

# AATT

## American Association of Teachers of Turkish

---

Near Eastern Studies, 110 Jones Hall, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544-1008

**NEWSLETTER 9**  
**Spring 1991**

- \*\* Announcements (7) \*\***
- \*\* Concerns from the Field (11) \*\***
- \*\* New Student Prize for Turkish (6) \*\***
- \*\* Textbook Reviews (9) \*\***

### CONTENTS

#### **PRESIDENT'S LETTER**

- |                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Annual Meeting                     | 7. Announcements                            |
| 2. The Proficiency Guidelines Project | 8. Turkish at the Foreign Service Institute |
| 3. Curriculum Design Pilot Project    | 9. Textbook Reviews                         |
| 4. National Council of LTCLs          | 10. Reports from the Field                  |
| 5. Student Survey                     | 11. Concerns from the Field                 |
| 6. New Student Prize for Turkish      | 12. Ve Saire                                |

---

#### **AATT Officers:**

*President:* Kathleen R.F. Burrill (Columbia University)  
*Secretary-Treasurer:* Erika H. Gilson (Princeton University)  
*Members at Large:* Ralph Jaeckel (UCLA)  
Ahmet Karamustafa (Washington University)  
James Stewart-Robinson (University of Michigan)

**Editor:** Erika H. Gilson (Princeton University)

## Letter from the President

Dear Friends and Colleagues,

AATT is in its fifth year and is growing, in size and reputation. Its roster of individual members has more than doubled since the Association came into being (from 23 to 54) and, although some pessimism continues to be expressed about lack of university support for Turkish literature, three institutions (Cornell, Minnesota and Washington University) have added Turkish language to their programs.

Our institutional membership, although now standing at 11, has not risen proportionately. I therefore urge those of you whose institutions are not yet members to do what you can to persuade your administrations to join up. Not only would that help AATT's budget but would serve also to draw attention to your institution. We list our members wherever we can—in newsletters and reports, applications to government departments, etc. etc.; more especially in our own publicity material. There is still time for new institutional members to be listed on the Turkish Studies poster that is being prepared. This will have wide distribution and is designed to draw students to both Turkish language and Turkish Studies in general. [Institutional membership comes in 3 sizes: Regular, only \$25; Supporting \$250; Sustaining, \$500].

It was a disappointment that it took three years to obtain funding for the Proficiency Guidelines Project. As you see from the report in this *Newsletter*, however, once a grant was secured last year the Working Committee went into action. Under the able leadership of Erika Gilson it is progressing on schedule and plans to have a draft Guidelines ready for you by the New Year. Meanwhile many questions remain about the implementation of Guidelines and the development of proficiency-based teaching for Turkish at Universities. You will have read contributions in the two previous *Newsletters* from Walter Andrews and Victoria Rowe Holbrook expressing their concerns about the effect the requirements of Proficiency might have on support for the teaching of Turkish literature and other aspects of Turkish Studies. The present *Newsletter* carries a third contribution, by Ralph Jaeckel, that presents

and comments on commonly expressed objections to Proficiency-Based Instruction in Turkish (at universities as compared with government language institutions). Please give these matters your thought over the Summer. Then plan to be in Washington, D.C. on the afternoon of November 23 when they will be discussed at a pre-MESA open session to be held in connection with a meeting of our Guidelines Working Committee. (Details will appear in the Fall Newsletter).

Finally let me draw your attention to the newly established TSA Student Prizes for Best Progress in Turkish (see announcement on p. 7). Not wishing to introduce a special examination it was agreed to choose recipients through a system of nominations. A few basic guidelines have been suggested for those submitting nominations and it is anticipated that experience will lead those coordinating the awards to formulate others. While the pecuniary value of the awards is modest they will give recognition of achievement in an area that we know too well to be the Cinderella of Academia. Furthermore, the Awards Committee has been instructed to write to the Administration of winners' institutions to inform them of the award. Hopefully some credit will accrue the Department and the teacher involved.

Have a good summer.

Sincerely,  
Kathleen R.F. Burrill

## 1. Annual Meeting

The fifth Annual Meeting of AATT took place in San Antonio, Texas in conjunction with the Annual MESA Conference on November 10, 1990. This year, the one-hour meeting was scheduled to take place before the TSA Annual Meeting at 6 p.m. The meeting was called to order by the President, Prof. Burrill, promptly at 6 p.m. and was adjourned at 7 p.m. All members of the Executive Board were present as well as 17 members and 5 guests.

### ***Treasurer's Report.***

AATT started its fourth year with \$2,896.34 carried over and had an income of \$5,565.81, including income from grants. Of the total available annual funds for AATT activity, *i.e.*, \$3,965, only about 25% was spent on travel, while 45% was spent on postage, xerox, printing and supplies. Almost 18% was spent on telephone charges, while 12% was spent on registration fees and contributions as affiliates of MESA and JNCL.

As in years past, income from membership dues, regular and institutional, barely covers the office expenses and telephone charges. Without the matching grant from the Institute, an organization such as AATT, inevitably small at present and for the foreseeable future, could not function. When applying for funding to other sources, AATT policy has been not to incorporate any overhead expenses for administrative costs, but to submit a conservative budget for basic estimated outlays only. Whether this will, or should, remain AATT's policy, needs to be discussed.

