>2088</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per week</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per day</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many times daily</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Not Applicable)</td>
<td>(1781)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1781)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1781)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The category "Not applicable" was used to identify people who intentionally skipped over a question or a portion of a question because they did not use English for one of the purposes specified.
3. **English Use Outside Work**

Four questions, 14-17, were included to probe the respondents' use of English outside work. Arabic was reported to be the language used most frequently outside work by 98% of all respondents. The language used next most widely was English, which was listed by 51% of all respondents (2466 out of 4804). Of these, 2% report that they use it most frequently while 94% report it to be the language used second most frequently. French, German, and "other" were each claimed by fewer than 5% of the respondents.

In question 16, we examined the respondents' use of English outside work to discuss matters not related to work with certain interlocutors. That is, we examined their use of English for informal communication. The data, summarized in Table 19, reveal that more respondents regularly use English outside their work for informal communication with certain people than use it for informal purposes at work (compare Tables 17 and 19). For example, 15% of all respondents use English outside work at least once every day to communicate with their family (14% with their friends) compared with 12% who use English with colleagues at work for informal communication. However, only 8% of the respondents regularly use English with their colleagues outside work for informal purposes compared with 12% at work.

When we examine the respondents' use of English outside work for other purposes, a slightly different pattern emerges. Thirty-nine percent of all respondents report that they use English once or more every day for listening to the radio, the movies, television, etc. This figure represents 72% of those respondents who reported using English for informal purposes. The informants' responses to question 17 are summarized in Table 20.

Unfortunately, we have no more specific information about how these respondents actually use English. For example, do they listen to radio programs from the BBC? If so, what type of programs—news, popular music, etc.—do they prefer? Do they frequently attend English-language movies? If so, how many of them listen to the dialog and how many merely read the Arabic subtitles?

We were also interested to note that 21% of all respondents use English daily for professional advancement (this represents 38% of those reporting the use of English outside business). Although we did not examine the pattern of responses to question 17 as a function of education or occupation, we can speculate that the bulk of these 992 respondents have university degrees and hold relatively high-status jobs. If such a large proportion of the respondents do find it necessary or desirable to read English materials outside work on a daily basis, this suggests that the majority of Jordanians who hope to obtain employment in occupational categories 0-1, 2, or 3 could profit by very extensive training in English, and particularly that they need to be
Table 19

English Use Outside Work to Discuss Nonbusiness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Family F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Friends F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Colleagues F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Professional People F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Government Employees F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Strangers F</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>1111</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>1628</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>659</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per week</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per day</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many times daily</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No answers)</td>
<td>(2181)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2181)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2181)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2181)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2181)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2181)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Read for Pleasure</td>
<td>Read Serious Literature</td>
<td>Read Professional Journals</td>
<td>Listen to Mass Media</td>
<td>Write Personal Letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very rarely</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per week</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least once per day</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>595</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>1113</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many times daily</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2623</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No answers)</td>
<td>(2181)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2181)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2181)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2181)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(2181)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
exposed formally and systematically to a much broader quantity and range of reading materials than is now the case.

Respondents were asked in question 15 to what extent they used English outside work to discuss business matters with a variety of individuals. Their answers, which have not been summarized in tabular form, indicated that a majority of the respondents do not use English for this purpose. (With family, 85% of all respondents never use English to discuss business matters; with friends, 70%; with fellow workers, 73%; with professional people, 72%; with government employees, 84%; with professional people, 72%.) The responses to this question must also reflect, at least partly, the fact that the respondents spend relatively little time discussing their business concerns outside of working hours in any language with these categories of people.

In the final question dealing with their use of English (#18), the respondents were asked to indicate what percentage of their total use of English occurs at work and what percentage occurs outside of work. They reported that 57% of their English use is work related and 47% not work related. The data, summarized in Table 21 indicate a disproportionately high use of English at work by respondents with preparatory completion or less (63%). These data reinforce the notion that there exists a real need for English at work on the part of a sizeable segment of Jordanians who have completed only the compulsory cycle of education or less. These data do not, of course, provide us with any direct information about how much English is used at work or outside work in any absolute terms.

Next, we shall examine the respondents' reported proficiency in English and the manner in which they acquired this skill.

4. Subjective Proficiency in English

Since the self-rating scale has been shown by Macnamara (1969) to be a reasonably reliable indicator of relative foreign language skill, we asked all respondents to estimate their listening comprehension, speaking, reading and writing skills in English using a series of subjective rating scales (questions 23-26). Their responses are summarized in Table 22. The number of respondents reporting a very high level of proficiency (i.e., those who chose the response alternatives, "most" or "everything") was striking: understanding = 60% of all respondents; speaking = 48%; reading = 63%; writing = 60%. This high level of reported proficiency may reflect an overestimate by the respondents, the efficacy of their lengthy English study (i.e., 73% of the sample had completed secondary schooling), or the fact that many respondents have had the opportunity to use English regularly at work since they completed their formal schooling. Although the respondents may have overestimated their subjective proficiency, it is
Table 21

Average Percentage of English Used at Work by Level of Educational Attainment and by Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Less than Preparatory</th>
<th>Preparatory</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>B. A.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-9</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>58.2</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

Subjective Proficiency in English\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only a few words</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic</td>
<td>1353</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>1943</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything by Jordanians(^b)</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everything</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4804</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4804</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\). The reader should refer to Appendix E or F, questions 23-26, for the exact wording of the items and the response alternatives.

\(b\). This response alternative was included only for question 23.
nevertheless important that they rated their perceived level of achievement for reading, writing, or understanding.

5. Reasons for Studying English

Respondents were asked to consider, in question 35, five possible reasons for studying English and to rank them in order of personal relevance from most important to least. The consensus of the respondents was that the most important reason for studying English is because a person who masters English has a much better chance of studying abroad or of obtaining a job abroad ($\bar{x} = 2.08$). This was followed by the statement that a person who masters English has a much better chance of obtaining a job in Jordan ($\bar{x} = 2.79$). Both of these statements characterize reasons that have been referred to by previous researchers as instrumental. The finding that respondents perceive a thorough mastery of English as important for instrumental reasons appears consistent with their responses to other items on the questionnaire where they reported a positive relationship between knowledge of English and job success. The other reasons for considering the study of English to be important were as follows: a person who masters English can keep himself better informed about developments outside the Arab world ($\bar{x} = 2.90$); a person who masters English can become more sensitive to the values and traditions of people from various parts of the world ($\bar{x} = 3.51$); and, least important, a person who masters English has better access to world literature ($\bar{x} = 3.71$). These data suggest strongly that our respondents view English as a vehicle for educational and occupational mobility.

The inference is supported by the data reported in Table 23 which indicate a positive relationship between a perceived high level of ability to understand, speak, read and write English and holding a good job (e.g., 85% of the respondents with category 2 jobs report superior proficiency in understanding spoken English in contrast to only 19% of those having category 5 jobs). There also exists a positive relationship between superior ability in English and average monthly salary. Eighty per cent of the respondents who earn J. D. 50 or more per month report being able to communicate most or everything that they wish to say in English versus only 27% of those who earn less than J. D. 35 per month. The same relationship applied to understanding (85% vs. 40%), reading (86% vs. 45%) and writing (83% vs. 43%).

We attempted to focus more directly on the relationship between occupational mobility and English knowledge with question 32, "Has your knowledge of English made it possible for you to earn more money or to advance professionally?" Forty-four per cent of all respondents replied that they "have a better job because of (their) knowledge of English." This response was given by 14% of those with less than preparatory completion and the percentage increased with level
Table 23

Distribution of Respondents Who Report Superior Proficiency in English by Occupation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>1289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8-9</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2876</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>3045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The entries refer to the number of respondents in each occupation who report, for example, understanding most or everything of what they read. The percentage in each case is based on the total number of respondents for that occupational category.
of educational attainment (preparatory completion = 37%; secondary completion = 42%; institute completion = 44%; B.A. = 62%). Once again, there was a noticeable relationship between occupational classification and perceived utility of English. Respondents employed as administrative or managerial workers (66%), sales personnel (56%) and professional or technical employees (52%) answered most positively followed by clerical or related workers (37%), agriculture or forestry workers (23%), production or related workers (18%) and service personnel (17%). Knowledge of English was more related to job advancement for the workers from Amman (46%) than for those from the towns (36%) or the villages (29%).

The data which have been presented thus far indicate that the mastery of English is extremely important for a reasonably large segment of the Jordanian population. How do Jordanians acquire their knowledge of English? Do they feel that the current school programs of English-language instruction train them adequately to meet their personal needs?

6. Respondents' Impressions of their Formal School English Training

As we mentioned previously, 32% of all respondents completed at least some portion of their education in government schools. With their diverse backgrounds, they would seem to constitute a group well qualified to comment upon the scope and adequacy of English training in Jordan. Respondents were asked to indicate in question 27 the extent to which each of six factors helped them personally to learn English. The distribution of responses to this question is summarized in Table 24. The single most important factor (of those which we surveyed) appears to be school study. Fifty-two per cent of all respondents report that their school study aided them "very much." The perceived importance of this factor is particularly meaningful since all Jordanians do have an opportunity to study English formally at school. They are at least partially satisfied by their school program. Traveling and studying in English-speaking countries was an important factor (48%) for those respondents (29% of the total) who answered that portion of the question. Speaking English with family members (8% "very much") or with friends outside of work (17% "very much") did not constitute major aids to learning English; but private study was important (46% "very much") for a select group of respondents. We shall return to the issue of private study. Lastly, 36% of the respondents who use English at work reported that this experience has helped them to learn or presumably to improve their English.

These data suggest first that formal schooling may provide a large number of individuals with a set of basic skills to which they may later add depending upon their individual needs; and, more importantly, that the respondents' school experiences per se do not suffice to meet their
Table 24

Aids to Learning English

Degree of Importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Study</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>2499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Study</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Usage</td>
<td>1093</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Usage</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>1169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Usage</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>1508</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel and Study</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>654</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English needs.

The responses to two parts of this question (27) have been summarized in Tables 25 and 26. Only 30% of the respondents who have completed less than preparatory schooling report that their school study aided them "very much" while at least 52% of each of the other groups report a similar degree of aid (see Table 25). This represents a discrepancy of 22% or more. By contrast, 29% of the respondents who have completed less than preparatory schooling report that using English at work aided them "very much" while the consensus of the other four groups approximates 25% — a discrepancy of only 6% (see Table 26). Work experience, therefore, may represent a relatively more important factor in English mastery for the less educated respondents.

Reports by the respondents concerning their subjective proficiency in English complement the data reported in Table 25. The data presented in Table 27, indicate a positive relationship between a perceived high level of ability to understand, speak, read and write English and level of educational attainment (e.g., 91% of those respondents with a B.A. report superior proficiency in reading English; but only 10% of those who have completed less than preparatory schooling). It is important to note that there are regular increments in perceived ability associated with each increase in level of educational attainment although the difference is greatest in every case between those who have not completed preparatory schooling and those who have completed their preparatory education. These data are complemented by those summarized in Table 28 which indicate a similar positive relationship between a perceived high level of ability to understand, speak, read and write English and the number of years of English study. The discrepancies in perceived ability between those who have studied for 5 years or less versus 6 years; 8 years versus 9 years; and 12 years versus more than 12 years are particularly noteworthy. These correspond respectively with the completion of preparatory schooling and the beginning of secondary study; the completion of secondary schooling and the beginning of advanced study; and with the completion of university study. One inference to be drawn is that the level of perceived ability in English by respondents with less than preparatory completion is very low.

To gain additional information about the impact of school study on English mastery, we asked a series of direct questions about the respondents' views of their school experiences. In response to question 36, 55% of all respondents reported that they believe that their children will not learn to communicate effectively in English by following the present government-school curriculum. An additional 32% reported that they believe that their children will learn to
Table 25

Relationship between Importance of School Study as an Aid to Learning English and Level of Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Importance</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Preparatory</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2092</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

Relationship between Importance of Speaking English at Work as an Aid to Learning English and Level of Educational Attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of Importance</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than Preparatory</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. A.</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>692</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>1415</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 27

Distribution of Respondents who Report Superior Proficiency in English by Level of Educational Attainmenta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Understanding F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Speaking F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Reading F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Writing F</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparatory</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>1438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>1252</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>1373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2876</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>3045</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>2905</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>4804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The entries refer to the number of respondents at each educational level who report, for example, understanding most or everything of what they read. The percentage in each case is based on the total number of respondents for that educational level.
Table 28

Distribution of Respondents who Report Superior Proficiency in English by Total Years' Study of English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Study</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or less</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>79.8</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 12</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2876</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>3045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The entries refer to the number of respondents who have studied English for the years specified who reported, for example, that they understand most or everything of what they read. The percentage in each case is based on the total number of respondents for each of the years of study.
Field Study: Presentation of Data

communicate effectively following the government-school curriculum if it is supplemented by outside help. Only 7% of the respondents indicated that school study alone would be sufficient. The respondents' impressions, if accurate, are quite disturbing. They suggest that neither the explicit or implicit instructional aims of the Ministry for the teaching of English are being met. The present data also suggest that secondary-school graduates who attend the science faculty of the University of Jordan and are now expected to study via English might not be well enough prepared for this undertaking.

These relatively pessimistic views were somewhat tempered by the report (question 28) that 63% of all respondents considered their teachers of English to have been either "excellent" or "moderately good". Only 11% remembered their teachers as being "poor".

The responses to question 29 ("do you wish your teachers of English had given more emphasis to any of the following" (nine activities of skills) are summarized in Table 29. The data appear to suggest that relatively more emphasis should have been given to active skills such as free conversation, pronunciation, writing and composition, and translation. Presumably, these beliefs reflect the respondents' occupational needs. We were surprised, however, that so few respondents indicated a desire to have read more material chosen from specific fields such as science, commerce, or agriculture.

Question 30 was intended to complement and extend question 29. Respondents were asked to identify the one skill which they considered to be most important. Their responses are summarized by occupation in Table 30. Remember that they were asked to identify the one most important skill, not the one skill which most needed to receive additional attention.

Free conversation was selected by the largest number of respondents from each occupation except category 5, service workers, as the most important skill. This was followed by rules of English grammar, writing and composition, and translation. Except for the minor discrepancy in category 5, the pattern of choices did not differ by occupation, but rather represented accurately the consensus of all respondents. Presumably, respondents need to be able to communicate effectively via English both orally and in writing, and they perceive that mastery of the rules of English grammar will help them to achieve these goals. We infer, however, that they view the mastery of English grammar rules as a means of accomplishing a specific purpose since fewer respondents indicated a desire for more emphasis on this activity (question 29) than on conversation, composition or translation. This finding presumably also reflects the possibility that a great deal more of the respondents' class time had been directed toward teaching them grammar than encouraging spontaneous conversation.
# Table 29

**Desire for Increased Emphasis Within English Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar Rules</td>
<td>3814</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Conversation</td>
<td>4431</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Literature</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Literature</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Mechanics</td>
<td>3427</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>4111</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Reading</td>
<td>3061</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>1616</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>4187</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>4059</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Relationship Between Most Important English Skill and Occupation

## Table 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7-8-9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar Rules</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Conversation</td>
<td>859</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Literature</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific Literature</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Mechanics</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronunciation</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid Reading</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1646</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1496</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No Answers)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a corollary to this question, we asked (question 37) whether the Secondary Certificate Examination in English actually emphasizes the skills that respondents need in their work. Only 6% of all respondents replied that the examination system emphasizes the needed skills. Forty-two per cent replied "not at all"; and 20% answered, "only partially." This finding supports our earlier observations about the lack of correspondence between the examination system and the explicit goals mentioned in the curriculum guide and presumably also reflects the need which many respondents have for oral proficiency.

In summary, the respondents' answers to questions 27, 29, 36 and 37 reveal their relatively firm belief that school programs alone do not adequately prepare them in English and their feeling that these programs are not likely to prepare their children adequately either.

Some Jordanians who believe that they have not been adequately prepared in English by their formal school training continue to study English privately.

7. Private Study of English

In an attempt to explore the strength of our respondents' commitment to improving their facility in English, we asked whether they had ever studied English privately (question 22) and whether they were now studying English privately (question 33). Both questions were designed for respondents who were following formal programs of English language instruction (e.g., attending courses at the Modern Language Center). Twenty-six per cent of all respondents reported that they had, at some time, studied English privately. This means that 26% of our sample felt, for one reason or another, the necessity to supplement the English instruction which they had received at school by additional formal study. Furthermore, it is likely that the majority did so at their own personal expense. This finding further strengthens the argument that there exists a relationship between English mastery and occupational mobility, that respondents perceive the importance and magnitude of this relationship, and that the typical school program of English language instruction does not adequately prepare them to meet this need.

The data summarized in Table 31 support this inference. These data indicate that the respondents with the lowest level of perceived superior ability in English skills are those who began their study of English from 1960 to the present. Interestingly, these are the respondents who because of their age are least likely to have had additional English-language training beyond that offered in school.

Eighteen per cent of all respondents reported that they are now attempting to improve their English by formal study. We found, to our surprise, that a sizeable percentage of respondents from each occupation was currently studying English: professional workers = 18%;
Table 31

Distribution of Respondents who Report Superior Proficiency in English by Date of Beginning Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Study Began</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before 1920</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920-29</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>83.9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-39</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-49</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-59</td>
<td>1652</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-Present</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2876</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>3045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The entries refer to the number of respondents who began to study English in the years specified who reported, for example, that they understand most or everything of what they read. The percentage in each case is based on the total number of respondents for each of the dates of beginning study.
administrative and managerial workers = 20%; clerical workers = 23%; sales workers = 15%; service workers = 9%; agricultural workers = 23%; and production workers = 9%. We do not have any details about their courses of study, the duration of their study, etc.; but we can speculate that private study results in a higher level of proficiency which in turn must afford greater occupational mobility.

In fact, when we examine the relationship between "reported proficiency" and private study, we find that relatively more individuals (from 14% to 19%) who have studied privately report being able to understand, speak, read or write most or everything in English than their counterparts who have not studied privately. Thus, private study appears to be associated with increased proficiency in English.

Paradoxically, the percentage of respondents studying privately was related to level of educational attainment with relatively more better-educated respondents currently studying English privately: B.A. = 23%; institute = 19%; secondary = 19%; preparatory = 15%; and less than preparatory = 7%. Thus, it appears that those who have already studied the greatest amount of English at school are most likely to continue to study privately. This must reflect, in part, the requirements for the types of occupations toward which well-educated respondents realistically aspire. Men who work in villages are least likely to study privately (8%), while women working in Amman are most likely to do so (22%).

Apparently, the English program in its present form does not provide the training necessary to meet completely the needs of all respondents. Do they feel that a mastery of English is important for their children? How would they modify existing English-language programs to better train their children?

8. Respondents' Views Concerning English-language Instruction for Children

When asked in question 34 "how important is it for you that your children learn to communicate effectively via English"? 93% of the respondents who answered the question (3528 of 4804 or 73% did reply) chose the alternative "very important" and another 6% chose "relatively important." Respondents with families, then, are almost unanimous in wanting their children to be able to communicate effectively in English. Since they apparently believe that the government-school program of English instruction will not adequately prepare their children (see question 36), what viable alternatives do they have available?

In question 38, we asked "if you went to a private school (at any time from grade 1-12) or if you have sent a child or intend to send one to private school, what was your main reason for that?" This question was answered by an astonishingly high 83% of all respondents. (The
most liberal estimate possible from our data indicates that 62% of the respondents may have attended a private school for some portion of their schooling.

Fifty-six per cent of those who answered reported that they did (would do) so because private schools put more emphasis on English instruction than government schools. A sizeable minority (28%) believed that the general level of education is better in private schools than in government schools while an even smaller segment (4%) appreciate the religious instruction offered by some private schools (this reason was chosen with equal relative frequency by Christians and by Moslems). Clearly, one alternative considered by a sizeable sample of our respondents, then, is a private-school education for their children.

Do pupils who attend private school actually attain a higher level of English proficiency than their peers who attend government schools? The distribution of respondents who reported a superior level of English proficiency by their type of schooling is presented in Table 32.

It is readily apparent from this table that relatively few respondents who have attended only government schools (this includes various institutes as well as the University of Jordan) report superior proficiency in contrast to respondents from any other source or combination of sources of training. Unfortunately, we did not distinguish between foreign and national private schools in our questionnaire. These data cannot be interpreted unambiguously of course, but they are suggestive.

Do respondents believe that alternative approaches to English-language instruction should be tried within the government system?

In answer to question 40, 61% of all respondents reported that they favored more, rather than fewer, hours of English instruction each week. They were not asked to distinguish between English instruction in the compulsory and the secondary cycle. In a related question (#39), respondents were asked when they thought that government schools should begin to teach English. Eighty-seven per cent of all respondents favored introducing English before grade 5, the present level. The consensus of these respondents was that such teaching should commence at the grade 2 level (x̄ = 1.73, standard deviation = 1.09). We did not ask how they would staff such an expanded school program. Although we did not examine specifically the relationship between advocacy of such an expanded program and the respondents' level of occupation or education, it is clear that the overwhelming endorsement for the earlier introduction of English must cut across the various levels of our sample.

In question 41, respondents were asked whether government schools should begin to teach content subjects via English instead of continuing to teach them exclusively via Arabic. Sixty-four per cent of all
Table 32

Distribution of Respondents who Report Superior Proficiency in English by Type of Schooling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Schooling</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Speaking</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government only</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private only</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Private</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Foreign b</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private and Foreign</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government, Private and Foreign</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign only</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2876</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>3045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The entries refer to the number of respondents who attended each type of school or combination of types who reported, for example, understanding most or everything of what they read. The percentage in each case is based on the total number of respondents for that type of schooling.

b. The term "foreign" is here used to refer to schools located outside of Jordan.
respondents supported such a change. Furthermore, 92% of the respondents who favored the change indicated that they would teach science via English; while 82%, would teach mathematics. However, only 28% would teach social studies in English. This probably indicates a recognition of the necessity to better prepare students who will proceed to the University, where science instruction is conducted exclusively through the medium of English. The discrepancy between respondents' preferences for teaching science and mathematics, but not social studies in English probably also reflects their awareness of the importance of presenting very personal information about their own values and traditions in their mother tongue together with some uncertainty about the possibility or desirability of translating these materials into English. The fact that people, although generally favorable to the idea of teaching content subjects via English, nevertheless reacted differentially in relation to different subjects prompts us to interpret these responses as carefully considered expressions of their firmly held beliefs about the necessity to broaden the base of English-language instruction in Jordan.