E. Gilson next announced that AATT has received a favorable ruling from the IRS on its status as a non-profit organization. Besides offering legitimacy, the tax-exempt ruling immediately translates into a sizable savings on the sales tax

### ***Reports on Projects.***

Dr. Stewart-Robinson reported on the **Ponies** which have been completed and need to be printed in a suitable format for distribution. Dr. Gilson reported that the pilot video project **Haberler** has begun with the distribution of taped TRT news on video to 10 participants. Some of the participants have been utilizing the materials and have already submitted their assessment of the advantages or disadvantages of such authentic resources for teaching purposes. The project is expected to continue through the Summer of 1991.

The **Grammatical Terminology** Project which has been on hold, will resume in the Spring. Dr. Gilson has asked to be excused due to scheduling conflicts and has rec-

ommended that Dr. J. Kornfilt, a linguist, be asked to join the Working Committee. The other members of the Committee are Dr. G. Kuruoğlu and Dr. U. Schamiloglu.

Dr. Gilson reported on the work of the **Proficiency Guidelines** Committee which began its work in the summer with OPI conducted at the Summer Language Schools East and West to collect speech samples. The Committee met in October in Washington at Georgetown University for a four day workshop concentrating on speaking proficiency. This was followed by a one and a half day meeting at San Antonio on November 9 and 10. The Committee is presently collecting as many speech samples as possible at all levels of proficiency.

K. Burrill who attended a working session of the Guidelines Committee in the morning commented on the dedication and hard work of the Committee members and also expressed her appreciation for the presence and active participation of teachers from government language schools. (Please see also # 3 on current status of the Proficiency Guidelines Project)

### ***New Business.***

The results of the election for a new Executive Board member were announced. By a very close vote Ahmet Karamustafa was the winner and he will serve for the next three years..

The new Board members are:

J. Stewart-Robinson	1 years
E. Gilson	2 years
R. Jaeckel	2 years
A. Karamustafa	3 years.

The President is elected by the Executive Board and K. Burrill was re-elected to serve for one year.

The President next asked to form the Nominating Committee for next fall's candidates. One new officer will be elected to replace J. Stewart-Robinson whose term will expire. Drs. Sarah Atış and Walter Andrews were elected to the Nominating Committee and will together with the President nominate two candidates for next year's election.

E. Gilson next urged the formation of a Development Committee to help charting the future course of AATT and to take the initiative for fundraising. She stressed that with the current interest in Washington as well as among other private funding agencies for the less commonly taught languages and the desire to improve the teaching of these languages, opportunities exist for AATT which did not exist 10 years ago and which should not be missed. W. Andrews commented that rather than a committee, individual members should develop grant proposals with AATT's encouragement and support. E. Gilson pointed out that many many of the funding sources will not accept proposals from individuals. Although there were several members who offered to help such a committee, no further action was taken at this time and K. Burrill suggested that members interested in serving on such a committee should contact her during the year.

E. Gilson also favored the forming of a Testing Committee which would be charged with keeping abreast of developments in the field and designing testing mechanisms to assess student proficiency in the various language skills. K. Burrill suggested that an institution with several members in close proximity might accept this responsibility so that the potential problem of distance between members of a 'testing committee' is avoided. There was consensus that testing should be the next priority following and indeed overlapping proficiency guidelines development. No further action was taken at this time on this issue.

G. Kuruoğlu next made a brief announcement inviting the membership to a reception given by the Turkish-American Association of San Antonio and the Turkish Consulate General in Houston. Because of time constraints, the last two items on the agenda were not discussed. W. Andrews argued that questions relating to the proficiency movement and Turkish Studies might best be covered in a workshop format. Although U. Schamiloglu reminded those present of the poorly attended proficiency workshop held in Los Angeles several years ago, it was agreed to that the movement and its repercussions are more fully understood today and that a workshop titled "Impact of the Proficiency Movement on Turkish Studies" during MESA in Washington would gener-

ate considerable debate.

As the room was filling up with colleagues who came for the TSA meeting, K. Burrill adjourned the meeting shortly after 7 p.m. inviting the members to meet for an informal breakfast meeting on Monday morning at 7 a.m. to continue with the discussions.

## 2. Proficiency Guidelines Project

As announced in previous Newsletters, the Working Committee on Guidelines is currently working on the AATT Project on **Standards and Guidelines for Competency-Based Turkish Language Teaching**. The Working Committee consists of the following members: D. Gökçora (Minnesota), R. Jaeckel (UCLA), S. Kamışlı (Columbia), E. Creel (ILR), G. Kuruoğlu (Texas/Austin), M. Onursal (FSI), S. Özsoy (BU and Michigan), J. Stewart-Robinson (Michigan), and E. Gilson (Princeton) who is directing the project.

So far, there have been three major meetings involving all members of the Working Committee:

The first major workshop for the Working Committee of the Project was held in October at Georgetown University. The workshop was given by Pardee Lowe, the 'mother' of the Oral Proficiency Interview and one of the principals of the proficiency movement in general. This three-and-a-half day meeting focused on the oral proficiency interview (OPI). With the evaluation and discussion of speech samples obtained during the Workshop as well as samples that the members had collected previously, began the deliberate and rather slow process of defining 'speaking' proficiency for Turkish following the ACTFL Guidelines.

The next meeting which took place in San Antonio before the MESA conference, was also devoted to 'speaking' and the preparation of a grammar grid. Taking advantage of the presence of numerous students of Turkish at all language levels, members of the Working Committee conducted many Oral Proficiency Interviews on tape which were then collec-

tively discussed and evaluated. Thus far, a total of 49 taped Oral Proficiency Interviews have been collected for review and evaluation.

Although a draft of the Speaking Guidelines has been completed, and a grammar grid prepared which specifies the underlying grammatical structures, the Committee feels that more speech samples are needed to test the validity of the parameters identified for the proficiency levels. Members who wish to evaluate and comment on the current draft of the speaking guidelines are asked to contact E. Gilson at 3 Hawthorne Drive, Cherry Hill, NJ 08003-2221.

The third meeting was again a three-and-a-half day meeting held at the end of January in Princeton. The emphasis during this meeting was on 'reading'. Two consultants who were instrumental in the development of the ACTFL Guidelines, David Hiple (ACTFL) and Irene Thompson (George Washington University), were present during the first day of the meeting to explain ACTFL's approach and experience with ranking reading proficiency. The rest of the time was spent selecting 20 authentic passages and developing test items to enable assessment of reading comprehension. The questions are both, open-ended and closed. An attempt was made to write for a reading passage not only 'focused', i.e., level-specific items, but also 'offset' questions which allow for assessment of several levels based on one authentic passage.

This packet of 20 passages and 102 test items is also ready in draft form. Based on student feedback and response to the test items, we will define the Proficiency Guidelines for Reading. It is therefore very important that this draft is exposed to many with Turkish reading proficiency at all levels. Anyone interested in reviewing and commenting on the draft is asked to get in touch with E. Gilson as above.

A fourth meeting has been scheduled to take place at the University of Pennsylvania prior to a workshop for the teachers of Turkish and Persian who will be teaching at the Summer Intensive Language Program of the East Coast Language Consortium. The Guidelines Meeting will concentrate on 'listening'. We will work to identify listening tasks

representative of the skill levels.

We have passed the halfway mark of the 18 month project. Before the beginning of the next academic year a draft of the Provisional Proficiency Guidelines will be distributed to the AATT membership. There will be an open meeting on the Saturday before the MESA meeting at Georgetown University in Washington to discuss the guidelines for Turkish and the issues concerning competency-based language teaching in an academic setting. Detailed information will be mailed in September. It is hoped that many colleagues will plan to attend this meeting in November.

### 3. Curriculum Design Pilot Project

AATT's proposal for the expenditure of the allocated Ford grant has been approved. Some of the funding has been used to strengthen AATT as an organization (see #1 Annual Meeting). Most of the funding will go to a pilot project on curriculum development.

AATT proposed to develop and test six different instructional units, built around one topic, 'The Family', for three learner levels, novice, intermediate, and advanced, and elicit learner response to the units. As colleagues are well aware, although there are a few instructional materials for Turkish, all are very inadequate in meeting the needs of today's language learner and none of them were conceived to follow any curricular design.

As instructors of less commonly taught languages face the challenge of competency-based language teaching, the pooling of expertise, efforts and resources to develop the most suited vehicle for instruction becomes essential. As we start to respond to the challenge, we are afforded this chance to experiment with teaching approaches and solicit as well as observe learner reaction to instruction for guidance in curricular development.

The objective of this project is to identify instructional prototypes which hold the most promise for an effective and captivating learner environment.

A Unit on Family, to correspond to a week of instruction at the beginning, intermediate, and advanced levels in an academic setting, is being developed and will be tested in class. The topic remains the same, in order to provide for a concrete sample of the 'spiraling effect' as the same topic is re-introduced at the higher levels.

Each team member will develop one unit on the Family for two levels *based on his or her own experience and pedagogical approach* to language teaching, and test the units on site. The Unit for the beginning level will incorporate five contact hours, while the two higher levels will assume three contact hours. The developed units will be distributed to colleagues teaching Turkish in the summer programs and at additional sites during the fall semester. Those who would like to take part and volunteer to test the units on their students, should contact the Secretary. According to the timetable for the Project, the units will be ready for testing by the beginning of June.

The manner of evaluation and eliciting learner response—which is a most crucial part of the Project objective—will follow the design being developed by the Curriculum Development Task Force of the National Council of LCTLs.

#### **CD Working Group Members:**

Dr. Sumru Özsoy, Boğaziçi University and U. of Michigan  
Deniz Gökçora, University of Minnesota  
Sibel Kanişlı, Columbia University  
Erika H. Gilson, Princeton University (coordinator)

Dr. Sumru Özsoy has a Ph.D. in Linguistics from the University of Michigan ('83). Currently visiting faculty at Michigan, she is an Associate Professor at Boğaziçi University in Istanbul and where she has taught and directed Turkish language courses for foreigners in addition to courses in Linguistics, for the past 13 years. A member of AATT's Proficiency Guidelines Project, she is at present working on a textbook for Turkish.

Deniz Gökçora is a Ph.D. candidate (degree est. '92) in Second Languages and Cultures Education of the Department of Curriculum and Instruction, the College of Education at the

University of Minnesota. A member of the Proficiency Guidelines Project, she has been teaching ESL, here and in Turkey, for six years and is currently in charge of Turkish instruction at her institution.

Sibel Kanişlı, a Ph.D. candidate (degree est. '91) at Teachers College, Columbia University, also comes with an ESL background and a solid base in teaching methodologies. She has been teaching Turkish at the advanced level at Columbia University for the past five years.