The main focus of this Field Study centered on examining the relationship between the respondents' need for and use of English and their training in English. However, we also asked two questions about the teaching of foreign languages other than English.

9. Desirability of Teaching Other Foreign Languages

At the present time, with the minor exceptions noted earlier, English is the only foreign language taught in Jordanian government schools. The answers to two questions (43, 44) indicate the existence of popular support for teaching other foreign languages. Twenty-eight per cent of the respondents reported that they had studied a foreign language other than English. More than one half of these people (16%) reported that they had studied this foreign language in Jordan. The two most widely studied foreign languages were French (751 individuals) and German (294 individuals). In contrast to the relatively small percentage of respondents who had studied an additional foreign language, 80% reported that they believed that government schools should offer instruction in a foreign language besides English. The respondents' own experiences appear to have affected their preferences, with 86% endorsing French as the most desirable language, and only 8% favoring German. These findings do seem consistent with the popular notion that French was considered to be the language of the 'educated' people in Jordan, at least during the 1940's.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Our presentation of data from the Field Study necessarily involved a great deal of interpretative comment. In this brief concluding section, therefore, we shall merely summarize our findings and present a list of recommendations.

We have tabulated and examined the responses by 4804 randomly selected Jordanians to a 47-item, three-part questionnaire which probed their educational background (particularly their study of English), their use of perceived need for English, and their views concerning the program of English-language instruction in government schools.

We found that a large segment (63%) of the respondents reported that they use English at work. In fact, 26% of all respondents indicated that they use English at work at least once every day. They use English primarily to communicate orally about business matters with their colleagues or their superiors and to read such materials as professional journals or printed directions.

Positive relationships were found between their level of proficiency in the various English skills and their type of occupation as well as their monthly salary. Even among respondents with relatively little formal education, the ones who reported a high degree of facility in English hold better jobs than those who lack this skill. Fifty-four percent of all respondents reported that knowledge of English was necessary for success in their jobs (the average percentages, by occupation, ranged from 25% to 73%). Superior proficiency in English appears to be a virtual prerequisite for obtaining employment in many of the 'higher-status' occupations.

We should, of course, consider an alternative interpretation; that the widespread use of English at diverse levels of Jordanian society may not represent a real 'need' for communication via English; rather it may represent an artifact of the long and widespread training which provides such a large segment of the Jordanian population with systematic instruction in English. We cannot investigate the 'validity' of this apparent widespread need for English using the present data. We can only observe that mastery of English is associated, in actual fact, with occupational mobility, and that the majority of respondents perceive this relationship.

The development of proficiency in English, then, represents an important goal for Jordanian citizens. Ninety-three percent of all respondents considered their children's development of effective communication skills in English to be "very important". As we have indicated in Chapter II, the Ministry of Education takes very seriously its responsibility to train students in a foreign language. It attempts to fulfill this responsibility by offering a substantial program of English-language instruction to all pupils beginning at grade 5.
Only 7% of the respondents felt that their children will learn to communicate effectively in English by following the present government-school curriculum. This impression was substantiated, in part, by data which revealed that relatively few respondents who had attended only government schools reported a superior level of proficiency in English when compared with those who had attended any other type or combination of types of schools. Furthermore, 18% of all respondents are currently studying English privately, and private study seems to be related to increased proficiency.

Fifty-two per cent of the respondents reported that their school study had helped them to learn English "very much." This observation, plus the existence of a positive relationship between level of educational attainment (or years of school English study) and English proficiency, suggests that students who have completed at least the preparatory cycle acquire a set of basic skills upon which to base and to extend their later study of English. We infer, however, that some later (presumably out-of-school) supplement to their school experience is necessary since the respondents who reported the lowest relative level of superior proficiency had begun their study of English most recently. Furthermore, the implementation of the school English-language program seems to be closely tied to the secondary certificate examination and may not accurately reflect the actual needs of the pupils. Respondents must communicate orally at work and be able to read a variety of technical materials. They view 'free conversation' as the single most important classroom activity, and wish that it had been emphasized more in their own training.

A majority of the respondents endorsed a series of relatively radical suggestions for curricular reform. Eighty-seven per cent supported the introduction of English earlier than the present grade-five level; 64% supported the teaching of selected content subjects such as science and mathematics via English; and 61% felt that more periods should be devoted to English instruction each week. We believe that these suggestions reflect the respondents' firmly-held beliefs about the necessity to broaden the base of English-language instruction in Jordan. We shall discuss the implications of the Field Study data for Jordanian educators in greater detail in Chapter VII.

We wish to emphasize that we have collected a large body of facts and documented opinions from certain, but not all, segments of the Jordanian population. Educational planners will, no doubt, wish to consult representatives from some of the segments that we did not sample and they will certainly wish to reconsider and to reinterpret the data which we have collected in light of subsequent discussions and newly formulated questions.
In concluding this sixth chapter, we wish to make the following recommendations:

1. That portions of the present data (e.g., questions 13, 16, 17) be re-analyzed to investigate more thoroughly the relationship between such topics as English use, English need, English proficiency and occupation. (This analysis could be done using two-digit occupational specificity to provide more precise information about respondents' need for English in specific occupations.)

2. That intensive follow-up interviews be conducted with small samples of respondents from each level of educational attainment and from various occupations. Some individuals would be chosen who had reported high proficiency in English and some would be selected who had not. (The purpose of the research would be to determine in what specific ways and to what extent Jordanians use English in various business settings. Do they use English in these settings for expediency or by necessity?)

3. That research be conducted to determine whether Jordanian farmers, armed forces personnel, other security officials and females who have not entered the labor force have needs for English which are comparable to those of the present group of respondents.

4. That research be conducted to investigate the effects on English language proficiency of introducing the language at various levels within a formal school setting.

5. That research be conducted to determine whether students who study selected content subjects via English achieve greater proficiency in English (without a loss in content mastery) than students who continue to study in Arabic. (See, for example, recommendation 4, Chapter II.)

6. That serious consideration be given to modifying the Secondary Certificate Examination in English to encourage teachers to focus classroom time on activities which are more directly relevant to their pupils' later needs.

7. That an investigation be conducted to examine various aspects of programs of English language instruction offered by national versus foreign private schools.

8. That Jordanian educators consider the relevant data from this Field Study and others like it as one component when they make future decisions regarding policy changes affecting English language instruction.
NOTES

1. The figures reported in the text have been rounded to the nearest per cent.

2. We realize that 100% of the individuals in one category did report using English; but there were only 3 respondents in that group.

3. i.e., 50% of the people with a B.A. who report that they use English at work with colleagues do so on a daily basis.

4. The value 1 was assigned to that reason chosen as most important, 2 for the second most important, etc. The arithmetic mean was then computed over all respondents for each of the five possible reasons. Hence, the lowest average identifies the most important reason; the highest average, the least important.
THE ROLE OF ENGLISH IN THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

This Chapter may be viewed as a rudimentary attempt to examine the apparently complex relationship which exists in Jordan among factors such as the country's general educational goals, the more specific goals for English-language instruction, the resources which have been developed to facilitate the realization of these sets of goals, and the views held by a large segment of the labor force concerning the need for a high level of English proficiency.

In Jordan, as in other countries, the formal educational system plays a major role in the transformation of uneducated, illiterate children into perceptive, informed, and useful citizens. Hopefully, the child who completes the prescribed educational sequence will be able to understand, speak, read and write the 'standard' form of his mother tongue. He should, in addition, have become sensitive to the values and traditions of his own, and possibly other, ethnolinguistic groups; he should have formulated a view of his own country in relationship to the outside world; he should have developed a sense of morality that will guide him in his dealings with other individuals; he should have acquired a mastery of the skills and knowledge that may be required for proceeding to higher education or to an occupation.

The Ministry of Education has assumed responsibility for developing appropriate curricula and resources to achieve these goals. As we have noted in Chapter I, a program of English instruction for all pupils, beginning in Grade 5, is an integral component of Jordanian education. This program is expected to meet the needs of those children who proceed to higher education as well as those who enter the labor force directly.

The English Department of the Curriculum Directorate of the Ministry of Education has interpreted its mandate very broadly. It has developed integrated programs for the compulsory and secondary stages which it hopes will enable pupils to "acquire the [English] linguistic skills and techniques needed for advanced work at post-secondary levels" (English Curriculum: Secondary Stage, 1971). Students are expected to develop a functional mastery of the four basic English skills and to become sensitive to the values and traditions of disparate groups of people.

These expectations (rather vaguely articulated in the compulsory-stage guide, but more explicitly stated in the secondary-stage guide) appear to us to reflect optimistic and perhaps unrealistic goals in view
of the basic program and resource limitations which now confront the English Department of the Curriculum Directorate.1

As we stated in Chapter V, we do believe that people's demonstrated needs for English should be considered by policy makers when they examine critically the scope and design of English instruction. The data from our Field Study indicated that a relatively large number of Jordanians from diverse occupations reported using English on a daily basis; that English mastery was viewed as necessary to job success by a sizeable number of respondents; that mastery of English is associated with occupational mobility; and that a majority of the respondents indicated that the present English program fails to develop the level of proficiency in basic English skills which they view as essential.

The respondents' reservations about the formal program of English training seem justified when it is remembered that the University of Jordan as well as the various post-secondary institutes all find it necessary to offer additional English-language instruction, and that 18% of all respondents to our Field Study reported that they were presently studying English privately. Presumably, such additional training or study should be unnecessary if secondary-school graduates actually do possess a mastery of the basic language skills in English. There does appear to exist on the part of a relatively large number of Jordanians a demonstrated need for greater proficiency in English than they now achieve by following the government curriculum.

This suggests to us that the Ministry may wish to consider several possibilities for revising its English-language program.

PROPOSALS TO MODIFY ENGLISH-LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION

We propose to identify and describe briefly four distinct types of program modifications. We believe that each of these alternatives could produce students with somewhat greater English proficiency than does the present program; but that the target of mastery of basic skills by all students would still remain an unrealistic goal. We have not attempted to rank these alternatives in order from most to least preferable, or to describe the various modifications that could result by combining, in diverse ways, their major components. The ultimate responsibility for deciding whether any program change is desirable and, if so, what type of change must, of course, rest with the appropriate Jordanian officials.

1. The Introduction of English at the Grade-2 Level

As we reported in Chapter VI, a very large proportion of respondents (87%) favored the introduction of English instruction before Grade 5. In fact, the consensus was that English instruction should begin in Grade 2. Even though our Field Study data as well as the results of
research conducted in other countries indicate a positive relationship between the total number of years of English study and level of proficiency, we must view this proposal as somewhat unrealistic.

At least three factors — the existing shortage of qualified teachers, the obvious absence of instructional materials, and the extremely large number of classes which would be involved if English were to be introduced throughout the public system in Grade 2 (or even Grade 3 or 4) — seem to us to pose serious problems for the successful implementation of any proposal to extend considerably the duration of English-language instruction for all students. We prefer to interpret the Field Study data as general support for the notion that many Jordanians do, in fact, require greater English proficiency than they presently develop in school.

2. Modifications within the Existing Framework

As we have suggested in various places throughout Chapters II, III and IV, we believe that students could be better prepared within the existing framework than is now the case if certain changes were introduced. (The following recommendations relate to this proposal: Chapter I — 5; Chapter II — 2, 3; Chapter III — 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15; Chapter IV — 1; and Chapter VI — 4.)

As an essential feature of such modifications, we believe that much more emphasis can and should be placed on using English for purposeful and meaningful communication in the classroom than is now the case. Students should be encouraged to talk, read, and write about topics that are familiar to them (particularly the compulsory-cycle students) and that are related to their future educational and occupational needs (especially the secondary-cycle students in the various streams or types of schools). During the secondary cycle, far greater demands could realistically be made of students. By the end of the cycle, all students should have been exposed to a wide variety of unsimplified reading materials, both required and supplementary, chosen to meet the interests and needs of students from the different specializations (e.g., the interests and needs of students from the agricultural schools undoubtedly differ greatly from those of science students in the academic schools).

Teachers should devote special attention and a greater proportion of time to free conversation, pronunciation, writing and composition, and translation. The Field Study respondents identified these as important skills which should have received more emphasis during their schooling. The teachers' effectiveness could be enhanced if they made greater use of easily available, relatively inexpensive teaching aids such as transistor radios and tape-recorders. The successful implementation of any of these ideas would, of course, depend upon a major revision of the present examination system.
We believe that modifications in the existing program of English teaching such as these (and others identified in the recommendations previously cited) would result in a multi-faceted course of study far better attuned to the interests and needs of all students than the present curriculum. We predict that such changes would produce higher student motivation which would in turn lead to greater achievement. Furthermore, we believe that the cost of implementing these changes would not be excessive.

3. Teaching Selected Content Subjects in English

This proposed modification would combine a basic program of English language arts for all students, such as the one described above, with the teaching of selected content subjects in English during a part of the secondary cycle. (The following recommendations relate to this proposal: Chapter II — 1, 4; Chapter VI — 5.) Research conducted in Canada (see Lambert and Tucker, 1972) has indicated that pupils who combine the study of content material in a foreign language with a language-arts program achieve higher levels of proficiency in the target language than students who take only the traditional foreign-language program. They appear to achieve this greater proficiency with no significant loss in their mastery of the content material. In Jordan, basic science and mathematics courses might lend themselves ideally to this approach, especially since English is used as the medium of instruction within the Faculty of Science at the University of Jordan. This recommendation also received support from a majority of the respondents to our Field Study. In a similar manner, various practical, vocational activities could be conducted in English in the agricultural, commercial and industrial schools.

This proposal would require the identification of a number of secondary-school teachers (probably not more than 100) who have received their university training in the special subject(s) and who are proficient in English. Presumably, some of the secondary-school teachers now working in the government system possess the necessary skills. In addition graduates from the Faculty of Science at the University of Jordan, who receive their training in English, should certainly be able to teach any of the secondary-cycle courses in science and mathematics in English. Appropriate textbooks could certainly be selected from the many which are now used to teach science and mathematics to English-speaking students. The adoption of this proposal would probably yield a very significant increase in English proficiency for a large number of students at a relatively minimal cost.

As a preliminary step toward investigating the feasibility of this proposal, research could be initiated on a small scale in a few carefully-selected schools.
4. Intensive English Instruction for Specific Purposes

Although we have argued previously that mastery of English is associated with occupational mobility and that a sizeable number of Jordanians do need to use English at work on a daily basis, it may still be the case that the economic and human resources of Jordan could be more efficiently utilized by delaying the introduction of English until a later stage (e.g., Grade 7) than the present Grade-5 level. At that time, an English program such as the one described in proposal 2 would be introduced.

To compensate for this reduction in the absolute quantity of English teaching in the public schools, the Ministry of Education together with the University of Jordan would organize courses with diverse focuses to provide English instruction to groups of individuals who needed to upgrade their proficiency.

The courses could be organized to meet certain predetermined academic or occupational needs. In the latter category would be courses specifically designed to train groups of workers such as immigration officials, secretaries, or hotel employees. Classes would meet after working hours in public schools. They would be staffed, at least partially, by English teachers hired to work overtime. These teachers would use specialized materials adapted to the particular needs of their students. Similar courses already exist in various Arab countries (e.g., Egypt, Lebanon).

This proposal, to provide specialized English training for individuals whose limited language proficiency would preclude their access to higher education or to more challenging and rewarding occupations, might enable the Ministry of Education to better utilize its limited resources and to provide qualitatively better training for those individuals with demonstrated need than it can now provide for all students.

This proposal will probably prove unpopular for at least two reasons. First, the recent commitment by the Ministry to the CITTI 'experiment' seems to indicate a desire to continue to offer English instruction to all students in the 5th and 6th years of the elementary grades as well as in all years of the preparatory grades. Second, the reasons as yet unknown to us for which the Ministry rejected Raja Nasr's recommendation (1967) to introduce English in Grade 6 may still be salient enough to prevent any serious discussion of this modification.

Nevertheless, we feel that this proposal does offer a viable alternative to the present system. In this period of limited economic and human resources, little argument can be made for teaching English inefficiently for a substantial portion of each week to a very large number of students who have no foreseeable need for the language. However, we have no ready solution for two critical questions. At what level is it possible to identify, with reasonable accuracy, those
students with demonstrable need for English proficiency? How much would it 'cost' to bring these students to at least the same level of achievement as students now attain who study English for eight years?

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In the preceding Section, we have attempted to identify and to describe briefly four distinct types of program modifications. Obviously, each alternative has both strengths and weaknesses; but we believe that the implementation of any one could effect a significant increase in the English proficiency of Jordanian students — and that such a change need not be prohibitive in cost.

The question posed in Chapter II, "Has the very considerable Jordanian investment in English paid off in terms of tangible results?", remains very difficult to answer. We have ascertained that the English needs of a sizeable sample of Jordanian citizens are not now being completely satisfied by the present English curriculum. We have identified positive as well as negative aspects associated with various components of the present program, and we have formulated a total of 49 recommendations concerning various aspects of English instruction in Jordan. They include recommendations concerning language policy, curriculum changes, teacher training, potential research, and the University English program. The decision to reject, to accept in principle or to implement any or all of these recommendations cannot, obviously, be made by the foreign consultants who prepared this report. The question of whether the return in English achievement justifies the investment in economic and human resources can only be answered by Jordanian educators who can examine the various facets of the English-language program as one of the many components in the total educational endeavor. We cannot legitimately assign priority to the teaching of Arabic vs. English, science vs. Islamic culture, etc. We can only hope that the information which we present in this report will assist Jordanian educators as they undertake such a critical review.

NOTES

1. This does not imply that we view these goals as logically undesirable. However, it may be unrealistic to expect every Jordanian secondary-school graduate to achieve these goals.

2. We view the addition of two weekly periods of English instruction for science students as the necessary elimination of a seemingly arbitrary inequality in the programs for students from the scientific and literary streams. We do not view it as a major innovation in the curriculum.
In this concluding Chapter, we have grouped our recommendations from the previous Chapters into several broad categories: those pertaining to English-language policy, curriculum change, teacher training, and research. Within each category, the recommendations are arranged according to their order of introduction in the monograph with the exception that we have grouped together those dealing with similar topics.

**RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING ENGLISH-LANGUAGE POLICY**

1. That the Ministry of Education consider the possibility of providing more instruction in English in the secondary industrial schools (from Chapter II, recommendation 1).

2. That the possibility also be examined of adding two weekly periods of studying 'scientific texts in English' to the present program of students in the scientific stream during their last two years in academic secondary schools (II-2).

3. That all possible alternatives be considered before a further reduction is carried out in the number of weekly periods of English in academic and commercial secondary schools (II-3).

4. That every effort be continued to reduce the average number of students in English classes (II-5).

5. If the attempt to carry out the above recommendation is unsuccessful, that serious consideration be given to modifying the method of English instruction used in the schools in the compulsory cycle so as to put more emphasis on the teaching of reading, and that emphasis on oral activities be postponed until the secondary level (II-6).

6. That the Ministry of Education initiate a strenuous effort to eliminate the obstacles that now stand in the way of requiring all students to complete a substantial amount of extensive reading outside of class (III-9).

7. That a closer correspondence be developed between the aims for English teaching and the public examination system (I-5).

8. That attempts of two types be made to discourage the practice of allowing examinations to determine the nature of instruction: the inclusion in the examinations of sub-tests for which no direct classroom preparation is possible, and experimentation with ways of taking students' performance both in the classroom and on examinations into consideration for promotion and graduation (III-13).

9. That serious consideration be given to modifying the Secondary
Certificate Examination in English to encourage teachers to focus classroom time on activities which are more directly relevant to their pupils' later needs (VI-6).

10. That Jordanian educators consider the relevant data from this Field Study and others like it as one component when they make future decisions regarding policy changes affecting English-language instruction (VI-8).

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING CURRICULUM CHANGE

1. That the explicit aims for English instruction at the compulsory stage be stated in the form of operationally defined behavioral objectives (I-1).
2. That these objectives be realistically chosen to reflect the perceived needs of the students as well as the resources available to meet these needs (I-2).
3. That the newly developed explicit aims for English instruction at the secondary level be critically evaluated and, if necessary, revised in terms of the actual English needs of secondary-school graduates (I-3).
4. That the aims for English instruction at the secondary level reflect the differing needs of secondary graduates, and at the same time complement the stated aims of Jordanian education in general (I-4).
5. That the data on language use provided by this Survey be examined with care for the information it gives regarding the specific skills in English that graduates of the Jordanian schools have need of, and that this information be taken into account in determining the priority to be assigned to the teaching of each skill (III-7).
6. That any new instructional materials to be chosen or prepared should be of such a nature as to contribute significantly and directly to the achievement of the non-linguistic objectives of English instruction and the general objectives of education in Jordan at each grade level (III-4).
7. That adequate guides for the secondary industrial and agricultural curricula be provided at the earliest possible date, and that all curriculum guides be updated as often as may be feasible (III-1).
8. That first drafts of all new versions of textbooks be carefully checked in order to insure that the sections on grammatical structure deal only with functional aspects of grammar, provide sufficient drill-material on each structure to enable students to acquire an active mastery of it, and state the grammatical principles involved succinctly and accurately (III-6).
9. That the programs of study for literary, scientific, commercial, industrial, and agricultural students should include reading material of two distinct types: (a) a central core of material to be read intensively by all students in common, and (b) particularly relevant supplementary
material for each of the five groups of students which would be read by each group alone (III-2).