Dr. Erika Gilson, Ph.D. in Oriental Studies from the University of Pennsylvania ('81) is Lecturer in Turkish at Princeton University and currently directs AATT's Proficiency Guidelines Project. She is the representative to the National CD Task Force and is particularly interested in SLA and learner strategies.

## **4. The National Council of Organizations of LCTLs**

At the Annual Meeting held in Washington May 3-4, 1991, the invited participants representing the founding organizations voted unanimously to ratify the draft constitution and form an umbrella organization to be known as "The National Council of Organizations of Less Commonly Taught Languages. AATT is one of the eleven founding members, and E. Gilson, who was on the Steering Committee, has been elected to serve as one of two members-at-large on the Council's Executive Board. T. Ramos (University of Hawaii) will serve as president, E. Bokamba (University of Illinois) as vice-president, J. Means (NASILP) is secretary-treasurer, and J. Schillinger (American University) will serve as the other member-at-large.

Readers of the AATT Newsletters have been kept abreast of the developments leading up to the formal establishment of the Council. This Council was formed essentially to represent the LCTL teaching profession in the national dialogue on Foreign Language and International Studies. The goal of the Council is the development of a national strategy for address-

ing the problems common to the instruction of the LCTLs. Activities of the Council will focus on the following areas:

- \* *Policy and Planning* for the LCTLs;
- \* *Research* to promote and facilitate LCTL learning and teaching;
- \* *Support* to nurture and strengthen language teaching organizations for the LCTLs;
- \* *Professional Development* of LCTL teachers;
- \* *Curriculum Development* in the LCTLs;
- \* *Collection* and dissemination of data and information on the LCTLs ;
- \* *Fundraising* to carry out the activities mentioned above as well as approved programs of member organizations;
- \* *Voicing* the collective concerns of the LCTLs.

The Council will now approach various private and government funding agencies seeking support for activities listed above. As an organization representing LCTL associations, the Council is in a better position to obtain funding as well as expert guidance for activities which will be beneficial to all of the individual organizations, such as teacher training workshops, curriculum design, and workshops on educational technology.

## 5. 1990-1991 Student Survey

The student survey forms were mailed out towards the end of the year when students intent on taking a full academic year can readily be identified. The same form has been used for the last few years although it apparently is proving to be less than satisfactory for eliciting a response to all items listed. We will work with the Council on a new data collection form and hope to come up with a better format. Any suggestions from the members in this regard is most welcome.

In the 1990-1991 Academic Year, the number of students enrolled in Turkish and Ottoman Turkish in academic institutions in the United States as reported was 243:

	(90-91)	(89-90)
1st year	111	71
2nd year & advanced	77	75
Ottoman	55	32

Compared to last year's survey, this represents a sizable increase at the first year level, no attrition at the second year level, and continued interest in Ottoman as there appear to be at least 23 new students. The figure above does not include students at government schools, nor does it include those attending commercial language schools and institutes. Also not included are 31 students (average enrollment per quarter) reported by the University of Washington, since this figure includes enrollments for the other Turkic languages and a breakdown was not available at the time of publication.

In addition, there were 49 students enrolled in language courses of other Turkic languages, mainly Uzbek. This brings the total student count for all Turkic languages to 323.

## 6. New Student Prize for Turkish

### Annual Student Prizes for Best Progress in Turkish

As the result of a generous offer from the Federation of Canadian-Turkish Associations to make an annual donation towards student prizes, the Turkish Studies Association has decided to set aside annually a sum of \$400 to be awarded in the Fall of each year as four prizes of \$100 each in recognition of students who have made the "best progress in Turkish" in the preceding academic year.

The following procedures were approved at the 1990 Annual Meeting of TSA:

**Administration:** A two-person Language Awards Committee (one representative each for the Boards of TSA and AATT) will oversee the annual awards in consultation with the Presidents of the two organizations and four Area Coordinators.

**Student Eligibility:** Any student (graduate or undergrad-

uate) who in the preceding academic year completed a full one-year course at any level in modern Turkish or Ottoman at a university offering such courses in its regular program is eligible for nomination. However, eligibility will be limited to a "once-in-a-lifetime" award.

**Eligible Institutions:** Currently there are 21 eligible institutions (but this number could change). They will be grouped into four areas with roughly the same number of institutions in each. By agreement between the Presidents of TSA and AATT, one faculty member in each area will be asked to serve for a three-year term as Area Coordinator.

The four areas are:

**West:** Berkeley, UCLA, Texas-Austin, Utah, University of Washington

**East:** Columbia, Connecticut-Storrs, Harvard, NYU, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton

**North:** Chicago, Cornell, McGill, Michigan, Toronto

**South/Midwest:** Indiana, Minnesota, Ohio State, Washington University, Wisconsin

(This distribution could be modified at need in order to maintain an acceptable numerical balance.)

**Procedure:** Each institution may select ONE nominee annually, judged by faculty members to be the student who made the most progress in modern Turkish or Ottoman in the preceding academic year. The nominee's name must be submitted, with supporting material, no later than September 25 to the Area Coordinator who (with whatever consultation is necessary) will make the final choice of one recipient for the area. The Area Coordinator will inform the Language Awards Committee by October 15 of the choice, and the Committee will arrange for the recipients to receive their prize by mail or (preferably) at the TSA Annual Meeting.