10. That future curriculum guides should specify the minimum number of pages to be read by students each year, the level of difficulty at which they should be able to read, and the speed with which they should be able to read silently with a given degree of comprehension (III-3).

11. That no complete curriculum in English should fail to provide students with a moderate amount of unsimplified reading material written in the language normally used by educated adults to express themselves in print (III-8).

12. That no complete curriculum in English should fail to provide students with an appropriate amount of experience in writing which serves a real communicative purpose or fills a real need and in the preparation of original full-length compositions (III-10).

13. That a systematic effort be made to improve the pronunciation of students at all instructional levels, but especially during the secondary cycle. This effort might involve the provision of superior recorded models for imitation, of reading passages with stress and intonation markings, of various types of phonetic drills, or even a limited amount of information about the sound system of English formulated in non-technical language (III-5).

14. That the great value of informal communicative activities not directly related to the textbooks be recognized in future curriculum guides and that teachers be urged to provide their students with such experience both inside and outside of class (III-12).

15. That the possibilities be explored of using films, radio, and television as means of teaching in English some small portion of the content of courses in various subjects at all pre-university levels (II-7).

16. That plans for encouraging the greater use of teaching aids might well center around increasing the availability of transistor radios and individual tape-recorders and exploring the many and varied instructional advantages that can be derived from such relatively inexpensive equipment (III-11).

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING TEACHER TRAINING

1. That the lists of recommended professional readings for teachers be omitted from future curriculum guides and be replaced by separately printed or mimeographed lists that would be updated and distributed to teachers annually (III-14).

2. That the Government consider a placement scheme for English specialists which would enable them to teach English during as many as possible of their working hours (IV-1).

3. That teacher-training institutes consider softening their stand of strict adherence to any particular method of language teaching (IV-2).
4. That the Government consider various ways in which the English specialist might be given a greater command of the English language, whether through an English-medium teacher-training institute or through intensive instruction in English during the summer (IV-3).
5. That a standardized English proficiency examination be devised to aid in the selection of English specialists at the teacher-training institute (IV-4).
6. That a language aptitude examination be devised to help select trainees on the basis of their innate linguistic capacity (IV-5).
7. That every effort be made to assist the CITTI program in monitoring the language progress of its trainees in order to establish clearly the efficacy of this unique approach to teacher training (IV-6).

RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING RESEARCH
1. That the Ministry of Education call on the University of Jordan and any eventual Training College for Teachers of English for aid in gathering much needed information about common errors in Jordanian English (a practical alternative approach to contrastive analysis), the abilities measured by various types of examination questions, the particular interests of students of different ages, the specific reading and writing skills needed by university students and other questions of special relevance to the development of the national program of English instruction (III-15).
2. That portions of the present data (e.g., questions 13, 16, 17) be reanalyzed to investigate more thoroughly the relationship between such topics as English use, English need, English proficiency, and occupation (VI-1).
3. That intensive follow-up interviews be conducted with small samples of respondents from each level of educational attainment and from various occupations. Some individuals would be chosen who had reported high proficiency in English and some would be selected who had not (VI-2).
4. That research be conducted to determine whether Jordanian farmers, armed forces personnel, other security officials, and females who have not entered the labor force have needs for English which are comparable to those of the present group of respondents (IV-4).
5. That an investigation be conducted to examine various aspects of the programs of English-language instruction offered by national versus foreign private schools (VI-5).
6. That research be conducted to determine whether students who study selected content subjects in English achieve greater proficiency in English (without a loss in content mastery) than students who continue to study via Arabic (VI-5).
7. That an experiment be conducted in one or more academic secondary schools in which at least one year of the mathematics course for students in the scientific stream would be taught in English, and that the achievement in English and mathematics of students in this school or schools be compared with that of students in other schools at the time of their graduation from Grade 12 (II-4).

8. That research be conducted to investigate the effects on English-language proficiency of introducing the language at various levels within a formal school setting (VI-7).
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APPENDIX A: AQABA CONFERENCE ON THE ENGLISH-LANGUAGE TEACHING POLICY OF JORDAN

January 24, 1973
First Session: 8:00 - 10:30 a.m.

The Opening

The first session was started at 8:15 a.m. with the opening speech by His Excellency, Dr. Ishaq Farhan, Minister of Education. He welcomed the conference members and pointed out the importance of the discussions that would take place.

Professor Clifford Prator presented an overview of the Survey using Appendix G: "Initial questions on which Field-Study Questionnaire was based." He explained how these questions were formulated and their relevance to the Study. He made special mention of the very short time in which the Study was completed and attributed this to the cooperation of co-workers in the Ministry of Education and the Statistics Department. One factor that made this possible was the straightforward nature of the sociolinguistic situation in Jordan: there is one mother tongue used by virtually all people and one foreign language, English. He pointed out that the data was collected during the summer months which meant that it was impossible to visit classes, interview teachers, etc. He explained that the members of the team of authors presented their recommendations with great diffidence but nonetheless hoped that the Conference participants might find in some of the recommendations a basis for action.

Presentation of the Field Study

Dr. Richard Tucker made a presentation of the material from Chapters V and VI which are concerned with the Field Study. He pointed out that the level of education was taken as the basis for classification. He made the following notes: at least 25% of the employees in all occupational categories use some English at work; people in higher occupations use English more frequently than people in lower occupations; people who are highly educated use English more frequently than others.

Dr. Tucker referred the conferees to Table 14 showing the relationship between distribution of respondents by education and occupation, as well as the use of English at work. His conclusions were that, regardless of educational level, people who have somehow acquired a mastery of English have better jobs than those individuals who do not possess a high degree of proficiency in English. He added that knowledge and use of English is related to the advancement and mobility of people. English is used at work by a sizeable segment of Jordanians
and is used outside of work by many to listen to mass media, etc. 78% of the respondents perceive a relationship between English and job success.

He pointed out that while school provides a solid foundation in English for people to build on, superior proficiency in English is not achieved through formal schooling only. It appears to result from the combination of the formal school program plus other supplementary out of school activities.

He concluded his summary by saying that there is a demonstrated need for English in various levels of Jordanian society.

**Panel Discussion**

Miss Salma Jayyusi, Chairman of the panel discussion on the Field Study said that the Field Study was a remarkable achievement done in a very short time. Dr. Adnan Badran concurred with this, and he referred to the Survey as being the first of its kind to be done in Jordan in terms of the English needs of society. It is a good approach for tailoring education to the needs and demands of society. Dr. Badran commented on Table II, on the variance in percentage of the 5 different educational levels. He said that the respondents at each level will vary and results between levels cannot be compared directly. 80% of the respondents of this study came from Amman and 20% from outside Amman. Samples were collected according to the size of the towns. He said that the samples do not reflect the present distribution of the work force. He pointed out a lack of creative presentation in the report; correlation analyses and regression lines, which he indicated would help extend the study to further uses. However, he pointed out that the age selected was a suitable one and indicated that samples showed an age of maturity. The results of the Field Study are astonishing: 63% use English at work and this indicates the importance of the language in this country; the positive relationship between level of proficiency in English and type of education and monthly salaries; those who hold higher degrees of education hold better jobs, and he wondered whether this is related to English or to education; 54% of the respondents indicated knowledge of English as essential for success in their jobs; a positive relationship between number of years of English study with proficiency; 55% do not communicate efficiently after they graduate from the Government secondary schools; 32% indicate they communicate efficiently after they receive instructional help in English following the completion of their secondary education; the most important skill was conversation and the curriculum should emphasize conversation; only 6% replied that the examination system emphasized needed skills; the lowest proficiency of English was reported by individuals who began their study of English from 1960 to the present; 18% indicated that they are now taking additional training in
centers to improve their English language.

Mr. Shahir Al-Hassan's main comment was on the attitudes of the respondents to their former schooling. He expounded on this by presenting a graph to the conference showing that 50% of the respondents are between 30-50 years old and 34% of the remaining respondents are between 21.6-29.8 years old.

The Living English for Jordan series began in 1964, at the 5th elementary, where the average age of pupils is 11.5. LEJ books have been used in Jordan for the last eight years only. Therefore 84% of the respondents are passing judgment on a course of instruction which they have not taken.

He referred to another point which was raised by Dr. Tucker and Dr. Badran. They said that this group from 1960 are the lowest in their proficiency in the language. In addition to the reasons given, Mr. Al-Hassan added that these people have the least experience in life, that they are very young and moreover have been the victims of a radical change in methods of instruction and instructional material.

Miss Selma Jayyusi emphasized the need for English as displayed by respondents in their answers to questions like:

1. Would you like your children to learn English?
2. Would you like English to be introduced at an earlier grade in the schools?

Respondents felt that there is an instrumental need for English both at work and outside work. She suggested that the means to satisfy this need should be left to another discussion to determine how far this can be taken into consideration. The Field Study is a guideline for the Ministry of Education in adopting some measures to improve the teaching of English and in conducting similar field studies for other subjects as well. She finally indicated that the Field Study was established as a mode of relating the philosophy or goals of education to the needs of the individuals in society.

Dr. Tucker commented on Dr. Badran's observations on: 1) Choice of sample: he explained in detail the nature of the stratified-random distribution and that samples were taken from both the public and private sectors; 2) Method of data analysis was descriptive with limited inferential statistical tests. Dr. Badran's suggestion was to go beyond this and demanded doing other types of specific analyses in a more complex way. Dr. Tucker agreed with him that this should be done and added that there are people in Jordan who can take this next step.

Dr. Tucker said that Dr. Badran identified an interesting area of research which can be done in Jordan. Dr. Tucker asked the conference if any of them were actually chosen for the Field Study and said that the writers were concerned with the validity of responses and not only the reliability.
In a summary statement concerning the validity of an interview Dr. Tucker added that people often do know what they are talking about. A lot of the present respondents were concerned about the problems of education and the future of their children and thought seriously about those matters before answering the questions. Dr. Abdurrahman Adas pointed out that the findings of the Survey were obvious and that there was no need for the Study. He said that the Study did not touch on the subject of how much benefit is derived from the actual time allocated for English nor did it deal with the means of improving it. He also questioned classification by education and not occupation. Dr. Badran made a similar comment. Dr. Tucker answered that a decision was made to stratify the random samples by education rather than by occupation, since if the sample had been stratified by occupation it would not have been possible to collect sufficient respondents from the various levels of education for the Ministry to use in making decisions. A lengthy discussion took place between Dr. Adas, Dr. Badran and Dr. Tucker on whether to stratify by education or occupation. Mr. Masri commented on one point made by Dr. Badran regarding the tendency to correlate occupational advancement and level of knowledge of English. He thought it might be a true statement but not an accurate one. He said that since the knowledge of English is part of the level of general education it is more accurate to correlate educational advancement with level of education. Dr. Tucker added that the statements made in the text were most accurate. He said that they had not done formal statistical correlations but stated that English, occupation and education go together. Speculation about the causality in this is premature but may be investigated if so desired. Dr. Abul Haqq requested a clarification of objectives of the Field Study. Dr. Tucker explained that the writers believed that people's use of English, Arabic and science should influence in some way the design of the programs which are needed to convey these skills or information to students. The Field Study was conducted to collect information about the situations of English use, how well the respondents thought they had been trained and whether they wished a change in the training program for their children. It also tried to relate these findings to level of occupation and education. This information should provide a useful context within which to examine the curricula, syllabus, textbooks, etc. and should be of use to decision makers. The Field Study was an exercise attempting to obtain a definite type of information that people often wish to have when they make decisions of this kind. Dr. Majali pointed out the value of the study and said that it would serve as a feedback to the Ministry of Education to change the
curriculum. Table 29 was in Mr. Hassan's opinion the most important part.

Dr. Abdurrahman Adas remarked again that most of the results of the Field Study were self-evident and he asked how to improve the present system. In answer Dr. Prator said that the Field Study was never intended to deal directly with the instructional materials and techniques in current use. These are treated primarily in Chapter III.

January 24, 1973
Second Session: 11:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.

Presentation
The second session began at 11:00 a.m. with Professor Prator's presentation of the first three chapters: Stated and Implicit Aims of English Instruction, Dimensions of English Instructions, and Curricula and Instructional Material. Brief comments were made on the recommendations in each of the three chapters.

Panel Discussion
Dr. Albert Butros, Chairman, presented the order of the panel discussion. It was decided that Chapters I, II and III should be taken together because they are closely related and are looked upon in the discussions as one unit.

Mr. Ahmad Tawil commented on the aims and implementation of the curriculum with reference to instruction in government schools. He pointed out that the audio-lingual method adopted in the textbooks for the compulsory cycle demands well-qualified teachers and smaller classes. He said that since we cannot meet any of these conditions under present circumstances, recommendation 6 of Chapter II is worth serious consideration. This recommendation calls for a slight shift of emphasis towards reading and not for a radical change in the general approach.

Mr. Tawil supported Recommendations 1 and 2 given in Chapter II of the Survey which call for more weekly hours of English for the industrial secondary schools and adding two weekly hours to the secondary scientific stream.

Mr. Tawil supported Recommendation 1 of Chapter I which calls for operationally-defined objectives in the compulsory cycle. He added that the need for this is felt.

The panel discussion was continued by Mrs. Widad Boulus who gave an outline of the English instruction in foreign private schools with emphasis on mode, method, textbooks and syllabi. She pointed out that classes in foreign private schools are smaller (25-35 students) and that they have the advantage of having English-speaking teachers.
The student body itself is different because they consider English as the key to higher education and they come from higher socio-economic strata. Mrs. Boulus concluded by saying that she agrees with the Recommendations 2 and 6 of Chapter II.

Mr. Mustafa Kuswani raised two points on the examination system. He pointed out that a choice has to be made between using public exams and relying on the annual results of students for university admission. He was reluctant about the latter as being a proper way of evaluating the students' achievement.

Dr. Albert Butros continued the discussion by pointing out two interesting features of the Survey: 1) A great deal of strength exists because the Survey was written completely by three English-language experts who have dealt with the situation from the outside. He pointed out that there was a great deal of value in this approach. 2) There is an aspect of weakness in the report — it is purely technical. He felt that it would have been more appropriate if a Jordanian member joined the 3-man team in the preparation of the Survey and that the Survey could have been a more useful document for future planning of English in the country. He concluded by suggesting that the Survey be revised by including 2-3 people involved in the teaching of English in Jordan.

Mr. Munther Al-Masri followed by opposing Recommendation 1 of Chapter II relative to the provision of English instruction in the secondary industrial schools. The reasons he gave were: 1) Improve methods of teaching (curricula, aids, etc.). 2) Increase in the number of periods should take into consideration total number of periods and the ratio of English periods in relation to other subjects; total number of students; and method of instruction. He further commented on the recommendation of teaching subjects other than English.

Dr. Prator answered that more English instruction could be provided in several ways, such as carrying out practical vocational activities in English, without adding more weekly periods of English. He further commented on Mr. Kuswani's statement concerning final examinations (Recommendation 13 of Chapter III). It was not necessary to depend entirely on examination grades or course grades given by teachers. By a suitable formula both types of grades could be considered in combination.

The Army Representative asked why there were no questions directed to the employers of the graduates. He indicated that precise information could be obtained from the employers.

Mr. Rabah Ezzat, supervisor of English in Amman, pointed out the fact that the approach was not the problem but the way the teachers handle it. He attributed the superiority of English instruction in private schools to the better socio-economic background of the students.

Mr. Burhan Kamal agreed to the statements that Mr. Al-Masri made...
and demanded a solution for the problem of finding technical teachers for industrial and trade schools who could teach the technical English needed. Mr. Kamal also pointed out that oral exams can be introduced and should therefore constitute a part of the public exams.

Dr. Majali agreed to the points made by Dr. Butros and referred to conclusions from the data. Finding enough teachers to teach all the students is an important point; the increase of the hours is not the solution. Mr. Majali then referred to Table 3 and to the average scores of English in public and private schools. He agreed with the comments made by Mr. Al-Masri and Dr. Butros on the importance of the overall picture.

Mr. Lovett-Turner, the British Council Representative, expounded on Dr. Kuswani’s point of view that oral examinations do exist in their public exams, but not in Arabic as a foreign language. He emphasized the need for improved motivation of students rather than increase of hours.

Dr. Adas pointed out that the chapters under discussion are informative and added that aims should be precisely defined. He referred to the public examinations and stressed that correspondence should be between aims and books and not public examinations. If this is guaranteed, the exams will correspond to the aims.

Miss J. M. Brolly, UNRWA advisor, was not in agreement with Recommendation 6 relevant to the postponement of oral activities. She stated that examinations should be on a broader base of reading material than there is at present.

Mr. Shaher El-Hassan commented on the recommended modification of the method of instruction to make more room for reading at the expense of oral skills. He pointed out that the Ministry of Education is firmly committed to the audio-lingual method because of the textbooks that are used. If a shift has to be made, the Ministry would have to modify the textbooks.

The comment made by Dr. Butros was that reading is one of the most difficult skills. He suggested that research be conducted before this is implemented.

Dr. Adbel-Haqq suggested that more priorities be given to teaching English but not at the expense of the native language. For higher education there should be special programs in English language.

Professor Prator referred the conferees to recent research conducted in Canada on English-speaking children receiving their education in French.

Dr. Ibrahim’s suggestion to postpone introduction of English in the schools might have a value because the adults have the capacity of learning better. The other point referred to was concerning the number of hours. Dr. Tucker displayed the relationship between the
length of instruction in a foreign language and proficiency in that language.

The opinion of Mr. Khayat was that the standard of English in Jordan is higher than in any of the other Arab countries. The weakness that exists is also in the instruction of Arabic and science. This is due to mass education — too many students and unqualified teachers. He recommended that the experiment mentioned in Recommendation 4 of Chapter II be applied.

Dr. Adas conducted a further discussion on the critical age of language acquisition. Reference was made by Dr. Tucker to some data available — which were by no means solid.

Mr. Ahmad Tawil recommended that emphasizing teaching of reading should be implemented. He indicated that the outcome of the oral approach is minimal because of the unqualified teachers and large classes. He pointed out that more emphasis on reading could minimize the harm done to students if only oral skills were emphasized.

January 24, 1973
Third Session: 5:00 - 7:30 p.m.

Presentation
Mr. William Harrison gave a detailed presentation of teacher-training policy (Chapter IV). He elaborated on the recommendations in this chapter.

Panel Discussion
Dr. Mohammed Ibrahim, Chairman, set the order for the panel discussion on teacher training. He began his discussion on pre-service and in-service training, both at the university and CITTI. He had one minor point concerning Table 9: Projected English Graduates of Qualifying Institutions 1973-1980. He said that the Department of English at the University of Jordan has decided to increase the number of students graduating and in 1976 the Department will produce 100 English specialists each year. Concerning the language courses, Dr. Ibrahim said that the Department of English at the University of Jordan has decided to increase the number of students graduating and in 1976 the Department will produce 100 English specialists each year. Concerning the language courses, Dr. Ibrahim said that four language courses were listed as being required: the skills of speech, translation, reading and writing. He indicated that there are more than these and this can be considered an important point. In addition, in the first year there are four courses, two of which are language courses for students who want to major. There is also a list of elective courses in linguistics. He referred to what Mr. Harrison said whether students doing education could be forced to do one or the other, a point which Dr. Ibrahim confirmed namely that the students actually have to do that. He finally gave details of the courses the students take.
Dr. Abdul Rahman Adas explained the three roles of the Department of Education as: pre-service, in-service and post graduate. He recommended that a committee from the University of Jordan and Ministry of Education be formed to look after teacher certification.

The subject of training colleges was dealt with by Mr. Kenneth Forster. He said that the teachers' competence in language is a central factor in teaching. He referred to Recommendation 3 of Chapter IV; that the Government consider various ways in which the English Specialist might be given a greater command of the English language, whether through an English-medium teacher-training institute or through intensive instruction in English during the summer. He also said, quoting from Appendix C, that "experts differ on the importance of the teacher and his share in the success or failure of foreign language learning. But no one denies that the teacher has some influence, and most seem to consider the teacher as the most important factor in making his students succeed or fail," He backed this by quoting "one of the main causes of ineffective English teaching in the world today is that so many teachers have an inadequate command of English." Mr. Forster listed the following points on the Training College System: that a great deal can and must be done to improve the competence and oral performance of these teachers; that the teacher must speak the language well as a first requirement; one of the drawbacks of the pre-service programme is that there has not been enough time devoted to the English language; it is assumed — wrongly — that students in the college have a good command of English by the time they arrive. He suggested that English should be taught for more hours and he noted the difficulty in doing so because of the other courses to be studied. He continued by saying that there are two language labs in operation, but their use was severely restricted because of budgetary and time considerations. He said that consideration is being given to an experiment in line with Miss Jayyusi's proposal. He concluded by saying that the suggestion made in Recommendation 3 is being actively investigated and that there is a possibility that there will be a long, intensive summer course with emphasis on language training.

Mr. Shahir El-Hassan gave a brief outline of the in-service training activities including a general picture of the certification program. He did not agree with the authors that the type of phonetics being taught in CITTI represents a practical approach to this subject area. He pointed out the following: that CITTI proposes to grant certificates like the pre-service institutes; that there is a great difference between pre-service and CITTI; that pre-service focuses on language patterns and skills and not phonetics or linguistics; that trainees at CITTI cannot handle phonetics and linguistics; this is a high level of
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instruction given at the graduate level. Mr. El-Hassan thought that the author of Appendix C has something very important to offer. He believed that the Ministry of Education should seriously consider Appendix C.

Mr. Harrison's comment was that CITTI was a new program and that it should be closely observed and supported. He agreed that the credit hours are important and that they should be carefully monitored and perhaps adjusted. He said that the CITTI courses dealing with phonetics, language teaching problems and in general the linguistic component seem to be practical in nature. He agreed with Mr. El-Hassan's comment that these courses are sometimes taught with a theoretical content in more advanced levels of education.