The 1991 Language Awards Committee consists of:

Dr. Eleazar Birnbaum (Toronto)

Dr. Kathleen R.F. Burrill (Columbia)

and the following AATT members have agreed to serve as Area Coordinators for 1991-1993:

**West:** Dr. Ralph Jaeckel

Department of Near Eastern Languages  
and Cultures

University of California -Los Angeles  
Los Angeles, CA 90024

**East:** Dr. Erika H. Gilson

Near Eastern Studies, Jones Hall

Princeton University

Princeton, NJ 08544-1008

**North:** Dr. James Stewart-Robinson

Department of Near Eastern and North  
African Studies,

University of Michigan

Ann Arbor, MI 48109

**South/West:** Dr. Sarah Atis

Department of South Asian Studies

University of Wisconsin

Madison, WI 53706

**N.B.:** No official nomination form has been devised. It is suggested, however, that the faculty nomination include such information as the student's academic status (undergraduate/graduate, degree candidacy, etc.), a general description of the Turkish or Ottoman course taken and, (for administrative purposes), the name of the instructor, some assessment of the student's natural aptitude versus effort in language learning, details of other foreign languages the student knows, of any time spent in Turkey and/or other previous exposure to Turkish.

Kathleen R.F. Burrill  
Columbia University

## 7. Announcements

### Turkish Language Courses

#### Turkish Delights

at the

University of California, Los Angeles

June 24 - August 16, 1991

All courses are intensive, proficiency based, and will equal a full year of regular university language study. Classes will meet four hours each weekday. Additional language laboratory hours.



### **Modern Turkish**

**Elementary Turkish and Advanced Turkish** will be offered through the Western Consortium of Middle East Centers and UCLA Summer Sessions. The latest methods proven effective in teaching American government employees to communicate in Turkish will be used. Native speakers, audio and video tapes, and films will be featured.

Cost of the course [registration fee: \$ 190 and tuition: \$ 684]: \$ 874.

On-campus housing, including 21 meals per week: \$ 1039.50.

For information:

Dr. Ralph Jaeckel (213) 206-1388,

Dr. Thomas Penchoen (213) 206-1385,

Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures (213) 825-4165.

### **Central Asian Turkic Languages:**

**Elementary Azeri, Elementary Uzbek, Advanced Uzbek** will be offered through the John Soper Seminar for Central Asian Languages and Cultures and UCLA Summer Sessions. Scholarships are available.

Cost of the course [registration fee: \$ 190 and tuition: \$ 984]: \$ 1174.

On-campus housing, including 21 meals per week: \$ 1039.50.

For information:

Dr. A.J.E. Bodrogligeti, (213) 1- 818-784-7687 or (213) 825-5167,

Department of Near Eastern Languages and Cultures (213) 825-4165,

Ms. Jeanne Abrams, UCLA Summer Sessions, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1418, (213) 206-4126.

### **Summer Language Consortium (East) in Persian and Turkish at the University of Pennsylvania June 10-August 16, 1991**

The Summer Intensive Language Course sponsored by the Consortium of Middle East Centers in the East will be held at the University of Pennsylvania. Courses at the novice and intermediate level will be offered in Turkish.

For information, please contact:

Dr. Brian Spooner, Director

Middle East Center, Williams Hall, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104-6308  
(215) 898-6335

### **Summer Institute for Central Asian Studies**

Uli Schamiloglu announces the establishment of an annual Summer Institute for Central Asian Studies at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The following language courses are offered during the 1991 Summer Sessions:

*Elementary Kazakh I,*

four-week intensive course, June 17-July 14.

*Elementary Kazakh II,*

four-week intensive course, July 15-August 11

Fellowship support for Kazakh is available through a Social Science Research Council "Grant for Summer Language Institutes for Soviet Languages Other than Russian."

For further information for admission contact:

Summer Sessions Office, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706 (608) 262-2115

For fellowship information contact:

Dr. Uli Schamiloglu, Department of Slavic Languages, 720 Van Hise Hall, 1220 Linden Drive, University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI 53706 (608) 262-3498

## CONFERENCES

### **The Middle East Institute Summer Language Classes for Turkish June 3 - August 15, 1991**

The Middle East Institute in Washington, D.C., will begin an 11-week summer semester of Turkish classes on June 3, 1991.

The classes for this semi-intensive, affordable course are held in the evenings at the Middle East Institute in the heart of Washington, D.C. Instruction is by native speakers.

For information, call: (202) 785-2710

### **Boğaziçi University Summer Course in Turkish Language and Culture July 1 - August 23, 1991**

The annual international summer program in Turkish Language and Culture will be held between July 1 and August 23, 1991. In addition to the language courses, students are expected to participate in extracurricular activities including lectures on various aspects of Turkish culture as well as other cultural events.

Intensive Elementary Turkish is offered in two levels, further Intensive Advanced Turkish and Intensive Advanced Spoken Turkish. All courses earn 12 credits.

Tuition is \$1250; accommodation on campus is not available this year.

For information contact:

Prof. R. Ömür Akyüz, Co-Director, Summer Program in Turkish, Boğaziçi University, Bebek/Istanbul 80815 Turkey  
(90) (1) 157-2311; (90) (1) 163-1500  
Fax (90) (1) 165-6357

**October 18-20, 1991**

#### **Bridging Theory and Practice in the Foreign Language Classroom**

at Loyola College, Baltimore.

The conference will include such topics as applied linguistics, second-language acquisition, the curriculum, empirical research on teaching and learning, pedagogy and methodology.

For information contact: Committee for the Conference on Language Learning, Department of Foreign Languages, Loyola College, 4501 N. Charles Street, Baltimore, MD 21210-2699;  
(301) 323-1010 ext 2780.