Dr. Ibrahim said that the recommendations contained in the Survey and suggestions by panelists revolve around the general consensus, the problem of teaching proficiency in English.

There was extensive discussion among Dr. Badran, Dr. Adas and Dr. Majali concerning the minor in education and major in English at the undergraduate and graduate levels at the University of Jordan. The point was raised that there are presently two methods by which a graduate English major may qualify himself for teaching, either through an in-service course done after receiving the B.A. or through an integrated education minor during the undergraduate years. The questions revolved around the acceptability of these two methods of certification by the Ministry of Education.

The Minister of Education said that this has not been faced by the Ministry yet but that a detailed study will be made of those who major in English and minor in education and how they are to be recognized by the Ministry as certified teachers.

Dr. Albert Butros said that there was no specific English major/education minor. He referred to Recommendation 7, (Chapter IV) and said that the Department offers two courses in methodology of language teaching but they are not part of the departmental requirements. The decision is left to the student to determine if he wants to go into teaching or not. His comment on Recommendation 8 was that it does exist within the Department as a strong specialization in language and explained in detail what the statement implied. He clarified that language specialization does not mean that it is a person who knows the language only, he should have a command of both language and education.

A further debate took place between Dr. Butros and Mr. Harrison regarding the major and minor hours. Dr. Ibrahim was of the opinion that language methodology courses are required for students with a minor in education. However, the point was clarified that this was not the case.
Miss May Nabil commented on the remark made by Mr. Al-Hassan regarding CITTI. She said that describing the CITTI program as a teach-yearself program would imply that the trainees work entirely on their own. She pointed out that this is not true. There are trainers, lecturers from outside to aid CITTI and tutors in charge of a certain number of trainees. She pointed out that the trainees are not students but colleagues and that CITTI tries to help them in the best possible way. The curriculum of CITTI was designed with all these factors in mind. CITTI has 14 credit hours for language because language proficiency is important. Miss Nabil gave a brief outline of CITTI in general and she described how they implement modern techniques.

Mr. El-Hassan had said that the two hours of phonetics at CITTI were unrealistic; Miss Nabil did not think so because they deal with the sound systems of both Arabic and English and they need a knowledge of both. She also did not agree with Mr. El-Hassan about the assignments written by specialists. She said that CITTI gets Ministry of Education personnel who specialize in education curriculum to assist in writing this material.

Mr. Sa'di Khayyat, Director of Education, UNRWA, said that the Ministry of Education made a lot of efforts concerning the training of teachers and their retention in the system. Mr. Harrison's comment was that part of this chapter deals with the retention of teachers in the system. He believed that the incentive measures taken up by the Government have helped keep secondary teachers in the system. Statistics indicate there is now 100% retention. He also said that statistical evidence shows that 60% of compulsory cycle teachers are retained and projections of new graduates from CITTI and other training institutes would give a net gain of 1000 new teachers with certification by 1980. On the whole, Mr. Harrison stated, this was a very favorable index of general improvement in the quality of teaching which would be gained by the educational system.

Dr. Abdul Haqq made the following comments:
1. In teachers colleges there are no English specialists. There are English majors. He recommended a change in the term to English major.
2. Teacher training colleges should be called teacher education institutes. He felt strongly concerning the use of the term education. He said that some valuable information was included in the Survey but no research has been done to tell if it is usable or not. He thought this was especially crucial as regards Miss Jayyusi's proposal in Appendix B.

Dr. Abdul Haqq questioned what was written on Page 1 of Appendix B: "the quality of teaching in TTC's is not up to the standard required" and wished that there had been some research made to verify it. His main
observation was that the Survey dealt with teachers colleges, but that it dwelled excessively on curriculum with a minimum of treatment regarding faculty and students. He recommended a change in the statement "The trainee of the institute, then, generally has chosen the institute as his second priority for post-secondary education." As pointed out by Mr. Forster, teachers are a very important factor. Due to special incentive pay, many well-qualified training personnel would work in the Curriculum Department or in CITTI. A re-examination of the special allowances given to CITTI and the Curriculum Department should be made and applied to teacher education colleges in order to attract equally well-qualified faculty members.

Dr. Abdul Haqq finally pointed out the importance of CITTI and in-service and pre-service training and that these should be seriously considered by the Ministry of Education in the future.

Mr. Forster again emphasized the importance of the competence of the teaching staff in the Teachers Colleges.

Miss Jayyusi then referred to the importance of a high standard of English proficiency required among English specialists. She indicated that there are no proficiency tests given to the English specialist graduates of the Teachers Colleges. The main idea was to have the teacher of English in the compulsory cycle able to reproduce the structures which are found in *New Living English for Jordan*. She said that many of the graduates of the Teachers Colleges are presently not capable of reproducing the language structures required. She emphasized English as a skill subject and as such it needs intensive practice and training. She said that the Board of Education has recently passed a resolution concerning the increase in number of hours for Teachers College specialists which she said was a healthy sign and a commendable decision.

Dr. Adbul Haqq thanked Miss Jayyusi for her proposal. He urged the conferees to discuss Mr. Forster's remark with special attention to increase of hours and starting the specialization from the first semester.

Miss J. M. Brolly was of the opinion that language and methodology cross paths and are closely allied in many ways. She felt that an integration of methodology and language must be achieved. Teachers must be able to communicate the materials of the textbooks to the students according to Miss Brolly.

Dr. Albert Butros again stressed the fact that training is a very important aspect of the preparation of teachers. The basic ingredient would be whether the teacher knows English or not. If effective programs at all levels could be organized to realize this important goal, training in methodology would become an effective process. He indicated that training should be placed in intensive courses and that
summer courses should be seriously planned to teach English to those who do not know the language.

Mr. Shahir El-Hassan agreed with Dr. Butros and said that if the two language laboratories that are available at the Teacher Training Institutes are properly used they would certainly help in the direction of qualifying the language of these students.

Mr. Ahmed Tawil pointed out that three criteria are essential in choosing teachers to teach English: 1) Grades in English at the secondary level; 2) Performance on an English examination specially devised for selection; and 3) Grades at the end of the first semester. He was of the opinion that subject matter for language specialists differs totally from subject matter of science or math. He supported Dr. Butros' point of view to look at the training of English teachers in the Teachers Colleges in a different way: if the students' English is not up to a sufficiently high level in the Tawjihi then special measures should be sought to bring him up to that level.

Dr. Adas suggested that English and methodology be taught for two years, which was in support of Miss Jayyusi's proposal.

Mr. Thomas Olson offered a suggestion for a small research project by which the proficiency standard of teachers be determined and an attempt made to discover the time needed to bring those teachers from their current standard to the standard required. He further suggested that these be translated in terms of cost to find out if it could be afforded or not.

Dr. Butros pointed out that the Ministry of Education has a regular intake of teachers every year for all kinds of subjects, not only English, and that the graduates of the Teachers Institutes are expected to teach more than one subject. He queried whether or not the Survey suggestion that English specialists teach English exclusively was practical.

January 25, 1973
Fourth Session: 8:00 - 10:30 a.m.

The discussions of the fourth session were concerned with the present policy and its implementation in the light of the Field Survey.

Mr. Abdurrahman Bushnaq, Chairman, opened the session by saying that this session would be an informal one and that certain decisions would have to be made. He stressed the problem of English as a medium of instruction. He said that English should not be used as a medium of instruction at the secondary level. He continued by saying that the Survey is a very valuable document which had to be brought up to date and will be used as a model for other subjects. He wished that a similar study could be made for the Arabic language.
He suggested considering the following two subjects: 1) The suggestion made by Miss Salma Jayyusi to establish a separate training college for teachers of English, both men and women; and 2) The idea of the Arab College.

Mr. Bushnaq appealed to His Excellency, the Minister of Education, to consider the establishment of a college like the Arab College of Jerusalem which existed during the mandate.

Other points made were: 1) Determination of a rationale for the study of English literature; 2) More attention should be given to examinations; 3) Improvement of contents of Arabic books versus English textbooks; 4) The need for greater demands on students (i.e. teachers should spend more time during the holidays with the students).

Presentation


"In the Survey our aim has been to examine critically diverse phases of English language instruction in Jordan. He hoped that enough information had been gathered and presented in such a way as to interest educators who must make decisions regarding English-language policy and the implementation of that policy. Researchers may wish to apply the methodology of our investigation in other countries; or to other subject matter areas."

He further indicated that the basic steps were:
1. to examine critically: the explicit and implicit goals of English teaching; the curricula which have been developed to implement these goals; the textbooks which are used; and the human resources, the teacher's, who must implement the curricula.
2. To conduct a field study to examine the relationship which exists between English and occupational and educational mobility.

In each of these areas, he said, we find strengths and weaknesses: goals do exist, but they are unrealistic; curricula are well thought out, but they are perhaps not demanding enough; available textbooks are good but the development of independent reading needs to be emphasized; good steps have been taken in teacher training, but large gaps remain, both to certify the unqualified and to upgrade the language proficiency of many.

Dr. Tucker's further comment on the present policy of English-language instruction in Jordan was that it seems to yield as its product a group of students who have developed a set of basic English skills which they use whether their secondary education is terminal or is a preparation for further training.

Many individuals appear to need greater facility in English than they can obtain within the framework of the present curriculum. This poses a dilemma: 1) We can accept the gap between expectation and
achievement and do nothing (and in doing so we know that this gap must
grow larger because of the increasing demand for universal education;
or 2) We can ask whether the present program can be revised in an
acceptable and economical manner to provide better English instruction
"within the general framework of Jordanian educational goals."

Dr. Tucker concluded by commenting on the four proposals of
Chapter VII: 1) The introduction of English at the Grade-2 level; 2)
Modifications within the existing framework; 3) Teaching selected
content subjects in English; 4) Intensive English instruction for
specific purposes.

Professor Clifford Prator spoke and directed his comments to the
present policy and the Field Survey. Dr. Prator again referred to the
four proposals of Chapter VII and indicated that No. 2 is the most
tempting. He did not think however, that modifying the methodology of
teaching English is a promising area. He emphasized that there seems
to be a failure to use English as a tool. Some of the recommendations
deal with this general field — to try to make more communicative use
of English. He pointed out the following recommendations as being of
particular interest.

1. Recommendation that certain activities be carried out in English
   in the vocational schools.
2. Recommendation dealing with the introduction of two additional
   hours of English instruction in the science stream.
3. The use of audio-visual aids to teach some aspects of content
   material.
4. Recommendation that there should be a certain amount of reading
   that is interesting to students of commerce.
5. Recommendation for planning the content of the English textbooks;
   attention should be paid to non-linguistic objectives.
6. Recommendation with regard to increasing the amount of outside
   reading expected of students.
7. Recommendation for finding ways of introducing more purposeful
   writing (e.g. to report real facts to classmates) with the
   curriculum.
8. The various recommendations dealing with the possibility of
   carrying on co-curricular activities within class hours.

Dr. Prator hoped that thought would be given to the use of English
as a medium of instruction as it increases the reason for using it
instrumentally. A correlation has been found in many places between
the use of English as a medium of instruction and better English
proficiency.

Sharif Fawwaz Sharaf believed that the Ministry of Education thought
that there was something wrong with the teaching of English in Jordan
and that the Survey supported two aspects. His feeling was that there
existed a great need to change teaching of English at the secondary level plus preparing the students with new skills in English to help them in acquiring jobs as part of the economic planning for the future generation of Jordan. He continued by saying that this Survey would help in deciding what should be done when the recommendations are accepted. The important thing was that new attitudes and priorities should be thought of when the curriculum or policies are changed. He indicated that the problem cannot be separated from the general problems of the system of education in Jordan. Teaching English is only one aspect of many other subjects being taught. He thinks that though Jordan is proud of its educational system, that does not mean that one should not be self-critical in order to improve the teaching of English or other subjects. He further said that within the limited resources available, there should be a reconsideration of the priorities. He concluded that we should be ready to take bold measures and decisions to remedy the situation.

Sharif Fawwaz differed with the viewpoint of the Chairman (Mr. Bushnaq) that subjects cannot be taught in English in view of the fact that the University of Jordan teaches science in English and will be teaching medicine as well.

His Excellency Dr. Ishaq Farhan, Minister of Education, agreed with Sharif Fawwaz' point of view that subjects can be taught in English, but at the university level only. He thought that using English as a medium of instruction would be a radical change in education. He further pointed out that using English to teach other subjects at the Secondary level is rejected because of two main reasons: 1) national prestige and 2) the fact that teachers are not prepared to teach such subjects in English.

Mr. Munther Masri commented on the recommendation for using English as a teaching medium. He said that if the sole aim is to improve language, it is a good suggestion; but if consideration is given to other factors within the picture it will be different. He pointed out that there was a recommendation by ALESCO to use Arabic as a teaching medium especially in technical and scientific subjects in Arab universities. He felt that there was an urgent duty to enrich Arabic by using it as a medium of instruction. The only criterion was whether Arabic is able to serve as a teaching medium or not. If it is, then it should be used. Regarding compromise solutions suggested by Mr. Bushnaq he said that they are unacceptable solutions. On the other hand, he supported using English as a teaching medium for students who specialize in English.

Dr. Abdurrahman Adas disagreed with the recommendation that undergraduates can use English as a medium of instruction. His view was that teaching can be done in English, but will not be up to the standard and skill required.
The use of English instruction in the university was extensively discussed by some of the members. Dr. Prator's point of view on that particular point was that by using English for meaningful purposes one learns the language.

Dr. Abdal Salam Majali, President of the University of Jordan, said that English is being used in the university because of the lack of books in Arabic, and that concentration should be on the improvement of textbooks and teachers. Mrs. Boulos' comment was that English should be strengthened in the school first rather than the university.

Mr. Burhan Kamal opposed the teaching of subjects in English because of the lack of trained teachers.

Dr. Mohammed Ibrahim emphasized the insecurity of Arabic and the problem of the lack of teachers. He supported the suggestion made by Mr. Masri regarding the use of English as a teaching medium for students who specialize in English.

Mrs. Joan Undeland said that it would be very good to teach science in English and pointed out the fact that a big effort had to be made by her English teachers to point out the structures used in the textbooks.

Mr. Shahir Al-Hassan's comment was that it would involve a lot of expense to do that and that the people concerned should have the technical know-how if those books were to be produced in Jordan. Dr. Prator said that the idea of using English as a medium of instruction clearly lacked support and urged promoting use of the language for other purposes. He indicated that situations in which language can be used should be defined. Mr. Ahmed Tawil's observation was that language teaching should be meaningful and that it is part of the whole behavior — it cannot be separated from what it is about and that the improvement of English instruction should be thought of along these lines.

Mr. Abdurrahman Bushnaq wished the Ministry of Education would find a solution for this problem and to the suggestion made by Mrs. Joan Undeland regarding the teaching of science in English. A solution was pointed out by Dr. Albert Butros: 1) Selecting teachers who know English extremely well regardless of their formal training and certification; 2) Devising curricula that take care of the general and special needs of the country; 3) Finding textbooks built on those curricula which are productive and functional; and 4) Training and follow-up.

In Jordan, 2, 3, and 4 become almost irrelevant when measured against 1. The solution would be to pick teachers who know English and upgrade the curricula and textbooks. He further emphasized the question of a foreign language versus the native language. As His Excellency, Dr. Ishaq Farhan said the native language reflects basic philosophy. A foreign language is for basic communication, making
use of research, communicating with foreign countries and services of tourism. Dr. Butros said that this would be a bold initiative to make. It is a question of shift of resources; he thought that there are many people who know English in Jordan better than most of the teachers of English. If a system of incentives for attracting these people into this profession can be devised, then it would be very meaningful.

Mr. Bushnaq's comment was that such a step would be made as an emergency measure only but a long-term plan has to be made to train teachers.

Further discussion was made by the members on the idea of an Arab College.

His Excellency, Dr. Farhan said that this idea has been under consideration since the time of the membership of Mr. Bushnaq in the Board of Education, but that the Ministry is hesitant to take such a step, not from the academic point of view, but from the social point of view. It might reflect a sort of segregation. The members of the Board of Education will reconsider this suggestion.

Miss Salma Jayyusi stressed that there should be special education for the gifted child in the secondary level. A college along the lines of the Arab College in Jerusalem would serve that need.

Mr. Al-Hassan refuted the idea of admitting the elite only with no consideration to the others in different parts of the country.

His Excellency, Dr. Farhan agreed with the suggestion made by Dr. Albert Butros. He considered the issue of teacher training as being the most important one. Dr. Butros' suggestion, His Excellency said, might be one of the guidelines to direct action in the Ministry of Education. He continued saying that the Ministry has taken several measures but this will motivate broader measures. His Excellency, Dr. Farhan consented to the idea of using resources in the community on a part-time basis to solve some of the problems.

His Excellency, Dr. Farhan said that more work and elaboration is needed in the area of examination. The general pool referred to by Dr. Butros is a good potential to which serious consideration should be given. But efforts should be made to develop sophisticated examinations to recruit better teachers.

Miss Jayyusi believed that these measures would be of great help in producing better qualified teachers. English is a skill and has to be treated in a different way from other subjects in the Teacher Training Colleges. Students need to be immersed in an English-language atmosphere to be proficient in the use of the language and to be able to teach it at the compulsory stage. It would not be too great a burden to initiate such a college for prospective teachers of English.

His Excellency, Dr. Farhan referred to the proposal of Miss Jayyusi and said that it would be worth further study. He, however, rejected
the idea of using English as a medium of instruction for those who are not specializing in English. He concluded by saying that such an idea could be experimented in parallel with what exists.

Dr. Nouri Shafiq's view was that the improvement of English teaching in Jordan should be looked upon as a tool to introduce changes along the different components: the individual, society and the whole culture. He hoped that thought would be given to how this tool can be used to accelerate changes that are taking place in the process of modernizing the whole culture.

Dr. Albert Butros supported Miss Jayyusi's proposal. His only reservation was about setting it up separately from existing institutions which might imply weakening the programs of other teacher colleges. He offered a modification to Miss Jayyusi's proposal; that the Ministry select one of the existing teacher colleges and strengthen its program and use it as a resource center for other teacher colleges in the area.

Miss Jayyusi strongly opposed the modification suggested, because it would not achieve the strategy that was set up for it. Students have to live in an English-language atmosphere. She said that if the college succeeds it could be made to be a regional center that would serve the entire Middle East.

Dr. Adnan Badran suggested that specialized institutes should be established: English, Arabic, Science and Technology, and by doing so good instructors could be provided in each specific field. His Excellency, Dr. Farhan said that such a suggestion would be worth studying.

January 25, 1973
Fifth Session: 11:00 - 1:30 p.m.

Panel Discussion
The Fifth Session dealt with future plans, with Dr. Nouri Shafiq as Chairman. He presented the order of the panel discussions.

Dr. Shafiq started by saying that we are in an age of very rapid cultural change which the whole world is experiencing. The changes are taking place in different cultures and societies. Jordanians are experiencing changes in society and as individuals. He proposed that the improvement of English teaching in Jordan be regarded as a tool to help individuals in their growth and the country as well as in the process of development. He indicated three factors to be considered: 1) Nature of change; 2) Agents of change; and 3) Environment.

He pointed out that the Survey deals with the nature of change and to some extent with the agents of change but it has not dealt with the environment of change. To introduce such changes one has to think
whether it is desirable to do so as a comprehensive approach or an incremental approach. The values are leadership and time. A comprehensive approach can only be applicable if the two values are available; but since these are not 100% available, then an incremental approach would be more suitable, e.g. to introduce bits of change for the improvement of English teaching in Jordan. Consideration should be seriously given to: 1) Agents of change; 2) Leadership in the Ministry of Education; and 3) Other leaders needed: teachers, professors, etc. These are not available to introduce the changes.

Thought has to be given to the training of teachers. He indicated that this corresponds with the notion that Dr. Butros mentioned as number one priority: preparation of teachers. How do we prepare agents of change to improve language teaching? There are two kinds of institutions: 1) Teachers colleges and the University of Jordan; 2) Miss Jayyusi’s proposal to have a separate institute to train teachers at the compulsory level.

The other areas to be explored relate to the curriculum (Chapter VIII) objectives at the compulsory and secondary cycle, textbooks used, whether to use English as a medium of teaching other subjects, the area of adult education and the area of graduate university education. As for change agents in the areas needed for moderizing the cultural development of the society two graduate programs are needed at the University of Jordan: 1) To train MA students in economic development and English; 2) To have MA graduates in management.

Dr. Shafiq’s concluding statement was that the above were some ideas that would help look into the recommendations in the five areas mentioned in Chapter VIII of the Survey.

He opened the floor to the panelists to start making comments on recommendations in Chapter VIII: the main points to be stressed and emphasized.

His Excellency, Dr. Ishaq Farhan made two remarks concerning the teaching of English as a foreign language and using English as a medium of instruction. The former is being taught without the purpose of teaching the standard of a native speaker of the language. The latter is not accepted because of the environmental and cultural aspects referred to during the course of the discussions. He classified the recommendations of Chapter VIII as follows:

1. Some of the conclusions are self-evident; these should not appear as conclusions but rather as general statements within the body of the chapter.
2. The second set of conclusions are not practical because of the dimensions in Jordan. There is no value in pushing them as recommendations for action.
3. The third set of recommendations need further research. They
are good because they open the door for further research whether related directly to this study or research as a model for other students.

4. The fourth set of recommendations lead to action directly. They are worth study and further consideration as worksheets that lead to action.

His Excellency, Dr. Farhan commented on the Recommendations:

1. Recommendation 1 is worth study and although he believes that the spirit of R. 2 and R. 3 is that care should be directed to English teaching, its importance, the increase in number of periods, etc., he thinks that teaching English in secondary industrial schools is worth studying.

2. Recommendation 7 is worthwhile and closer correspondence should be developed between the aims of English teaching and public examination systems. He suggested that some tests should be designed and that the Ministry will take action on this. Oral tests and comprehension should also be tried in public examinations — the Ministry has had no experience in that aspect.

3. Recommendation 8 relates to the examinations. If the University of Jordan designs entrance examinations of its own, the Tawjih could then be eliminated. To reach such a stage the Minister agreed with the recommendation to prepare some examinations and consider taking students' performance.

Dr. Nouri Shafiq drew the attention of the conference to the point that the panelists represent themselves and not the Government.

Mr. Masri commented on the change in number of weekly periods and pointed out that any attempt to do so should be governed by the necessity to maintain a good balance with other subjects. He said that concentration should be placed on improving methods of teaching English rather than increasing the number of periods.

Dr. Abdul Haqq referred to Recommendation 5 concerning modifying the method of English instruction used in the schools in the compulsory cycle so as to put more emphasis on the teaching of reading and that emphasis on oral activities be postponed until the secondary level. Dr. Abdul Haqq thought this to be a good recommendation and that it could be one of the guidelines which should be discussed by the specialists in the Ministry of Education in the English language.

Dr. Prator said the reason for including Recommendation 4 was simply the connection between size of classes and possible methods of instruction.

Miss Salma Jayyusi commented on Recommendation 1 that the Ministry of Education consider the possibility of providing more instruction in English in the industrial schools. She feels that this needs to be taken into serious consideration. There is a certain
minimum which the teaching of a foreign language requires. It is not achieved by these schools and the two hours of English instruction should be wholly modified. Either we do away with English altogether or bring up the number of weekly hours to the minimum required for English language learning.

Dr. Nouri Shafiq concurred with recommendations under (A). He emphasized Recommendations 6, 8 and 9. With regard to R. 8 and R. 9 he hoped that the Department of Examinations could start working on their follow-up and implementation.

Dr. Shafiq then opened the floor for comments on the recommendations in (B): "Recommendations concerning Curriculum Change."

Mr. Shahir Al-Hassan's comments on R.1 and R.2 were that these two should be considered carefully.

On Recommendation 11 Dr. Ibrahim said that it is extremely important. He said that since the Ministry is already working on a new series of books in the secondary cycle, this recommendation should be kept in mind because, as the authors pointed out, students finish high school without being exposed to the type of English of the native speaker.

Mrs. Undeland stressed the importance of writing (R.12). She said that students do not carry speech habits into writing and that she feels that writing should be taught as part of the process.

Miss Jayyusi commented on Dr. Ibrahim's observation relative to the point of extensive reading to be included in the curriculum in the secondary stage. She said that this has already been included. Dr. Shafiq said that assistance is needed in procuring books that are related to the basic needs of students, that this kind of material will help improve English teaching in the schools. He suggested that there should be in-service training for the English teachers on how to use outside readings. Miss Jayyusi pointed out that the problem is more complex because of the fact that these children's books are written for the native speaker of English and that consideration should be given to the mental capacity and interests of the non-native speakers of English who will use these books. Dr. Prator agreed with Miss Jayyusi's point of view. Dr. Shafiq pointed out that there are two kinds of children's literature: 1) that geared to native language, and 2) simplified material for foreign learners.

The panelists then moved to Recommendation 16 concerning the use of mass media. Dr. Butros suggested that his recommendation should not have been included because it deals with something that already exists, while Dr. Shafiq elaborated on the use of mass media and children's literature.

Sharif Fawwaz' remark was that television and radio should be more emphasized because of its real impact on the teaching of English and that special efforts should be made by the Ministry to come into this
area to save efforts in other directions. The Ministry of Education should have complete supervision of these programs and set up a department that is really advanced in using television and radio. This would be a very economical aspect.

In summary, Dr. Shafiq said that all recommendations were agreed upon in (B) with special emphasis on R.4, R.9 and R.10. He, however, hoped that in the rewriting of the recommendations attention would be paid to adult education while thinking of using television and radio.

Then discussion of recommendations in (C) followed. These concern teacher-training. His Excellency, Dr. Farhan commented on R.10: to have this as a document to design a sort of in-service course to be adopted immediately because this will make a contribution to the goals of in-service education. On R.11 he commented: although it is very necessary, it needs very painstaking and lengthy research processes, to find out who is fit for teaching English and what should be done about others who are not good potentials.

Dr. Albert Butros suggested the inclusion of one recommendation at the beginning: that the teacher should know English. He moved to Recommendation 8 of (C) that certain alterations be considered in the course requirements for the Department of English of the University of Jordan in order to assure that all graduates have a special course in the methodology of language teaching. His feeling on that recommendation was that a methodology course should not be made a requirement for all majors. Methodology courses should be open for all students in the department. They should not be included in the curriculum for every single student. There are some who do not want or need it. He recommended that this particular recommendation be discarded. He also urged that R.9 — that the University establish a clear specialization in language for those Department of English students who are undertaking a minor in education — be discarded.

Mr. William Harrison clarified R.9: that a number of these people are on Government scholarships and that the recommendation was made to match the needs of the Ministry of Education for the school system.

Dr. Abdul Haqq raised the following four points:
1. That the Ministry of Education study the possibility of extending teacher education in the institutes for three years for those who will teach in classes 7, 8 and 9 and two years for those in primary 1-6.
2. Concerning Miss Jayyusi's proposal: a recommendation should be taken that the Ministry of Education study the proposal and at least try a kind of experiment to see if the Ministry could benefit from this proposal for the teaching of English language.
3. Concerning the recruitment of qualified and better teachers for
teachers institutes: the Ministry of Education has tried to retain and attract teachers. He suggested that the Ministry consider seriously a kind of increment for the instructors at teachers institutes.

4. Concerning the university: the teachers institutes do not attract the good students. He proposed that a committee be formed from the University and Ministry of Education Teachers Section to discuss possibility of accepting graduates in their 3rd year since they are following the credit system. This should be thought of seriously.

Dr. Majali opposed Dr. Abdul Haqq's suggestions 1 and 4. His Excellency, Dr. Farhan referred to the suggestion of incentives as being a good idea and that it might improve total teacher supply. He also agreed with Dr. Majali's point of view: that instead of increasing it to three years, add nine months and the students will get a B.A. He hoped that the time would come when the minimum requirements of the teachers would be at least the B.A. degree. He indicated that he would be ready to consider urgently that the newly established Faculty of Education take on the problem of education and to concentrate the efforts on in-service education.

Miss Jayyusi believed that to have all teachers in the Compulsory Cycle have a B.A. degree is a luxury which Jordan cannot afford. She added that there is still a need for what is called "the middle-man," two-year course at the post secondary level is all that is needed for qualifying a teacher at the Compulsory cycle level. She added that the implementation of her proposal would guarantee the production of such qualified teachers of English. The proposed institute could become a regional center of quite a high standard.

Dr. Shafiq commented on Recommendations 5, 6 and 11. He suggested that Recommendation 6 should be reworded to help with the pre-service and get rid of the untrainables who are in service and at the same time have some kind of placement tests. He was in favor of establishing a new institution in Jordan where all courses are taught in English and that if it succeeds, it should be expanded to become a regional institute to help with the production of teachers. He finally hoped that the Ministry of Education would work out details of such a project.

Dr. Abdul Haqq proposed that experimentation be made on groups to see if there will be any progress before making any commitments. He also noted that the University might be taking over the whole training process.

The panelists moved on to recommendations under (D). His Excellency, Dr. Farhan indicated that any kind of research, whether suggested in the recommendations or not, is worth following up. He
suggested that R. 6 and R. 7 be discarded because he thought they were not practical in terms of the product.

Dr. Albert Butros also strongly supported any recommendation in the direction of basic research.

Dr. Shafiq, however, suggested that R. 6 and R. 7 be reworded to introduce English as a medium of instruction at the graduate level. He hoped that some programs be established for planners and managers who know English well. He suggested that there should be some kind of recommendation that the graduate programs at the University have half of the courses conducted in English. Also at the undergraduate level to introduce some courses to be conducted in English, at least one course each semester. He strongly felt the need for future leaders who know English well.

Mrs. Undeland requested that more research be made on the point of developing techniques to have the student use English textbooks. This is a real problem.

Dr. Albert Butros suggested another recommendation on research: that research be conducted in Jordan on the special needs that exist in various departments, ministries public and private sectors, and have courses that would satisfy some of the special needs.

Comments followed on recommendations under (E). Dr. Albert Butros said that most of the recommendations concerning the University English program are in existence in the University, and that placing them under recommendations changes the whole picture. He said that that section was the least documented of the study. He indicated that he was away at the time the study was made and that there was not sufficient provision for the orderly progression of the chain of command and that he would recommend the following.

R. 1: A number of these statements be taken out of the recommendations section into the area in which they originally appear and that any further statements about the university programs have to be very carefully documented. He indicated that there should be a field study on that particular situation. He thought that that was a purely administrative problem.

R. 2: (a) was already done by the University.
(b) was already done by the University.
(c) to be considered carefully in terms of the overall priorities of English which would grow out of other deliberations resulting from discussion in this conference.
(d) did not agree that students take placement tests.

R. 3: Very useful and that it is the policy of the University. He said that these should not be mere exercises in translations.

R. 4: This is a very difficult one. He agreed with the writers of the Survey that language labs like any other equipment should not
be brought in until they are made absolutely functional within the program. Steps were being taken by the University to start a language lab. He proposed a rewording along the lines: a language laboratory might be a very desirable thing to have. Perhaps this could be done in steps: 1) Concentrate in the next 2-3 months on working on getting a phonetics lab before a language lab into the Department; 2) Install the language lab and tie it in with the phonetics lab and hours of the program; 3) Consider the language lab at some point when the people can use such machinery.

Dr. Nouri Shafiq made the following comments:

1. The writers should make relevant changes in these recommendations in terms of the observations made by Dr. Butros. He suggested that a committee be formed of the writers, one man from the University and one from the Ministry of Education to clear up the recommendations.

2. Dr. Shafiq felt that there was a need for a recommendation about the teaching of English to adults, and that for the development of the society, the English language of the different categories of the people in different locations should be improved. This could only be done through other educational programs.

3. To increase the input of the Department of Education, that number of enrollment be increased in the coming years from 100 to 200-250 annually.

4. To follow up on the implementation of these recommendations. That the Ministry of Education, the University of Jordan and other agencies in Jordan form a committee to be established as soon as possible to plan for that implementation.

A final remark was made by Mr. Burhan Kamal in which he suggested that a general recommendation should be made to include the provision that whenever any of those recommendations are studied, the needs of technical and industrial education should be kept in mind.

His Excellency, Dr. Ishaq Farhan closed the conference by thanking all the members who have had active participation, with special thanks to the team of authors who have provided this valuable Field Study. He said that he was sure this will provoke many avenues of research and will be a point of reference in the attempt to improve English teaching in Jordan. He concluded by saying that the Ministry look forward to the implementation of the recommendations and to a final report which is to be published in line with the discussions that have taken place. He once again thanked the members of the conference for their participation.
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APPENDIX B: A TRAINING COLLEGE FOR TEACHERS OF ENGLISH

I. Background
A. At present all new compulsory-cycle teachers are trained in the three existing training colleges of Amman, Hawwara and Ajloun.
B. There are strong reasons for supposing that the present system has serious disadvantages;
   1. Not enough teachers are being trained; in 1971-72 all three colleges together will produce a maximum of 92 teachers of English; 70 men and 22 women. In 1971 all three colleges together produced 40 teachers of English, 29 men and 11 women. In 1973, all three colleges together will produce a maximum of about 90. These figures do not even cover natural wastage from the profession (retirements, transfers, marriage, death, etc.). In other words, we are finding fewer trained teachers in the schools each year instead of more.
   2. The quality of training in T. T. C. is not up to the standard required. a) Not enough time is given to English in the syllabus; and b) Not enough time is given even now to language training as opposed to the theoretical training.
   3. It must be remembered that English, like all language is a skill subject. This means that we must think more in terms of training rather than teaching. The ability to understand and speak a language cannot be imparted to students in a set and limited number of class periods; on the contrary it is a continuous process requiring intensive and prolonged practice. The skill aspect of English is all the more important when we remember that we are, in Jordan, officially committed (in our view quite rightly) to an aural-oral or "direct" approach to the teaching of English. This approach demands, if it is to be successful, teachers who have good oral command of the language, especially in the first three or four years of school English. This condition is not being met at the present time; on the contrary, children are being taught English in their first 3 or 4 years of language (5th Elementary to first or second Preparatory) by teachers whose own command of the language, especially in speech, is sadly lacking.
C. As the most effective remedy for the unhappy situation outlined above, we suggest the following:
   1. Prospective teachers of English should be separated out from prospective teachers of other subjects and should be trained in a separate institute.
2. The main features of such an institute would be:
   a) heavy emphasis on practical English training, including
classroom teaching, intensive language work in the language
laboratories (the existing language labs to be installed in the
new institute), and basic insights into phonology, linguistics
and comparative Arabic-English studies.
   b) English-medium instruction in other subjects. This means
that the trainees should study all education and psychology
subjects and all general subjects in English. Experience in
many parts of the world has shown that at all levels of education,
from kindergarten to Ph. D. degrees, students learn more
English from subjects taught in English than they do from their
English lessons proper. We feel strongly that this excellent and
valuable motivating and training factor should be used by us in
such an institute to the fullest possible extent.
   We realize of course that some subjects will have to be taught in
Arabic. In particular, we think of Arabic Language and Islamic
religious culture. The intention behind this proposal is most
certainly not to turn the student away from his first language
and its culture, but rather to give him a sound education in that
culture plus a high standard in his field of specialization. The
English teacher's main professional equipment is a high level of
performance in the English Language, and we feel that this can
only be achieved in a two-year course by teaching a large
proportion of the syllabus in English.
   c) The daily life and routine of the institute, its social life and
activities, and all co-curricular functions would be conducted as
far as possible in English. The aim here is to keep the student
constantly, or as constantly as possible, in an English-language
environment. Again, it must be emphasized that the under-
lying purpose is a professional one: to train teachers of
English who are up to their responsibilities to their future
students.

II. A. Practical Proposals
   1. The proposed institute should be located in Amman. We feel
that Amman's position as the capital, with all that this implies
in terms of recruitment (both of staff and of students), library
facilities, etc. makes this choice of location the only logical
one.
   2. The institute should train men and women students. This will
entail the use of two buildings. Ideally, the larger of these
two buildings should contain all reaching facilities, plus
accommodation for either men or women. The second building should serve as an accommodation unit only for students of the other sex.

3. As far as cost is concerned, we realize that the rent for the two buildings necessary has to be found. In practice, however, the net cost of such an institute need not be all onerous, since a large part of the extra funding required for rental would be offset by savings resulting from the central nature of such an institute. For example, under the present system, at least five full time English staff are necessary in the three colleges together, plus the full time British-recruited lecturer. In the proposed institute, the same number of students would be trained, much more effectively, by three full-time English staff members, including the British-recruited lecturer. There is thus a considerable salary saving. Furthermore, the new institute would cost hardly anything under the head of equipment, since all necessary equipment could be provided from existing stocks. There is the further point that a considerable capacity would be left free in the existing three institutes, enabling these institutes to increase their intake and output in other fields of specialization than English.

All in all, we are convinced that the proposed institute would cost surprisingly little, especially when the benefits are taken into account.

4. The intake of the new institute should be on the order of 100-120 for the first year. In the second and subsequent years, the intake should be expanded to something like 200 (both figures represent men and women students). This would mean that from the very beginning, we should train as many teachers of English as are now being trained by the other three colleges, and that we should from the institute's second year of operation, begin to produce at last an adequate number of new teachers of English. Above all, the products of the new institute would be much more highly trained in their field of specialization. Thus would be laid the foundations to the long-term solution of Jordan's main problem in the field of English-language teaching.

B. We envisage (though this is looking rather far ahead) the future status of this institute as growing to a point at which it would be a model for the whole of the Arab world. It could easily become in time a famous and respected centre, not only for the training of teachers, but for experimental work in teaching
and in English-language studies in general. Properly launched, and effectively administered, this institute could well attract worthwhile support from outside agencies. However, we do feel that the initial impetus should come from the Jordanian Ministry of Education.

Submitted by: Salma Jayyusi
Head of English Section
Curriculum Directorate
APPENDIX C: THE TRAINING OF ENGLISH TEACHERS IN JORDAN

PRELIMINARY CONSIDERATIONS

1.1. The Problem. According to statistics published by the Ministry of Education about 75% of all of our teachers are technically unqualified for their jobs (Risalat al-Mu'allim, pp. 87-88). The Education Bill No. 16 (1964) defines the qualified teacher as one who has passed the General Certificate Examination and has successfully completed two additional years of study devoted to instruction in general education, the teacher's field of specialization, and education. Even if we accept this inadequate criterion of what constitutes a qualified teacher, the percentage of unqualified English teachers in Jordan probably exceeds 75%.

1.2. Importance and Role of the Teacher of English. Experts differ on the importance of the teacher and his share in the success or failure of foreign language learning. But no one denies that the teacher has some influence, and most seem to consider the teacher as the most important factor in making his students succeed or fail in learning the foreign language which is his specialty. Here is a sample of opinions:

"One of the main causes of ineffective English teaching in the world today is that so many teachers have an inadequate command of English." (Lee, p. 115)

"Why is it in all countries where a foreign language is taught, a very large proportion of the pupils fail, after five or six years work, to become proficient? The main reasons are: (1) unsuitable classroom conditions, (2) unsatisfactory textbooks, (3) wrong methods, and (4) untrained teachers. The last is the most important, for if we can train the teacher, make him efficient, and give confidence, he can himself remove or get round most of the other drawbacks. He can improve his classroom environment, and though he may not be able to reduce the size of a class, he will know how to get the best results from the fifty or sixty pupils he has to teach. As for the textbooks, the trained teacher becomes expert at making the best of even the wrong specimen, avoiding its defects and adding what is necessary. And he is not likely to cause his pupils to suffer by trying to teach them by mistaken methods. It seems therefore, that most of the obstacles to the acquirement of a second language will be removed if we can provide the perfect teacher." (Gatenby, p. 213)
"For a properly trained teacher, almost any book will serve, merely as a check on the ground he has covered. An untrained or badly trained teacher is likely to make poor use even of a good textbook." (Cartledge, p. 62)

If we agree on the importance of the teacher, then this report is justified. My main concern in the following pages will not be with facts and statistics pertaining to the teacher situation in Jordan. I shall take it for granted that the problem exists and I shall, therefore, devote my attention to exploring the most practical ways for relieving the problem and making it less acute.

1. 3. Qualifications of the Teacher of English. Who is qualified to teach English? I believe that the qualification criterion set forth by the Ministry of Education and quoted in section 1.1. is inadequate. It gives too narrow a description of who is qualified to teach a certain subject. A much more satisfactory alternative would be for us "(1) to agree upon what constitutes the minimal, good, and superior qualifications of a secondary school teacher of (a certain) subject; (2) to develop reliable tests of these qualifications, and then (3) firmly to decline all responsibility for persons certified to teach without having performed satisfactorily on these tests." (Parker, p. 57)

To the best of my knowledge, nowhere in the world has this outline been implemented for the teachers of any subject. In the United States, however, a number of academic organizations concerned with language teaching have agreed on a detailed statement with reference to point (1) above (see pg. 182). If we find this statement suitable for us in this country, then perhaps we should start working on the next point.

1. 4. The Needs of the English Teacher in Jordan. The needs of the English teacher fall into two categories: linguistic and professional. The English language teacher will remain ineffective as long as his command of English is inadequate, no matter how well trained he is. Likewise, a teacher whose command of English is more than satisfactory may still fail in his job of teaching English if he is not properly trained for the task. Therefore, any plan which seeks to improve our teacher's effectiveness should take these two factors into account; the plan should aim first at improving the teachers' own English and, second, at equipping them with the necessary educational techniques and devices needed for their task.

1. 5. The Present Situation in Teacher Training. The training of English teachers in Jordan at present may be divided into three
areas: (1) in-service training, (2) the preparation of English teachers by the teachers colleges and (3) the preparation of English teachers by the Department of English at the University of Jordan.

In-service training programs carried out by the Ministry of Education are at best ineffective. Many of these programs last for a very short time (a single day or a week) and even this short time is usually abused since most of it is used for lecturing the teachers on education and psychology. There is nothing wrong with giving the teachers some basic knowledge of these fields, but our teachers of English need other things more badly. If we remember that what most of our teachers lack is a good command of English, we will know how futile it is to try to teach them about psychology and education. The best educational and psychological principles are no substitute for a basic knowledge of the subject one is teaching.

Almost the same thing can be said of the efforts of the teachers' colleges in training English teachers, but the picture here is a little brighter since the students of these colleges spend at least some time studying the English language. This time, however, is not enough. This seems to be not only our problem, but a world wide one, if this is any consolation: "For many thousands of teachers of English in developing countries, existing training is largely a waste of time because it is too academic. . . . There is often a lack of realism in teacher-training: time given to courses in psychology, often of an out-of-date kind, and principles of education, which would be better spent on ensuring, as far as student English teachers are concerned, that they had a better command of what they will have to teach and how to teach it. . . . Education in primitive societies or the culture epoch theory may doubtless be of interest, but they are not an essential part of training a teacher in English." (Smith, pp. 184-185)

The University of Jordan's English Department is superior to the in-service training programs and the teachers' colleges in that it devotes much more time to improving its students' command of spoken and written English. From personal experience, however, the English Department is still not doing all it can to alleviate the shortage of trained English teachers for the following reasons:
1) The program of the Department is literature-oriented. The students of the Department learn a great deal about English literature from the Old English period to the present. Most of what they learn, however, will be of little use for them after their graduation as teachers of English in our secondary schools since very little literature is taught in these schools.
2) The proficiency in English of some of the graduates of the English Department is below the minimum desired for English teachers.
3) Even those graduates with an adequate command of English are ill-prepared for the teaching of English. This is because in their four years of study at the Department the students do not take a single course in methodology or in the teaching of English as a foreign language. Thus it seems that the problem of preparing teachers of English in Jordan is getting more and more serious and that, unless an extensive training program is devised and carried out, the standard of our English teachers, and consequently the standard of English in our schools, will continue to worsen. In what remains of this report, I shall attempt to outline such a program and suggest the means for its implementation.