**November 23-25, 1991**

#### **American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL)**

This year's annual meeting in Washington, D.C., ACTFL's 25th Silver Anniversary, is titled: "Promoting the Study of World Languages and Cultures: a National Priority".

**November 23, 1991**

**AATT Guidelines Meeting  
AATT Annual Meeting**  
during MESA in Washington, D.C.

**November 23-26, 1991**

**Middle East Studies Association**  
in Washington, D.C.

This will be MESA's 25th Anniversary Meeting also.  
(602)621-5850; Fax (602) 321-7752

**December 27-30, 1991**

**Modern Language Association (MLA)**  
in San Francisco, CA (212) 475-9500

## 8. Turkish at the Foreign Service Institute

*Note:* The following information was supplied by Dr. Frederick Jackson of the Foreign Service Institute (FSI)

### TURKISH SECTION AT FSI

The Turkish Section has two Basic Course offerings, aimed at the average to high-aptitude learner:

i) a 23-week program enabling an individual to reach a Limited Working Proficiency in the language, which is usually associated with the level of S-2/R-2, and

ii) a 46-week program, aiming for a General Professional Proficiency, associated with a level of S-3/R-3. There are also two FAST Course inputs annually.

The main goals of the training are to develop in each individual student communicative ability to manage everyday-life problems, social encounters, and typical professional interaction, as well as ability to comprehend newspapers and other media sources. The program also aims to develop confidence in using the language, even when communication becomes difficult, and to sensitize students to cultural differences in the host-country environment.

The Basic Courses begin with "Comprehension Week" which is designed to heighten student receptivity to the language and to sharpen learning strategies. The sounds of the Turkish language are introduced during this one-week phase, and students are also exposed to some of the grammatical features of the language. In the ensuing weeks, students acquire increasing control over Turkish grammatical patterns and job-relevant vocabulary, as well as greater general fluency in speaking and understanding spoken and written Turkish. Such skills are developed through systematic work on the basic course text and a curriculum rich in speaking and comprehension activities. Speaking skills are enhanced through job-related role-plays and simulations, interviews, and interpreting and briefing exercises. The Turkish section utilizes a particularly rich video library and many audio resources to develop comprehension abilities. Students may also borrow

tapes for individual viewing and listening. A variety of printed materials, including many newspaper and magazine articles, are used throughout the course to develop reading comprehension. Perceptions on the country and culture are heightened through an active area integration program, which follows regularly on the area studies sessions and through a continuing dialogue on Turkish perspectives, customs, and even non-verbal behavior. During the integration sessions, students have an opportunity to elicit the teachers' views and to increase vocabulary relative to the subject matter covered. Classes rotate among all instructors to provide exposure to different speakers and different perceptions from various parts of Turkey.

The Turkish FAST Course, which is 8 weeks in length designed to develop language skills needed to cope with everyday-life problems which may arise during a tour in the country: asking directions, shopping, hiring staff, telephone calls, emergencies, etc. The approach is primarily situational, with a small inventory of grammar taught as needed. Students are also prepared for some of the cultural differences between life in the U. S. and Turkey.

## 9. Textbook Reviews

### Bengisu, Rona

#### *Turkish in Three Months.*

Hugo's Language Books Ltd. London/Edison, NJ.: Hunter Publishing Inc. 1989. ISBN 1-55650-176-5, 205pp., \$ 6.95, (paper).

"Turkish in Three Months" is based on Hugo's method of teaching. The purpose of this book, as it is stated in its preface, is to teach or self-teach essentials to enable English speakers to understand and use the Turkish language for practical purposes (e.g., making arrangements for holidays).

The book consists of 18 lessons, an answer key section, and a short English-Turkish dictionary. The key section provides answers to the exercises and translations of the conver-

sations and reading passages. The English-Turkish dictionary includes the new vocabulary introduced in the book.

Audiocassettes which accompany the book, contain recordings of all written (Turkish) materials in lessons one through twelve (i.e., sample sentences, conversations, and reading passages). However, only conversations or reading passages belonging to lesson thirteen through eighteen are recorded. (i.e., no exercises are included in the recordings).

Each lesson contains short, concise, clear, and simple grammar explanations followed by few sample sentences. In addition, short and very simple translation exercises are also given. However, neither in the text nor in the audiocassettes can one find a variety of oral exercises (such as substitution drills, and response drills), written exercises (such as fill-in-the blank type exercises), or comprehension exercises to develop comprehension and production.

Each lesson ends with a rather short conversation or a reading covering such topics as greetings, shopping, asking directions, and dealing at the customs. These materials are written using every day Turkish. However, the book does not contain any follow-up exercises for the conversations or reading passages (e.g., direct questions, true or false questions, multiple choice questions). In addition, the book does not include any exercises to develop listening or communicative skills. Furthermore, the book does not cover any basic traditional or cultural points. Such points may provide beginning students with valuable information for their survival in the country and facilitate their learning process.

Despite the above-mentioned shortcomings, *Turkish in Three Months* can be a very useful and valuable grammar reference book, especially for those who do not have any linguistic background.

Mukrime Onursal  
Foreign Service Institute

## **SALMAN, Yurdanur**

### **Yabancılar İçin Türkçe Dersleri - I**

**(Turkish Lessons for Foreigners - I)**

Istanbul Türk-İngiliz Kültür Derneği Yayınları- I

(Istanbul Turkish-British Association Publications - I)

Istanbul 1985. 192 pages.