A PLAN FOR TRAINING ENGLISH TEACHERS IN JORDAN

In accordance with what has been said in section 1.4. and 1.5., any effective training program for the teachers of English must include two broad types of activity: (1) improving the teachers' grasp of English, and (2) improving the teachers' professional adequacy.

2. 1. Better Proficiency in English. Every teacher of English should, ideally, be able to listen, read, speak and write in English with reasonable facility. An effective teacher, however, will need more than these fundamental skills. He should also study English usage and the varieties of English. "Usage" refers to the use of the language in different situations such as formal, informal, colloquial, slang, and dialect. "Varieties" in English includes differences between American and British English and, if possible, some familiarization with the Canadian, Australian, etc. varieties of the language. Under "varieties" I would also include differences between Modern English, and say, Shakespeare's English. This does not mean that the teacher must study the history and development of the English language, desirable as this may be, but that he should know all that is necessary for teaching the language.

2. 2. Better Professional Preparation. The English teacher should undergo special training to prepare him for the job of teaching English. Courses in education and psychology are not enough because in such courses one studies the most general principles which apply to the teaching of any subject. The English teacher needs something additional and special for his own field. Broadly speaking, this type of training and preparation should seek to provide the English teacher in Jordan with an awareness of the structures of Arabic and English, with an understanding of the teaching methods.
of English as a foreign language, and the means for acquiring some
teaching skill and improving it. (cf. Lee, p. 123)

2. 3. Organization of the Training Program. In the light of the previous
discussion, a program for the training of English teachers in Jordan
may be organized along the following lines:
1) The Ministry of Education should organize courses for instruction
in English for those teachers willing to improve their level of pro-
ficiency in the language. These courses should be of different levels
to suit the level of the individual teacher. A placement test should
be devised by the Ministry and taken by all teachers who wish to
participate in the training program to determine the level of the
course which may best serve the teacher's need.
2) Teachers who, on the basis of the placement test, are found not
to need any further instruction in English and teachers who success-
fully complete a certain level in English (let's call it Advanced
English) may take courses of a different nature. No one should be
allowed to take such courses before passing Advanced English.
3) In addition to courses in English, the Ministry should also
organize other types of courses such as in English usage, the
varieties of English, history of the English language, teaching
methods, contrastive linguistics, and teaching English as a foreign
language (for details see section 2.4 below).
4) Teachers who pass all or some of the courses administered by the
Ministry should be given credit for their work. This credit may be in
the form of a certificate or diploma and a raise in the teacher's salary
proportionate to the number of courses that the teacher has success-
fully completed.
5) A teacher enrolled in one or more of the courses should be given
a somewhat lighter load in order to enable him to do his course work
satisfactorily and effectively.
6) It is suggested that the courses be taught in the afternoons or
evenings. There are at least three advantages for such an
arrangement: a) To enable as many teachers as possible to attend
the classes; b) To ensure the availability of buildings for use as
classrooms; c) To ensure the availability of instructors needed for
the Program. (Presumably, most of the instructors connected with
this Program will be people who already have full-time jobs at the
University, the Ministry, the teachers' colleges, and other
institutions.)
7) Since teachers participating in the Program will be teaching and
studying at the same time, and since, presumably, there is not
enough manpower (mainly instructors) to provide immediately for the
needs of all teachers of English who need training, and since the
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Amman area seems to be the most natural place for running this type of program, at least two possibilities exist with regard to the administration of the Program:

a) The teachers in the Amman schools and in the schools of neighbouring towns and villages will have the opportunity to enroll in the Program courses during the school year. Teachers from other districts will be given the same courses during the summer vacation.

b) Teachers in the Amman area will be given the chance to enroll in the Program. Those who are unwilling to benefit from the Program should be transferred to schools with teachers eager to improve their professional standard. Another possibility is to transfer those teachers who complete the curriculum of the Program to schools in other areas and to bring teachers from those areas to the Amman area to give them a chance to benefit from the Program. This transfer, however, should be temporary in order not to make it appear as a punishment for those teachers who successfully complete the Program's offerings.

2. 4. Program of Training. In accordance with the discussion in sections 2.1. - 2.3., the following list of courses is suggested for a program of training intended for our teachers of English. Needless to say, the list below is not final and can be modified according to our needs and experience once the Program is set in motion. In compiling this list, I have drawn on suggestions for similar programs in other parts of the world in which the teaching of English poses a problem which is in no way less serious than ours (cf. Corder, pp. 93-94 and Bowen, p. 218). The courses are organized in two groups, A and B. As suggested before, a student must finish all courses in Group A before he is allowed to take any of the B courses.

Group A: Courses in English would include: English 1, ("Elementary"); English 2, ("Intermediate"); English 3, ("Advanced"). The terms "elementary", "intermediate" and "advanced" are relative, and it may be better, for psychological reasons, to designate the courses by number or letters. Here I shall not go into the details concerning the contents of each course, but it must be emphasized that the three courses should provide instruction in all of the basic linguistic skills: listening to and understanding native speakers of English, speaking, reading, and writing in English correctly and effectively.

Group B: Courses in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics would include: (1) English usage and varieties of English; (2) Introduction to general linguistics; (3) The structure (grammar) of English; (4) English phonetics and phonology; (5) Comparative
analysis of English and Arabic; (6) Teaching and testing English as a second language (two courses). Here I have tried to confine myself to the essential needs of the teacher of English; otherwise, the list may be easily expanded to include courses in education and psychology, practice teaching, etc.

2.5. Manpower Needs of the Program. The manpower needs of the Program will depend on the number of participating teachers. I believe that there is enough local manpower for all of the A-courses and most, if not all, of the B-courses. If any recruitment of staff is at all needed, it will involve no more than one or two staff members for the teaching of some B-courses. This belief is based on the suggestion that the Program classes be conducted in the late afternoons or evenings and during the summer vacations. For the A-courses, in addition to several excellent teachers in some private schools, the teachers' colleges, and the University, there are many local housewives who are native speakers of English married to Jordanians and who will be willing to teach in the Program. Similarly, there are enough instructors at the University and the teachers' colleges for most or all of the B-courses.

2.6. Long-Range Planning: The Need for an English Language Teaching Institute. It must be taken for granted that the teacher of English is not the only problem we have to cope with in attempting to improve the standard of English in our schools. It is, therefore, strongly recommended that an English-language Teaching Institute be established in this country. It is up to the policy makers in the Ministry of Education to decide whether such an Institute be independent, directly responsible to the Ministry, or affiliated with the University of Jordan. The responsibilities of the Institute will include the following:

1) To take charge of and co-ordinate training programs for the unqualified English teachers currently teaching in government schools.

2) To prepare new English teachers for the future. This means that the Institute will take over part of the teachers' colleges' job and will replace them in training and preparing English teachers for future needs. The student teachers will spend two years at the Institute and take, among other things, all the B-courses mentioned before. Only students with a reasonably advanced knowledge of English should be admitted to the Institute.

3) To aim at what Smith calls (p. 201) "a multiplier effect", i.e., "the training of key personnel" such as teacher-trainers, inspectors, advisors, and others needed for the profession. Special study
sessions can be organized by the Institute for such personnel.
4) To analyze and construct syllabuses for teaching English in our
schools.
5) To provide professional teaching materials and text books which
are best suited for the needs and conditions of our students and
schools.
6) To initiate or sponsor research activities in the field of teaching
English in this country. The following examples of research topics
are taken from Lee (p. 137):
"The collection and classification of errors of various types..., the
linguistic implications of the use of various media (e.g. film),
the influence of L.1 (Arabic in our case) skills on L.2 (English)
learning, the detailed observation of the way a given feature of
English is learnt in particular circumstances, techniques of
examining, ways of teaching, reading and other skills, the suit-
ability of particular pieces of literature in various parts of the
world, the relation of the language skills to each other, the influence
on foreign-language learning of procedures used in the same school
to teach other subjects, problems of grading, attitudes to language
learning, the comparative value of various "aids" used for particular
purposes, and the differences."
7) To provide the educational authorities and the teachers of
English with expert and professional advice on whatever problems
they may face.
8) To disseminate new ideas and up-to-date information related to
the profession. The Institute should have permanent staff whose job
would be solely to read as much as they can of the literature on
English and foreign language teaching, summarize the pertinent ideas
in what they read, and circulate these ideas among the teachers.
If it is not possible to establish an institute which can carry out all
of these duties, I would give priority to the second and eighth points,
in that order: the preparation of new teachers and the dissemination
of new ideas.

2. 7. Additional Recommendations. Any serious and long-range plan
for the solution of the problem of English teachers in this country
must, in addition to the preceding suggestions, give the following
ones some consideration:
1) The Ministry of Education policy of granting scholarships to
students to study English at the University of Jordan should be
changed immediately. I am not suggesting that those students who
are selected for scholarships by the Ministry or the criteria of
selecting these students should be changed; what I am suggesting is
that the Ministry put an end to its policy of selecting students to study
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English irrespective of the student's aptitude or ability in English. It may be better to leave admission standards and requirements for specializing in English to the University and its English Department.

2) The Ministry should approach the Department of English and try to have it modify the course offerings of the Department to include courses which may help the graduates of the Department become effective teachers of English after their graduation.

Such a request by the Ministry would not be out of place since the University, like the Ministry, is a government institution, and since the majority of students in the English Department receive financial support from the Ministry of Education and are thus expected to teach English in the government schools as soon as they graduate.

3) It is advisable that the Ministry define the "qualified teacher" in more precise terms than has been done in the past. Since my concern here is with English teachers, the Ministry should make it clear who is qualified to teach English and who is not. This is essential for any future planning by the Ministry. Without a precise definition of what constitutes a qualified teacher the Ministry cannot know accurately how many English teachers it needs for a given number of years, and thus, carry out sound planning.

4) Once the last recommendation has been executed, it is recommended that the Ministry design a comprehensive plan for training its unqualified teachers. On the basis of such a plan, the Ministry must then fix a date after which no teacher who, in terms of the policy set by the Ministry, is unqualified to teach English should be permitted to do so. This implies that before doing so the Ministry should provide all unqualified teachers with the opportunity to improve their professional standard.

QUALIFICATIONS FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL TEACHERS OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES

The following statement was prepared by the Steering Committee of the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association of America, and was subsequently endorsed for publication by the MLA Executive Council, by the Modern Language Committee of the Secondary Education Board, by the Committee on the Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies, and by the executive boards or councils of fifteen other national or regional language organizations.

It is vitally important that teachers of modern foreign languages be adequately prepared for a task which more and more Americans are declaring essential to the national welfare. Though a majority of the
language teachers in our schools are well trained, many have been poorly or inadequately prepared, often through no fault of their own. The undersigned therefore present this statement of what they consider the minimal, good, and superior qualifications of a secondary-school teacher of a modern foreign language.

We regret that the minimum here stated cannot yet include real proficiency in the foreign tongue or more than a superficial knowledge of the foreign culture. It must be clearly understood that teaching by persons who cannot meet this minimal standard will not produce results which our profession can endorse as making the distinctive contribution of language learning to American life in the second half of the twentieth century.

Our lowest level of preparation is not recommended. It is here stated only as a point of departure which carries with it the responsibility for continued study and self-improvement, through graduate and in-service training, toward the levels of good and superior preparation.

Those who subscribe to this statement hope that the teacher of foreign languages (1) will have the personal qualities which make an effective teacher, (2) has received a well-balanced education, including a knowledge of our own American culture, and (3) has received the appropriate training in professional education, psychology, and secondary-school methods. It is not our purpose to define further these criteria. We are concerned here with the specific criteria for a teacher of modern foreign languages.

1. AURAL UNDERSTANDING

Minimal: The ability to get the sense of what an educated native says when he is enunciating carefully and speaking simply on a general subject.

Good: The ability to understand conversation at average tempo, lectures, and news broadcasts.

Superior: The ability to follow closely and with ease all types of standard speech, such as rapid or group conversation, plays and movies.

Test: These abilities can be tested by dictations, by the listening Comprehension Tests of the College Entrance Examination Board — thus far developed for French, German and Spanish — or by similar tests for these and other languages, with an extension in range and difficulty for the superior level.

2. SPEAKING

Minimal: The ability to talk on prepared topics (e.g. for classroom situations) without obvious faltering, and to use the common expressions needed for getting around in the foreign country, speaking with a pronunciation readily understandable to a native.
Good: The ability to talk with a native without making glaring mistakes, and with a command of vocabulary and syntax sufficient to express one's thoughts in sustained conversation. This implies speech at normal speed with good pronunciation and intonation.

Superior: The ability to approximate native speech in vocabulary, intonation, and pronunciation (e.g., the ability to exchange ideas and to be at ease in social situations).

Test: For the present, this ability has to be tested by interview, or by a recorded set of questions with a blank disc or tape for recording answers.

3. READING

Minimal: The ability to grasp directly (i.e., without translating) the meaning of simple, non-technical prose, except for an occasional word.

Good: The ability to read with immediate comprehension prose and verse of average difficulty and mature content.

Superior: The ability to read, almost as easily as in English, material of considerable difficulty, such as essays and literary criticism.

Test: These abilities can be tested by a graded series of timed reading passages, with comprehension questions and multiple-choice or free-response answers.

4. WRITING

Minimal: The ability to write correctly sentences or paragraphs such as would be developed orally for classroom situations, and the ability to write a short, simple letter.

Good: The ability to write a simple "free composition" with clarity and corrections in vocabulary, idiom, and syntax.

Superior: The ability to write on a variety of subjects with idiomatic naturalness, ease of expression, and some feeling for the style of the language.

Test: These abilities can be tested by multiple-choice syntax items, dictations, translation of English sentences or paragraphs, and a controlled letter or free composition.

5. LANGUAGE ANALYSIS

Minimal: A working command of the sound-patterns and grammar-patterns of the foreign language, and a knowledge of its main differences from English.

Good: A basic knowledge of the historical development and present characteristics of the language, and an awareness of the difference between the language as spoken and as written.
Superior: Ability to apply knowledge of descriptive, comparative, and historical linguistics to the language-teaching situation.

Test: Such information and insight can be tested for levels 1 and 2 by multiple-choice and free-response items on pronunciation, intonation patterns, and syntax; for levels 2 and 3, items on philology and descriptive linguistics.

6. CULTURE

Minimal: An awareness of language as an essential element among the learned and shared experiences that combine to form a particular culture, and a rudimentary knowledge of the geography, history, literature, art, social customs, and contemporary civilization of the foreign people.

Good: First-hand knowledge of some literary masterpieces, an understanding of the principal ways in which the foreign culture resembles and differs from our own, and possession of an organized body of information on the foreign people and their civilization.

Superior: An enlightened understanding of the foreign people and their culture, achieved through personal contact, preferably by travel and residence abroad, through study of systematic descriptions of the foreign culture, and through study of literature and the arts.

Test: Such information and insight can be tested by multiple-choice literary and cultural acquaintance tests for levels 1 and 2; for level 3, written comments on passages of prose or poetry that discuss or reveal significant aspects of the foreign culture.

7. PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION

Note the final paragraph of the prefatory statement.

Minimal: Some knowledge of effective methods and techniques of language teaching.

Good: The ability to apply knowledge of methods and techniques to the teaching situation (e.g., audio-visual techniques) and to relate one's teaching of the language to other areas of the curriculum.

Superior: A mastery of recognized teaching methods, and the ability to experiment with and evaluate new methods and techniques.

Test: Such knowledge and ability can be tested by multiple-choice answers to questions on pedagogy and language-teaching methods, plus written comment on language-teaching situations.
NOTE

1. Since this paper was written in February 1972 some changes have taken place in the syllabi and course offerings of the English Department and the University in general. These changes make the above three points obsolete. The program of the Department is no longer literature oriented since it now offers 20 required and elective courses in language and linguistics of which two are in the methodology of teaching English (see Appendix J). It is hoped that this wealth of courses will help students graduating from the Department become more fluent in English, and thus become more effective English teachers. The foregoing makes it obvious that Additional Recommendation 2 (p. 182 of this Appendix) is now superfluous.
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APPENDIX D: QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO
TEACHERS OF ENGLISH IN JORDAN PARTICIPATING
IN SUMMER WORKSHOPS

1. Sex □ Male  □ Female

2. How old are you? ________

3. What is your religion?
□ Moslem  □ Christian  □ Other, Specify ________

4. Check the appropriate box regarding your education:
□ I didn't finish secondary school.
□ I finished secondary school.
□ I finished secondary school and passed the Tawjihi.
□ I finished secondary school and attended the University but
did not complete a B.A.
□ I finished secondary school and attended a Teacher Training
Institute but did not complete a certificate.
□ I finished my Bachelor's Degree and took a teaching certificate.
□ I finished a Teacher Training Institute.
□ Other, Specify __________________________

5. In which stream were you enrolled in secondary school?
□ I didn't attend secondary school.
□ Science  □ Literary  □ Other, Specify ________

6. What is your native language?
□ Arabic  □ Circassian  □ Armenian  □ Other, Specify _____

7. How many inservice courses specializing in English have you
attended?
□ This one only.
□ Two  □ Three  □ If more than three, please write
the total number ________.

8. How long did you attend a Teacher Training Institute?
□ I didn't attend a Teacher Training Institute?
□ Less than six months.  □ Less than one year.
□ Less than two years.  □ I received my certificate.
9. What was your specialization in a Teacher Training Institute or University?
   [ ] I didn't attend a Teacher Training Institute or the University.
   [ ] English  [ ] Science and mathematics
   [ ] Other, Specify

10. If you are now enrolled in a Certification program, please give your specialization.

11. Please write the name of the school you teach in now and the District in which it is located.

12. What type of school is it?
   [ ] Government  [ ] Foreign private  [ ] National private
   [ ] Other, Specify

13. How many years have you taught there?

14. How many years have you taught in Jordan?

15. How many years have you taught in other countries?

16. Please write the grades in which you teach English.

17. How many periods do you teach every week in your school?

18. How many English periods do you teach every week in your school?

19. What other subjects do you teach?

20. Please rate your own ability in English.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spoken English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. In what ways would you like to improve your English?
   □ My English is adequate for my needs.
   □ I wish to improve my reading skills.
   □ I wish to improve my speaking skills.
   □ I wish to improve my writing skills.
   □ I wish to improve my ability to understand spoken English.

22. How do you try to improve your English at present?
   □ My English is adequate; I do not try to improve it.
   □ By attending summer courses.
   □ By private study. Please specify ____________________________
   □ By attending Modern Language Center or British Council courses.
   □ Other, Specify ____________________________

23. Do you feel you have enough opportunities to improve your English?
   □ Yes □ No

24. Please state briefly any additional opportunities you would like to have to improve your English.

25. In which ways would you change the number of periods allotted to English or the number of years in which it is taught?
   □ I wouldn't change anything.
   □ I would increase the number of periods allotted. How many per week? ____________
   □ I would decrease the number of periods allotted. How many per week? ____________
   □ I would increase the number of years in which English is taught. How many? ____________
   □ I would decrease the number of years in which English is taught. How many? ____________

26. Check the appropriate box regarding your attitudes toward English teaching:
   □ I am completely satisfied with my English teaching.
   □ I like English teaching but I feel inadequately trained for the job.
   □ I don't like English teaching; I think I would like it if I were better trained.
   □ I would prefer to teach another subject.
   □ Other comments ____________________________
27. Do you feel that you are given enough guidance and support in English teaching from the Ministry of Education?
☐ Yes ☐ No
If no, please state what additional support you feel you need:


28. Do you feel that the Pupils' Books set by the Ministry of Education are adequate for your pupils' needs?
☐ I think they are adequate.
☐ I think they are too difficult for my pupils.
☐ I think they are too easy for my pupils.
☐ Other. Specify ________________________________


29. Do you feel the Teacher's Book which accompanies the Pupil's Book is adequate for your needs?
☐ Does not apply; I am a secondary teacher.
☐ I think it is adequate.
☐ I think it gives too much guidance to the teacher.
☐ I think it should give more guidance to the teacher.
☐ I don't like it; I never use it.
☐ It isn't available to me, though I am supposed to use it.
☐ Additional Comments: ___________________________________________


30. Check the appropriate box concerning the students to whom you teach English.
☐ They are adequately prepared for the English work in my class.
☐ They are inadequately prepared for the English work in my class.
☐ How could they have been better prepared? __________________________


31. a) Do you think your pupils are adequately prepared to do the work required in the next grade when they leave your class?
☐ Yes ☐ No


b) How could you have been helped to prepare them better?


32. Do you feel that a good knowledge of English is important for your pupils?
- ☐ They do not need English and they never will.
- ☐ They do need English but only a reading ability.
- ☐ They do need English but only a speaking ability.
- ☐ They do need a good knowledge of all the skills of English.

33. Have you ever traveled in English speaking countries?
- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
If yes, please describe the countries in which you traveled and the length of time spent there.

34. What teacher-made materials do you use in teaching English?

35. What radio or television programs do you use in teaching English?
الملكة الأردنية الهاشمية
دائرة الإحصاءات العامة

دراسة
الحاجة إلى اللغة الإنجليزية
والمجالات استعمالها

1972

جميع المعلومات المطلوبة في هذه الاستمارة هي للتوفير الإحصائي
الحالة، ويجري جمعها بوجب قانون الإحصاءات العامة رقم 24 لسنة
1950 وتمديله، وهي تبقى سرية ومكثفة.