#### **About the Author:**

Yurdanur Salman was born in Balıkesir, Turkey, and graduated from University of Istanbul, with a degree in English and Turkish Literatures. She taught in Atatürk University, Yıldız School of Architecture and Engineering, and in Boğaziçi University. She also taught Turkish as a second language at the University of Chicago in 1964 and 1970. She is currently teaching Turkish and translation classes in the Istanbul Turkish-British Association.

#### **Book Review**

It is usually quite difficult to produce a language book that is sincere, contemporary, and able to focus on developing communication skills rather than cut and dry grammar rules. Ms. Salman's book, *Yabancılar İçin Türkçe Dersleri*, has accomplished this rather difficult task quite successfully by using numerous drills that are directly related to daily routines and colloquial expressions, and by excluding irrelevant and lengthy explanations.

The book consists of 10 progressively difficult lessons. The section on Directions for the Teacher and the Student highlights the best method to work through the book. The additional questions, and the reading material that are included in the appendix are excellent for reviews.

*Yabancılar İçin Türkçe Dersleri* is designed to teach Turkish to foreigners regardless of their native language. Basic grammar rules are explained in simple and clear terms, without going into details. Each unit consists of three sections:

- a. Conversation
- b. Grammar
- c. Reading & Comprehension

The unit starts with a daily conversation using the most common vocabulary. These conversations need to be rehearsed at different speeds using the tapes. The following section identifies set phrases, common expressions and significant words, which then need to be repeated and compared to each other to clarify the differences among them. The contents of this section becomes progressively more difficult within each unit. Exercises are designed to practice the conversation, vocabulary, common patterns and check whether the reader has thoroughly learned how to use them within a conversation. The exercises may be completed in class, or be assigned as homework, and corrected by the teacher. The questions on the dialogues are taped, pauses allow the listener to answer after each question. Apart from the dialogue at the beginning of the unit, the exercises cover a variety of points. Fill in the blank exercises may be done in class orally, under the teacher's supervision.

The grammar section includes conjugations, personal and possessive endings, and vowel changes following the rules of vowel harmony. The grammar rules covered in each unit build on each other. Consequently, the student must be very clear about the grammar points in one unit before moving onto the next. This section may be completed before or after the dialogue and the exercise sections.

The readings at the end of each unit repeat the conversation at the beginning of the unit in prose. This gives the student a chance to practice the new vocabulary, and review grammar points.

*Yabancılar İçin Türkçe Dersleri I* teaches Turkish to beginners in a rather pragmatic and concise manner. The student would thus be able to learn the basics of the language within a short period of time, without going into the details. The emphasis on daily dialogues and vocabulary makes the book easy to follow and quite useful for those who encounter the language on a day-to-day basis. Although the explanation are kept simple, teacher guidance may at times be necessary to clarify certain grammar points and their relations to previously covered grammar rules. This book is most beneficial for those who have some knowledge of the Turkish language without a formal education, and who wish to improve their

Turkish grammatically and colloquially at a steady but rapid rate.

Belgin Çamlı  
New York City, NY

## 10. Reports from the Field

### Prof. Walter Andrews Resigns

Prof. Walter Andrews is resigning his position at the University of Washington in Seattle at the end of the summer. Although he will remain active in the field, it is a loss to the AATT community to have one less 'tenured' member. The University of Washington is looking for a temporary replacement for the upcoming academic year, and an announcement of a full search for a regular appointment is expected soon.

During this academic year, two positions were filled: **Engin Sezer** was appointed to the post at Harvard University and **Ayla Algar** is teaching at the University of California at Berkeley. For the coming academic year, **Mükriye Onursal** has been invited to teach a first year Turkish course at Georgetown University.

**Deniz Gökçora** reports from Minnesota that she was invited to hold a seminar at Concordia College in St. Paul as part of their faculty enrichment program. She taught a "Shock Language Lesson" in Turkish to a class of 40 faculty members. Using the **Total Physical Response** method, Deniz taught colors, numbers, directions, clothing, and names of family members. The main purpose of the 45-minute seminar was of course not so much to learn Turkish but to expose faculty members to a language they have never heard before and to make them aware of reaction in an environment where learners find themselves in a culture where nothing is familiar.

## 11. Concerns from the Field

The following article is the third the AATT Newsletter has devoted to the subject of 'proficiency'. The first was "Proficiency Based Teaching: The Shrinking of Turkish Studies and the Death of Turkish Literature" by Walter G. Andrews, in AATT Newsletter 7, Spring 1990; the second, "The Future of Turkish Literary Studies and Proficiency: A Different Set of Guide-lines", by Victoria Rowe Holbrook, in AATT Newsletter 8, Fall 1990. While the following article, like its predecessors, focuses on Turkish, much of the discussion, as in theirs, is valid for any of the less commonly taught languages [LCTLs].

### **Proficiency Based Turkish Instruction [PBI] at the University: Objections and Responses**

Since the early eighties certain government granting agencies, particularly the Office of Education, and some major associations of language teachers have made a concerted effort to improve language instruction in the United States by promoting the application of nationwide 'proficiency' standards whose roots lie in the language teaching experience and practice of such non-university institutions as the Foreign Service Institute and the Defense Language Institute.