اسم المبحوث:

عنوانه:
عمليات لحذيفة الاستمارة

يرجى ملاحظة ما يلي عند الإجابة على الأسئلة الواردة في هذه الاستمارة:
1- صممت الاستمارة بحيث أن قالب الأسئلة تتضمن الإجابات السكينة عليها.
ويوجد إلى جانب كل إجابة دليل رقم يشيدها. ضع دائرة حول الإجابة المناسبة مثل ذلك:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>الدين</th>
<th>سبب</th>
<th>آخر (عدد)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2- بعض الأسئلة تتطلب كتابة الإجابة رقبياً، وقد وضعت استطيلات خاصة بذلك إلى جانب كل سؤال، بحيث يجب رم واحد فقط في كل موقع. تثال ذلك: 2- العمر بالسنوات الكاملة;

(إذا كان عمر السبحة 25 سنة يكتب 25)

3- بعض الأسئلة تتطلب إجابة وصفية تهدف لوضع الدليل المناسب. وفي:

- اللغة النحوية، 2- اللغة التي تستخدمها في عملك 8- اللغة المصالحة.

- اسم آخر جيدة لاختيارك باللغة الإنجليزية.

في هذه الحالة يجب كتابة الإجابة فقط، وضع الدليل المناسب فيما بعد حسب الترتيبات المتفق عليها.

4- إذا تجاوز دخل السبحة مبلغ (999) دينار شهرياً يكتب رقم

9

في المكان المخصص للدخل.

5- تضمنت الاستمارة عدة من التنبهات تسهل عمل الباحث، يرجى التقيد.

6- في جميع الأسئلة يكتبون إجابة واحدة فقط، إلا إذا ذكر خلاف ذلك.

صراحة.

1

| 235 |
البطاقة الأوليّة

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الادعاء</th>
<th>الدليل</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>رقم الاستمارة</td>
<td>4-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| الجنس | 1- جنس
| ائتم | 2- ائتم |
| العمر بالسنوات الكاملة | 2- العمر بالسنوات الكاملة |
| الدين | 3- الدين |
| تعداد السكان من 1000 شهيد | 9- عمال من 1000 شهيد |
| ماهو عدد السنوات الدراسة التي اكتملها سواء في المدرسة أو في الجامعة؟ | 5- ما هو عدد السنوات دراسي |
| ما هو أعلى مستوى دراسي وصلت إليه؟ | 6- ما هو أعلى مستوى دراسي |

1. 1- أکثر من مستوى الدراسة الاعدادية الكاملة
2. 2- أکثر من مستوى الدراسة الثانوية
3. 3- أکثر من معهد أو جامعة
4. 4- حاصل على شهادة بكالوريوس
5. 5- حاصل على شهادة ليسانس أو أية شهادة
6. 6- أعلى شهادة
الدليل
التقييم

المهنة أو العمل الذي تمارسه

الدخل الشهري من المهنة (بالدينار)

اللغة الإنجليزية (1)
الألمانية (2)
الأسبانية (3)
الإيطالية (4)
التركية (5)
الروسية (6)
اللغات الأخرى (7)

اللغة العربية (8)

ب. توجه الاستمالة التالي إلى المبحوث الذي يستخدم اللغة الإنجليزية في عمله.
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11 هل تستخدم اللغة الإنجليزية لبحث الأمور العملية أو الفنية المتعلقة بعملك وما درجة استخدامك لها؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>عدد مرات يومياً</th>
<th>مرات في الأسبوع على الأقل</th>
<th>عدد مرات في الأسبوع على الأقل</th>
<th>استخدمتها مطلقًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ مع زملاؤك في العمل</td>
<td>22 0 4 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب مع رؤسائكم</td>
<td>24 0 4 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب مع مرؤوسيك</td>
<td>20 0 4 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب مع العملاء والزبائن</td>
<td>26 0 4 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 هل تستخدم اللغة الإنجليزية في مجال البحث غير الفنى أو بحث أمور خارجة عن نطاق العمل؟ (من قبل التحدث عن الأحداث الجارية أو الشؤون الرياضية وغيرها) وما درجة ذلك؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>عدد مرات يومياً</th>
<th>مرات في الأسبوع على الأقل</th>
<th>عدد مرات في الأسبوع على الأقل</th>
<th>استخدمتها مطلقًا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أ مع زملاؤك في العمل</td>
<td>27 0 4 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب مع رؤسائكم</td>
<td>28 0 4 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب مع مرؤوسيك</td>
<td>29 0 4 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ب مع العملاء والزبائن</td>
<td>30 0 4 2</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 - ما مدى استخدامك لللغة الإنجليزية في عملك في النواحي التالية؟

|            | مرة في اليوم | مرة في الأسبوع | مرة في الاقل على الأقل | لم تحدث مطلقًا | لم تحدث ما حدثت | الذين استخدموا التعليمات التي تمتلك لك B. اصدار التعليمات والتنبيهات، تشغيل
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. الاسترشاد بالملاحظات</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13 - اذكر اللحاس التي تتستخدمها خارج اوقات العمل الدلليل (بما فيها اللغة العربية) مرتبة حسب كثرة الاستعمال، الأكثر ثم الاقل استعمالًا.

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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يستخدم النظام التالي في وضع الدليل لهذا السؤال

اللغة (1) الإنجليزية (2) الألمانية (3) 
الفرنسية (4) الإسبانية (5) الإيطالية (6) 
التركية (7) الروسية (8) اللغات الأخرى (9) 

تنبيه: أ، إذا كان البحث لا يستخدم اللغة الإنجليزية
خارج أوقات العمل، انتقل إلى سؤال رقم (18).
ب، توجه الأسئلة التالية إلى البحث الذي يستخدم
اللغة الإنجليزية خارج أوقات عمله.

5، ما مدى استخدامكم اللغة الإنجليزية خارج أوقات العمل
لبحث امور يتعلق بملك (سواء في البيت، أو اى مكان
آخر خارج نطاق العمل) مع الأفراد البيضين أدناء؟

| استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية | أ. مع أفراد العائلة | ب. مع الأصدقاء | ح. مع زملاء العمل | د. مع المختصين في 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>مرات في عدة مرات في اليوم</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>طبيعة عملك</th>
<th>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0. مع موظفين</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. حكوميين</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. مع أشخاص آخرين</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
199 - ما مدى استخدامك اللغة الإنجليزية خارج نطاق العمل، (في البيت أو في أي مكان آخر) مع الأشخاص الذين أدعنا، بحيث أمور لا علاقة لها بملوك؟ (من قبل الحديث عن الأحداث الجارية الشؤون الرياضية، وغيرها من الأمور).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>عدد مرات يومياً</th>
<th>مرة في اليوم على الأقل</th>
<th>مرة في الأسبوع على الأقل</th>
<th>نادر ما استخدمها مطلقاً</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. مع أفراد العائلة
2. مع الأصدقاء
3. مع زملاء العمل
4. مع المتخصصين في طبيعة عملك
5. مع الموظفين حكوميين
6. مع أشخاص آخرين
**Questionnaire: Arabic Version**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>المتخصصة</th>
<th>أ. قراءة المطبوعات الشاذة للكتابات التسليمة (من كتاب وصحف)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

لا يوجد نادرًا مرة في مرة في عدة مرات هذا ما الأسبوع اليوم مرات مطلقة يحدث عليه على يومية الاقل الأقل

**التواحي التالية**

18- إذا افترضنا أن معدل استخدام اللغة الإنجليزية أثناء العمل وخارجه هو 100%، فكم من هذه النسبة يتناول أسر عائلتك

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>دليل البطاقة الأولى</th>
<th>60-79</th>
<th>80-</th>
<th>61-70</th>
<th>58-60</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

.. وكم منها لا علاقة له بعائلتك 0000..
بداية البطاقة الثانية

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الدليل</th>
<th>أعدة التقيق</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4-1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1- في اية سنة بدأت دراسة الإنجليزية؟ سنة...
2- ما هو عدد السنوات التي درست خلالها اللغة الإنجليزية سواء كوضح (دراسة اللغة نفسها) أو كواضعة لدراسة مواضيع دراسية أخرى؟...
3- سجل عدد السنوات التي درست خلالها اللغة الإنجليزية أو باللغة الإنجليزية...
4- كم سنة منها في المدارس الحكومية (بما فيها الجامعة الأردنية)...
5- كم سنة منها في المدارس الخاصة (الأهلية والاجنبية) داخل الأردن...
6- كم سنة منها في مدارس أو جامعات خارج الأردن...

21- هل درست اللغة الإنجليزية في:

الدارس الحكومية وحدها بما فيها الماجستير العليا والجامعة:...
الدارس الخاصة الأردنية وحدها:...
الدارس الحكومية والمدارس الخاصة الأردنية:...
المجستير العليا والجامعة:...
الدارس الحكومية الأردنية والمدارس خارج الأردن:...
(بما فيها الماجستير العليا والجامعات):...
الدارس الخاصة الأردنية والمدارس خارج الأردن:...
(بما فيها الماجستير العليا والجامعات):...
الدارس الحكومية والخاصة الأردنية والمدارس خارج الأردن:...
(بما فيها الماجستير العليا والجامعات):...
الدليل على التقييم

24 - هل سبق أن تعلمت اللغة الإنجليزية عن طريق الدراسة الخاصة الإضافية بشكل منتظم (في معاهد ..).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>مضمون</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>لا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>نعم</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23 - ما هو مدى قدرتك على فهم اللغة الإنجليزية من طريق السهولة؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>مضمون</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>لا - لا أفخمها أبدا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ب - أنهم بعض كلمات فقط</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ج - أنهم ما ينفق لوقت حاجاتي الأساسية (بعرفة الوقائع، الظاهري، النقل)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>د - أنهم معظم ما يقوله الأردني ولكن ليس كل ما يحدث به شخص</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>لغته الإنجليزية الأساسية</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>كان له التحدث بالإنجليزية</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24 - ما هي مقدرةك على التحدث بالإنجليزية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>مضمون</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>لا أقدر أبدا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ببعض كلام فقط</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ما ينفق للتعبير عن أفكار بسيطة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>ما ينفق للتعبير عن معلومات واضعي</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>استطيع التحدث بطلاقه ثانية</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 - ما هي مقدرةك على القراءة باللغة الإنجليزية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم</th>
<th>مضمون</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>لا استطيع القراءة أبدا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>أنهم بعض كلام حينما أقرأ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>أنهم رفع ما أقرأ تقريبا</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>باستخدام بقلم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>أنهم غالبية ما أقرأ باستخدام بقلم</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>أنهم كل ما أقرأ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
الدليل اعتمدة التثبيت

26- ما هي مقدرةك على الكتابة باللغة الإنجليزية؟

| 1 | لا استطيع الكتابة ابداً |
| 2 | أكتب كلمات قليلة وضعيفة |
| 3 | اكتب ما يكفي للتعبير عن بعض الأفكار البسيطة أو طلب شيء، ولكن باخطاء مديدة |
| 4 | اكتب باخطاء قليلة |
| 5 | اكتب بالإنجليزية جيداً كأحد اسئلتها |

27- الي أي مدى ساعدتك الأصير التالية في تعلم اللغة الإنجليزية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الساعدتي جداً</th>
<th>ساعدتي بشيء</th>
<th>لم يساعدني</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. الدراسة المدرسية
2. الدراسة الخاصة
3. التحدث والإنجليزية
4. استخدام الإنجليزية
5. استخدام الادعاءات
6. التحدث بالإنجليزية
7. خارج نطاق العمل
8. الدراسة في الدول التي يتحدث سكانها بالإنجليزية والسفر أو السفر إلى تلك البلاد
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28- هل تعتقد أن الأساتذة الذين تدرؤ اللغة الإنجليزية بشكل عام؟

- ستارين
- جيدين
- مناسبين
- ضعاف

29- هل كنت ترغب أن يكون الأساتذة الذين تدرؤ اللغة الإنجليزية قد أعطوا أهمية أكبر للمواضيع التالية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الدليل</th>
<th>نعم لا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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الدليل 
عدد الإجابة

38

ما هو الموضوع الذي تمتعده أنتم واحد من الموضوعات المذكورة سابقاً؟

ملاحظة: يستخدم الترقيم الوارد ضمن السؤال السابق في وضع الدليل لهذا السؤال.

39 - هل تمتعده أن معرفة اللغة الإنجليزية ضرورية للنجاح في مهنتك؟

لا

39.1

29

نعم، بالتاكيد

39.2

28

معرفتها تساعده، ولكنها ليست ضرورية.

39.3

27

دخل النقدي أو تقدم مستواك المهني؟

لا، لأن اللغة الإنجليزية غير ضرورية في عمل

40.1

لا، لسأني لا أعرف ما يكتب من اللغة الإنجليزية لمساعدة

40.2

نعم، فأتنا أحتاج بمثل أفضل

40.3

معروف بالمصطلح الإنجليزية

40.4

40.5

33 - هل تقوم الآن بأي محاولات لتحقيق لفتتك الإنجليزية بطريقة رسمية (من قبل الدراسة في معهد أو مدرسة الخ).

نعم

41.1

لا

41.2
لماذا تعتبر دراسة اللغة الإنجليزية أداة هامة؟

فيما يلي قائمة بالأغراض الرئيسية المتوقاة من دراسة اللغة الإنجليزية، رتبها حسب أهميتها:

1. لفهم أفضل لجديد اللغة.
2. لتعلم اللغة وتحسين مهاراتها.
3. لفتح عالم إنجليزي جديد.
4. لتعلم الثقافة والطريقة لعيش في البلاد.
5. لتعلم التكنولوجيا والاتجاهات الحديثة.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرتبة</th>
<th>أهمية</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>عظيمة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ممتازة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>جيدة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>هدف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>غير ملموس</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

إذا كان لديك أولد (لا تستقبل) هل تعتقد أنهم يستفتيون اجادة الإنجليزية عن طريق دراستها حسب المنهاج المقرر والشائع في المدارس الحكومية؟

1. كلاً، المنهاج الحالي ليس كافياً...
2. نعم بالتأكيد، يوجد مساعدات خارجية...
3. ربما ولكن بمساعدة خارجية...

الدليل

42 - ما مدى الأهمية التي تمتلكها على تعلم أولادك التحدث بالإنجليزية بطلاقة؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرتبة</th>
<th>أهمية</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>عظيمة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ممتازة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>جيدة</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

الدلالات الأهمية:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>الرتبة</th>
<th>أهمية</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>عظيمة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ممتازة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>جيدة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>هدف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>غير ملموس</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

الإجابات:

43 - لن فض أفضل في اجادة عمل في الأردن
44 - لن فض أفضل في الخارج
45 - يستطيع متابعة التطورات والحدث
46 - خارج العالم العربي
47 - يكون أكثر حساسا للقيم والتقاليد
48 - لدى شعوب العالم الأخرى
49 - يكون أكثر قوة في الاعتقادات على الأداب العالمية
الدليل اعداد التطبيق

37 - هل تمتد ان اجابت الشهادة الثانوية العامة (الوجهية) يركز على المبادر التي تحتاجها فعلًا في عملك؟

لا ............ 1
 بصورة جزئية .... 2
شكل جيد ....... 3
لا رأي ........ 4

38 - إذا كنت قد تعلمت في مدرسة خاصة (الصفوف من الأول الابتدائي حتى الثالث الثانوي) أو إذا كان أحد بناتك يدرس في مدرسة خاصة أو تميز إرساله إليها، فما هو السبب الرئيسي لذلك؟

- لن مستوى التعليم فيما لضمن منه
في المدارس الحكومية ......... 1
- لن المدارس الخاصة تركز أكثر على
تعليم اللغة الإنجليزية ........ 2
- من أجل التربية الدينية ........ 3
- لسبب آخر (حدد) ........ 4

39 - أنت تعتقد أنه يجب على المدارس الحكومية أن تبدأ بتدريب اللغة الإنجليزية؟

ابتداءً من الصف الخامس الإبتدائي (كما هو حالياً) ......... 1
قبل الصف الخامس الإبتدائي ....... 2
بعد الصف الخامس الإبتدائي ........ 3

ب، إذا كانت الإجابة غير الصف الخامس (حدد الصف) ........ رقم 52
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الدليل أعلاه التثقيب

*ـ إذا طلبت أنه يتم تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية في المدارس الحكومية حاليا بعد ل ٢ حصة أسبوعية في المرحلة الالزامية ومن ٢ـ٨ حصة أسبوعية في المرحلة الثانية، فهل تمتدق أن من الضروري أن تتم بمعنى اللغة الإنجليزية حسنا أكثر أسبوعيا مما هو عليه الحال الآن في المدارس الحكومية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم سؤال</th>
<th>نعم</th>
<th>لا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>٥٣</td>
<td>١</td>
<td>٢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

٥٣ـ هل تمتدق أن من الضروري أن تبدأ المدارس الحكومية باستخدام اللغة الإنجليزية كوسيلة بدلا من اللغة العربية لتدريس بعض المواضيع الدراسية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>رقم سؤال</th>
<th>نعم</th>
<th>لا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>٥٤</td>
<td>١</td>
<td>٢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

تذبيه: إذا كان الجواب (لا) انتقل إلى سؤال رقم (٤٣).

٤٣ـ إذا كان الجواب (نعم) ١٠٠ هي المواضيع التي تمتدق أنه يجب أن تدرس باللغة الإنجليزية؟

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>المواضيع</th>
<th>نعم</th>
<th>لا</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>٥٥</td>
<td>٢ ١</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>العلوم (كيمياء، فيزياء، احياء)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٥٦</td>
<td>٢ ١</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الرياضيات</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٥٧</td>
<td>٢ ١</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الاجتماعيات</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٥٨</td>
<td>٢ ١</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مواضيع أخرى (حدد)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

١٦
الدليل: اعدة التقييم

443- هل تعتقد ان من الضروري ان يبدأ التفكير في ان تقوم المدارس الحكومية بتدريس لغة انجنبية اخرى بالإضافة الى اللغة الإنجليزية ؟ وما هي اللغة التي تحب تدريسها؟

أ. لا ضرورة تدريس لغة انجنبية اخرى
ب. احب تدريس اللغة

1. العربية
2. الفرنسية
3. الإسبانية
4. الإيطالية
5. التركية
6. الروسية
7. لغة اخرى هي

444- هل تعلمت لغة انجنبية اخرى بالإضافة للانجليزية ، اين؟

لا ، لم ادرس لغة اخرى ...
نعم، داخل الأردن ...
نعم، خارج الأردن ...
نعم، داخل الأردن وخارجه ...

تذكري: اذا كان الجواب (لا) انتقل الى سؤال رقم (446)
**Questionnaire: Arabic Version**

اللغة 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>اللغة</th>
<th>داخل الأردن</th>
<th>خارج الأردن</th>
<th>داخل الأردن</th>
<th>خارج الأردن</th>
<th>غير معروفة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الألمانية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الفرنسية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الإسبانية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الإيطالية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>التركية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الروسية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

لا يوجد أسم آخر.

اللغة: 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>اللغة</th>
<th>داخل الأردن</th>
<th>خارج الأردن</th>
<th>داخل الأردن</th>
<th>خارج الأردن</th>
<th>غير معروفة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الألمانية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الفرنسية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الإسبانية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الإيطالية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>التركية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الروسية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

لا يوجد أسم آخر.

اللغة: 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>اللغة</th>
<th>داخل الأردن</th>
<th>خارج الأردن</th>
<th>داخل الأردن</th>
<th>خارج الأردن</th>
<th>غير معروفة</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>الألمانية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الفرنسية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الإسبانية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الإيطالية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>التركية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الروسية</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

لا يوجد أسم آخر.
APPENDIX F: FIELD-STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE—ENGLISH VERSION

1. Sex
   Male.........................1
   Female......................2

2. Age at last birthday
   (in years)
   ........................................

3. Religion
   Moslem.........................1
   Christian......................2
   Other, Specify.............3

4. Present Place of Work
   Amman.........................1
   Towns (pop. 5000)...........2
   Villages (pop. 5000).......3

5. Years of Schooling
   (School or University)
   ........................................

6. Highest Schooling Standard
   a) less than Preparatory
   ........................................1
   b) Preparatory Completed but less
      than Junior general certification
      examination
   ........................................2
   c) Junior general certification
      examination passed but less
      than B.A.
   ........................................3
   d) Institutes Completed but less
      than B.A.
   ........................................4
   e) B.A. and beyond B.A.
      (M.D., Ph.D., etc.)
   ........................................5

7. Occupation (actual work)
   ........................................

8. Monthly income from occupation
   J.D. .................................

9. Mother Tongue
   Arabic.........................1
   Other, Specify.............2
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10. What languages, including Arabic, do you use in your work? (list by frequency of use)

Note: (If English hasn't been listed go to Question 14).

11. Do you use English at work to discuss business or technical matters? How frequently?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>At least 1/ week</th>
<th>At least 1/ day</th>
<th>Many Times Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fellow Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Superiors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Customers (clients)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Do you use English at work to discuss nonbusiness or nontechnical topics (weather, sports, current events, etc.)? and how frequently

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>At least 1/ week</th>
<th>At least 1/ day</th>
<th>Many Times Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Fellow Workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Superiors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Subordinates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Customers (clients)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. Do you use English in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>At least 1/week</th>
<th>At least 1/day</th>
<th>Many Times Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Listening to instructions presented orally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Giving instructions and directions orally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Reading instructions or directions or orders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Reading for professional advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Filling out forms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Writing business letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. What languages, including Arabic, do you use outside of your work? (list by frequency of use)

1. 
2. 
3. 
4. 

Note: If you don't use English outside your work, go directly to Question 18.

15. Do you use English outside of your work (at home, recreation, etc.) to discuss matters related to work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>At least 1/week</th>
<th>At least 1/day</th>
<th>Many Times Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Fellow workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Professional people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Government employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Strangers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Do you use English outside of your work (at home, etc.) to discuss matters not related to work (current events, sports, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>With:</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>At least 1/week</th>
<th>At least 1/day</th>
<th>Many Times Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Fellow workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Professional people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Government employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Do you use English outside your work to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Very Rarely</th>
<th>At least 1/week</th>
<th>At least 1/day</th>
<th>Many Times Daily</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) read popular material (books, newspapers, etc.) for your own pleasure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) read serious literature (novels, plays, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) read for professional advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) listen to the radio, watch TV, go to movies, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) write personal letters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Considering your use of English at work and outside as 100%, what proportion is:

a) used at work ............. %
b) used outside work ........ %
19. In what year did you begin to study English?  

20. For how many years did you study English (either as a subject or as a medium of instruction)?
   a) Total years of studying English. ...........................................
   b) Years in government schools
      (including University of Jordan) ......................................
   c) Years in private schools .............................................
   d) Years in schools outside of Jordan (including Universities) ...........................................

21. Did you study English in:
   a) Government Schools only (including institutes & University of Jordan) .............................. 1
   b) Jordanian private schools only ....................................... 2
   c) Government schools & Jordanian private schools (including Institutes and University of Jordan) ...........................................
   d) Government schools and schools outside Jordan (including Institutes and Universities) ...........................................
   e) Private schools & schools outside Jordan (including institutes & univ.) ...........................................
   f) Government and private schools and schools outside Jordan (including institutes & universities) ...........................................

22. Have you ever studied English privately?  
    (Formal study)  
    Yes ...........................................
    No  ...........................................
23. How well can you understand spoken English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Only a few words</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Enough to satisfy my basic needs (e.g., locate food, transportation)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Enough to understand most (but not all) of what is said.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I understand everything that is said by Jordanians but not everything said by native speakers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) I understand everything that is said by Jordanians as well as by native speakers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. How well can you speak English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Only a few words</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Well enough to communicate simple ideas, requests</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Well enough to communicate most ideas</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I can speak fluently</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25. How well can you read English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) I can understand only a few words when I read</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) I can understand about half of what I read (with a dictionary)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) I can understand most of what I read (with a dictionary)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I understand everything I read</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. How well can you write English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Not at all</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Few words with difficulty</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Well enough to communicate simple ideas, requests with many errors</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Well enough to communicate most ideas with few errors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) I can write with native-like control</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. Which of the following helped you personally to learn English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) My school study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Private study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Speaking English with family members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Speaking English at work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Speaking English outside of work with friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Traveling &amp; studying in English-speaking countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Do you think that the teachers of English you had in school were (on the average)

Excellent .................... 1
Moderately good ............... 2
Adequate ........................ 3
Poor ............................ 4

29. Do you wish your teachers of English had given more emphasis to any of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Rules of English grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Free conversation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Serious literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Literature specially chosen from various fields (science, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Mechanics of writing (handwriting, punctuation, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Pronunciation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Rapid silent reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Writing &amp; composition (sentences, letters, correct spelling, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Translation (Arabic to English or the opposite)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Which of the previous do you consider to be the one most important skill?
31. Is a knowledge of English necessary for success in your job?
   a) No ........................................ 1
   b) It helps, but it’s not necessary ..................... 2
   c) Yes, definitely .................................. 3

32. Has your knowledge of English made it possible for you to earn more money or to advance professionally?
   a) No, English is not necessary in my work ........ 1
   b) No, I don’t know enough English to help me ... 2
   c) Yes, I have a better job because of my knowledge of English ......................... 3
   d) Has not helped .................................. 4

33. Are you presently attempting to improve your English by formal study (by studying in a school or an Institute, etc.)
   Yes ........................................ 1
   No ........................................ 2

34. How important is it for you that your children learn to communicate effectively in English?
   a) Very important .................................. 1
   b) Relatively important .............................. 2
   c) Unimportant ..................................... 3

35. Why do you consider the study of English to be important? (Rank the five choices from most important (one), to least important (five), (1 to 5)
   A person who masters English:
   a) has a much better chance of obtaining a good job here in Jordan. .................. 1
   b) has a much better chance of studying abroad or of obtaining a job abroad. .... 2
   c) can keep himself better informed about developments outside the Arab world. 3
   d) can become more sensitive to the values and traditions of people from various parts of the world. 4
   e) has better access to world literature. ......................................................... 5

36. Will your children (if you have any now or plan to in the future) learn to communicate effectively in English by following the present government school curriculum?
   a) No, the present curriculum is not adequate ............................................. 1
   b) Yes, definitely, with no outside work ..................................................... 2
   c) Possibly, but with outside help .............................................................. 3
37. Does the secondary certificate examination in English emphasize the skills that you need in your work?
   a) Not at all ........................................... 1
   b) Only partially ....................................... 2
   c) Very accurately ..................................... 3
   d) No opinion ........................................... 4

38. If you went to a private school (at any time from grades 1-12), or if you have sent a child, or intend to send one to private school, what was your main reason for that?
   a) The general level of education is better than that of the government schools ........................................... 1
   b) English was emphasized more than in the government schools ......................................................... 2
   c) To obtain religious instruction ........................................... 3
   d) Other (specify) ........................................... 4

39. When do you think government schools should begin to teach English?
   a) Grade 5 (the present level) ........................................... 1
   b) Earlier than grade 5 ........................................... 2
   c) Later than grade 5 ........................................... 3

   Note: If the answer was not grade 5, specify which grade.

40. Should the government schools offer more hours of English instruction each week? (At present 6 periods per week are offered in the compulsory cycle and 6-8 periods per week in the secondary cycle.)
   No ........................................... 1
   Yes ........................................... 2

41. Should the government schools begin to teach content subjects via English instead of teaching them via Arabic?
   No ........................................... 1
   Yes ........................................... 2

   Note: If the answer is "no" go to Question 43.

42. What subjects do you think should be taught via English?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Social Studies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Other, specify</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
43. Do you think that government schools should offer instruction in a foreign language besides English?
   a) No, it's not necessary
   b) Yes, I prefer
      1) German
      2) French
      3) Spanish
      4) Italian
      5) Turkish
      6) Russian
      7) Other, specify

44. Have you studied any foreign language besides English?
   a) No, not at all
   b) Yes, in Jordan
   c) Yes, abroad
   d) Yes, both in Jordan and abroad

45. If yes, what languages did you study and where?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Never studied it</th>
<th>Inside Jordan</th>
<th>Abroad</th>
<th>Inside Jordan and Abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. Name one book in English you have read in the last month.

47. Name one newspaper or magazine in English you have read in the last month.

The proposed investigation would help to provide answers to basic questions such as the following:

1. What groups of Jordanians need English most? Men or women, people belonging to what age groups, rural or urban residents, people in what types of employment?
2. To what extent does salary level correlate with knowledge of English and level of education?
3. How many years of English instruction are needed to give a graduate enough English to be of economic value to him? (To enrich his life otherwise?)
4. What schools have produced most graduates who use English?
5. Is a given amount of English taken in early grades more useful than the same amount in later grades?
6. Do those respondents who entered grade IV prior to 1955 report a better command of English than those who entered later?
7. Do those respondents who attended private schools report a better command of English than those who attended government schools?
8. Why do Jordanians study English or avoid studying it?
9. What type of motivation produces the most useful command of English in an individual?
10. Does the policy of teaching Jordanians British rather than American English have popular support?
11. To what degree have the schools been successful in imparting a useful knowledge of English?
12. What English-language skills have they been most successful in teaching: speaking, reading, writing?
13. Do Jordanians who use English feel that they learned most of it outside of school?
14. How do graduates feel about the methods used to teach English in the schools? Were the right skills stressed? Was there too much use of translation? Too much time devoted to literature and not enough to language? Not enough reading of technical and scientific material? Should students learn typewriting in English? Too much time spent talking about grammar, speaking, understanding, reading and writing?
15. Do former students think they had good English teachers?
16. Do they prefer as teachers native speakers of English or native speakers of Arabic?
17. To what extent do Jordanians use English and other languages in their work?
18. What languages do they use during their non-working hours?
19. Which Jordanians use foreign languages most?
20. In what specific ways do Jordanians use English under various circumstances?
21. Does the type of training they get in the school correspond to their real needs?
22. What types of employment require a knowledge of English?
23. Is English important to Jordanians in developing their intellectual and cultural life?
24. Should the schools concentrate on the practical or the cultural uses to which English is put?
25. What do former students read in English after graduation? Do the schools prepare them adequately for reading these types of materials?
26. Does English help Jordanians earn higher salaries?
27. How can Jordanians continue to improve their English after leaving school?
APPENDIX H: DISTRIBUTION OF FIELD-STUDY RESPONDENTS BY OCCUPATION

The list which follows identifies the occupation (e.g., 01 designates physical scientists and related technicians; 45 designates salesmen, shop assistants and related workers; 98 designates transport equipment operators).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Digit</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Digit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand total = 4804
### International Standard Classification of Occupations (1970)

(Two-digit specification)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Number</th>
<th>Title of Occupations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Physical scientists and related technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Architects, engineers and related technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>Aircraft and ships' officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>Life scientists and related technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>Medical, dental, veterinary and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>Statisticians, mathematicians, systems analysts and related technicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>Economists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>Accountants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>Jurists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Workers in religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Authors, journalists and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Sculptors, painters, photographers and related creative artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Composers and performing artists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Athletes, sportsmen and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Professional, technical and related workers (not elsewhere classified)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Legislative officials and government administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Clerical supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Government executive officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Stenographers, typists, card and tape punching machine operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Bookkeepers, cashiers and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Computing machine operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Transport and communications supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Transport conductors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Mail distribution clerks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Telephone and telegraph operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Clerical and related workers NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Managers (wholesale and retail trade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Working Proprietors (wholesale and retail trade)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Sale supervisors and buyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Technical salesmen, commercial travelers and manufacturers' agents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Number</td>
<td>Title of Occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Insurance, real estate, securities and business services, salesmen and auctioneers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Salesmen, shop assistants and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Managers (catering and lodging services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Working proprietors (catering and lodging services)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Housekeeping and related supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Cooks, waiters, bartenders and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Maids and related housekeeping service workers NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Building caretakers, charworkers, cleaners and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Launderers, dry-cleaners and pressers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Hairdressers, barbers, beauticians and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Protective service workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Service workers NEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Agricultural and animal husbandry workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Forestry workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Production supervisors and general foremen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Miners, quarrymen, well drillers and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Metal processors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Chemical processors and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Spinners, weavers, knitters, dyers and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Tanners, fellmongers and pelt dressers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Food and beverage processors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Tobacco preparers and tobacco product makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Tailors, dressmakers, servers, upholsterers and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Shoemakers and leather goods makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Cabinet makers and related woodworkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Blacksmiths, toolmakers and machine tool operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Machinery fitters, machine assemblers and precision instrument makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Electrical fitters, related electrical and electronics workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Broadcasting station, sound-equipment operators and cinema projectionists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Plumbers, welders, sheet-metal and structural metal preparers and erectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Glass farmers, potters and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Rubber and plastics product makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Paper and paperboard product makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Number</td>
<td>Title of Occupations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Printers and related workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Painters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Bricklayers, carpenters and other construction workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Material handling and related equipment operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Transport equipment operators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Laborers NEC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX I: LIST OF OUTPUT TABLES FROM FIELD-STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Distribution of respondents by sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Distribution of respondents by religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Distribution of respondents by residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Distribution of respondents by mother tongue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Distribution of respondents by occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>English use at work to discuss business with colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>English use at work to discuss business with superiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>English use at work to discuss business with subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>English use at work to discuss business with customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>English use at work to discuss nonbusiness with colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>English use at work to discuss nonbusiness with superiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>English use at work to discuss nonbusiness with subordinates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>English use at work to discuss nonbusiness with customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>English use at work to listen to instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>English use at work to give instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>English use at work to read directions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>English use at work to fill out forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>English use at work to write business letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss business with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss business with friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss business with fellow workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss business with professional people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss business with government employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss business with strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss nonbusiness with family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss nonbusiness with friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss nonbusiness with fellow workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss nonbusiness with professional people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss nonbusiness with government employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>English use outside work to discuss nonbusiness with strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>English use outside work to read for pleasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>English use outside work to read serious literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>English use outside work to read professional journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>English use outside work to listen to mass media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>English use outside work to write personal letters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Distribution of respondents by age (+ average age)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Distribution of respondents by salary (+ average salary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Educational attainment of respondents (+ average years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Distribution of English use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16A, 16.</td>
<td>Distribution of respondents by type of school study (+ average years studied English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>When should English teaching begin? (+ averages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Languages used at work by rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Languages used outside work by rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Understanding English — self-rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Speaking English — self-rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Reading English — self-rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Writing English — self-rating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Relationship between date beginning English and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Relationship between date beginning English and speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Relationship between date beginning English and reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Relationship between date beginning English and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Relationship between years of study and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Relationship between years of study and speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Relationship between years of study and reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Relationship between years of study and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Relationship between type of schooling and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Relationship between type of schooling and speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Relationship between type of schooling and reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Relationship between type of schooling and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Type of schooling and effectiveness of school study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Relationship between private study and understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Relationship between private study and speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Relationship between private study and reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Relationship between private study and writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Relationship between understanding and age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Relationship between speaking and age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Relationship between reading and age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Relationship between writing and age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Relationship between understanding and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Relationship between speaking and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Relationship between reading and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Relationship between writing and education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Relationship between understanding, location and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Relationship between speaking, location and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Relationship between reading, location and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Relationship between writing, location and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Necessity for English, location and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>English for professional advancement, location and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>Improving English, sex and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>School study, education and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Private study, education and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Home English, education and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Work English, education and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Friends, education and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Travel, education and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>Private study of English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>Ability of teachers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Now improving English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Aids to learning English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>Attend private school by religion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>Necessity of English for job success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>English and professional advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66A, 66</td>
<td>Distribution of respondents who report using English at work by education, occupation, location and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Necessity for English, education and occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>English for professional advancement, education and occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Improving English, education and occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Relationship between understanding, occupation and salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Relationship between speaking, occupation and salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Relationship between reading, occupation and salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>Relationship between writing, occupation and salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Distribution of English use at work to discuss business with colleagues by education, occupation and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Distribution of English use outside work to discuss non-business matters with family by education, occupation and location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>Average age of respondents, education, occupation, location and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>Average salary of respondents, education, occupation, location and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78A, 78</td>
<td>Average % English used at work by education, occupation and sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Importance of English for children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>Effectiveness of present curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table</td>
<td>Content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>Exam system and skill emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Should there be more hours for English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Reasons for attending private school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Reasons for importance of English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Redistribution of emphases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Importance of various skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Relationship between most important skill and occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Should schools teach content via English?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Distribution of subjects to be taught via English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90.</td>
<td>Have you studied a foreign language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Distribution of foreign languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Should a foreign language be taught?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93.</td>
<td>Distribution of foreign languages to be taught</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J: UNIVERSITY OF JORDAN DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH COURSE OFFERINGS

I. The three-figure number is assigned as follows:
a) The left-hand digit is the suggested year of offering the course, i.e. 1 = first year, etc.
b) The centre unit is the category description. These units are:
   Unit 1. Literature - British and American
   Unit 2. Language
   Unit 3. Shakespeare
   Unit 4. Linguistics
   Unit 5. Criticism
   Unit 6. Cultural Backgrounds to Literature
   Unit 7. Translation
   Unit 8. Pedagogical Methodology
   Unit 9. Special Subject
c) The right-hand digit is the course number.

II. 1. University Requirements: 15 hours
    Department of English offers: ENG 100 (English)
   2. a) Faculty Requirements: 18 hours
      Department of English offers:
      1. ENG 101 Approaches to the English Language
      2. ENG 102 English Composition
      3. ENG 103 Approaches to English Literature I: Poetry and Short Story
      4. ENG 104 Approaches to English Literature II: Drama
      The first year student in the Faculty of Arts may choose to take one or two of these courses, or none at all.
   b) Ancillary Courses: 15 hours of the (200) level and above. Those are to be selected from the following subjects*
      (provided that they are distributed over three Departments at least):
      1 - Arabic Language
      2 - Literary Criticism (Arabic)
      3 - Modern Arabic Literature
      4 - Arabic Short Story and Novel

* Students may choose specific segments of any subject. For example, Arabic Philology, fulfills the Arabic Language requirement and Modern British History fulfills the British History requirement.
5 - Arabic Drama
6 - Translation from English into Arabic
7 - Arabic History
8 - Arab Society
9 - Principles of Education
11 - General Psychology
12 - Philosophy
13 - British History
14 - American History
15 - European History
16 - History of the Middle Ages in Europe
17 - History of Fine Arts
18 - History of Music
19 - Sociology
20 - A Classical Language (Greek, Latin, etc.)
21 - Geography of Europe
22 - Geography of North America
23 - Geography of the Arab World
24 - Modern European Language

III. Departmental Requirements:
a) Compulsory Subjects: 54 hours distributed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Course</th>
<th>Title of Course.</th>
<th>No. of Credit hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 211</td>
<td>English Literature I: 1370-1616</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 212</td>
<td>English Literature II: 1616-1688</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 311</td>
<td>British and American Literature I: 1688-1798</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 312</td>
<td>British and American Literature II: 1798-1900</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 411</td>
<td>British and American Literature III: 1900-Present</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Course</td>
<td>Title of Course</td>
<td>No. of Credit hrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 221</td>
<td>Language I: Language Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 222</td>
<td>Language II: Study Skills</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 223</td>
<td>Language III: Pronunciation and Speech</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 224</td>
<td>Language IV: Reading and Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 431</td>
<td>Shakespeare I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 432</td>
<td>Shakespeare II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 241</td>
<td>Phonetics and Phonology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 242</td>
<td>Introduction to Linguistics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 251</td>
<td>Practical Criticism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 261</td>
<td>Greek and Roman Mythology</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 262</td>
<td>Homer to the Reformation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 361</td>
<td>Reformation to Modern Times</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 471</td>
<td>Translation of Arabic Texts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Overall Total</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Electives: 21 hours to be selected as follows:

Either a. 15 hours from Schedule A: (Language) plus 6 hours from Schedule B: (Literature)
or b. 15 hours from Schedule B: (Literature) plus 6 hours from Schedule A: (Language)

**Schedule A: Language**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Course</th>
<th>Title of Course</th>
<th>No. of Credit hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 225</td>
<td>Advanced Comprehension and Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 321</td>
<td>Old English: Language and Texts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 322</td>
<td>Middle English: Language and Texts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 323</td>
<td>Structure of Modern English I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Prerequisite for 324)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 324</td>
<td>Structure of Modern English II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Its prerequisite: 323)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 341</td>
<td>Advanced Phonetics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Its prerequisite: 241)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 342</td>
<td>Advanced Linguistics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Its prerequisite: 242)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 343</td>
<td>Transformational Grammar</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 344</td>
<td>Contrastive Linguistics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Its prerequisite: 242)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 391</td>
<td>Special Subject</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 441</td>
<td>History of the English Language I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Prerequisite for 442)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 442</td>
<td>History of the English Language II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Its prerequisite: 441)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 472</td>
<td>Advanced Translation of Arabic Texts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Its prerequisite: 471)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 481</td>
<td>Methodology: Teaching English as a Second Language</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Prerequisite for 482)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 482</td>
<td>Advanced Methodology: English as a Second Language</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Its prerequisite: 481)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Schedule B: Literature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Course</th>
<th>Title of Course</th>
<th>No. of Credit hrs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 213</td>
<td>The Metaphysical Poets</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 214</td>
<td>Understanding Drama I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 215</td>
<td>Understanding Drama II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 216</td>
<td>Understanding the Novel I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 217</td>
<td>Understanding the Novel II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 218</td>
<td>Understanding the Short Story I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 219</td>
<td>Understanding the Short Story II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 313</td>
<td>Chaucer I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 314</td>
<td>Chaucer II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 315</td>
<td>Milton</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 316</td>
<td>17th and 18th Century Prose</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 317</td>
<td>Studies in the Neo-Classical Period</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 318</td>
<td>Studies in American Literature before 1865</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 319</td>
<td>Studies in Poetry</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 353</td>
<td>Theories of Criticism</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 392</td>
<td>Special Subject I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 413</td>
<td>Studies in the Elizabethan Period</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 414</td>
<td>Studies in the Jacobean Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 415</td>
<td>Studies in the Romantic Period</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 416</td>
<td>Studies in the Victorian Period</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 417</td>
<td>Studies in American Literature since 1865</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 418</td>
<td>Studies in 20th Century English Literature</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 419</td>
<td>Arab Writers of English</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 492</td>
<td>Special Subject II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. University Requirements:</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. a) Faculty Requirements, 18</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Ancillary Courses, 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Department Requirements:</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Compulsory Subjects, 54; b) Electives, 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Free Electives:</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong> hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Department of English Course Offerings

(English Major)

No. of Hours: 132

1. University Requirements: 15
2. Faculty Requirements: 18
3. Departmental Requirements:
   a) Compulsory: 45 hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Unit 1 of Single Specialization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Unit 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unit 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Unit 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Unit 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   45 hours

   Unit 6 (261, 262, 361) is not included in the Compulsory Subjects.

   b) Electives: 15 hours

   Students may select these hours from Schedule (A) and
   Schedule (B). One or more courses may be taken from Unit 6
   and applied as Electives.

4. Minor and Free Electives: 39 hours

   Total 132 hours

Department of English Course Offerings

(English Minor)

1. Number of Hours: 30

2. Distribution of Courses:
   a) Unit 1 of Single Specialization 15 hours
   b) Unit 2 12
   c) Unit 5 3

   30 hours

3. Courses:
   a) Unit 1: 211, 212, 311, 312, 411
   b) Unit 2: 221, 222, 223, 224
   c) Unit 5: 251