The aim of these government institutions [referred to collectively below as GI] has always been mainly practical and specific, that is, to train their students to carry out the functions of the United States government in a foreign country in the language of that country. Thus the word 'proficiency' as used in their statements, and those of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages [ACTFL] which ultimately derive from them, refers to the ability to use a language in all common, everyday situations. One source defines it as 'the ability to function effectively in the language in real-life contexts' [Liskin-Gasparro 1984, 12]. The meaning of 'real life contexts' is spelled out in documents such as the ACTFL guidelines. Thus the term 'proficiency' as a statement of the goal of language learning does not sound the least bit revolutionary, for who would deny that a language should be

taught for use? It represents, however, a response to language programs that often did not produce graduates able to function adequately in the country whose language they had studied. Perhaps even more important and challenging, the touchstone of the entire proficiency evaluation system was the educated native user of the language.

Let it not be assumed, however, that the goal of 'proficiency' as defined above is supported only by the government and language teaching associations. In regard to Turkish, it also has the backing of certain students who had studied Turkish at an American university, gone to Turkey to do their research, and had difficulty communicating adequately in Turkish or of other students of Turkish who had gone to Turkey to teach English, had themselves used teaching methods more proficiency oriented than those they had been taught with, and were impressed with the results. Finally the goal of 'proficiency' has the support of some teachers of Turkish at the university who had used PBI materials in their courses and found them more effective than other methods they had used.

In the early days of the proficiency movement, proficiency advocates from the language teaching profession appeared to be concerned primarily with testing for proficiency and were often heard to state that the particular methodology employed to achieve it was not important as long as the desired results were produced. Yet it was obvious that means would be related to ends, that such testing would lead to new curricula, syllabi, and teaching methods, that is, to proficiency based instruction [PBI]. This in turn seemed to imply special instructional materials, the application of the latest technology, and the special training of language teachers, pre-service, post service and perhaps even *in service*. The ultimate result would be a learning situation—the classroom and the language laboratory—that would replicate the real life situations the student was expected to function in. The teacher would continue to teach grammar and structure, in fact much of the content he had always taught, but always in subordination to the situations in which the language was to be used, that is, in accord with a functional/notional syllabus rather than with one based on grammatical topics and vocabulary. The goal of such a program would be to train 'students to use the lan-

guage outside the classroom, independently of the materials and activities of the course' [Liskin-Gasparro 1984, 31].

Predictably a call for the sweeping changes that the proficiency approach seemed to require met with resistance, particularly at the university and among some faculty in Turkish. Until this government effort in the early eighties most university departments of Turkish had felt free to determine how they were going to teach the language, what particular aspects they would stress, and what kind of results they were going to achieve. 'Proficiency' threatened to bring changes. Furthermore the university's stress on research required an emphasis on reading rather than on speaking, and the professor may have feared that the funds for his program would be cut unless his students could somehow meet the high standards of speaking proficiency produced in GIs, standards which appeared to exclude as instructors and future teachers all non-native speakers. As if this were not enough, the Turkish sections of departments were already in stiff competition for limited resources.

Soon objections to introducing PBI in Turkish at the university began to be heard. Let me now summarize a few of the main ones, comment briefly on each, and so encourage further discussion of PBI as regards the teaching of Turkish at the university.

**Objection 1.** Present methods and accomplishments in teaching Turkish at American universities have been underrated. Changes in current methods are not required. If our universities do not always produce fluent Turkish speakers this is because the instructor has concentrated on providing a foundation in grammar and reading, not on conversation, although almost every university has been allotting time to that as well. This foundation has been provided at relatively low cost. The fact that our university students may not be fluent Turkish speakers does not mean that they have not acquired the fundamentals. Indeed, contrary to appearances, students who had studied Turkish at an American university and had then gone to Turkey did not learn all their Turkish there, but rather activated their previous knowledge. If they were there for only a short time, they usually developed their practical, conversational skills, less the language knowledge they actually needed for their research. Indeed in evaluating the non-

native Turkish graduates of our universities in the area of Turkish studies over the last decade, we should take pride in their accomplishments under the present low-input, high-output system of Turkish instruction.

**Comment** True, our universities usually provide students with a solid conceptual foundation in Turkish, and students do then activate it and build upon it when they go to Turkey. True, too, that an inability to speak Turkish with some fluency is often mistaken for a complete inability to understand or read Turkish, for the absence of any foundation in the language at all, especially, and quite naturally, by native Turkish speakers in Turkey. But I believe that by introducing PBI or some variety of it and shifting our emphasis in the direction of the spoken language, especially in the early stages of language instruction, and by striving to expand the use of spoken Turkish in the advanced courses even if the focus there is on reading, our students will have a better functional use of Turkish than they usually do now, that this greater facility will enable them to make much better use of their time in Turkey and will certainly better prepare them to use Turkish in their professional lives.

**Objection 2.** The aims of the university and GIs are fundamentally different. The same standards should not be applied to both. PBI may be ideal for the GIs, it is not appropriate for the university. The aims of the GIs are, as pointed out above, mainly practical, closer to those of a trade school. The role of the university is not primarily to teach Turkish, particularly at the elementary level, but to conduct research in Turkish culture and society, including Turkish language and Turkish literature. Consequently the university should limit its role as a language teacher, particularly at the elementary levels, and accept into its programs mainly, or perhaps entirely, students who already know Turkish, that is, 1) students who have learned Turkish by living in Turkey for an extended period, including former students of the Defense Language Institute, the Foreign Service Institute, and the Peace Corps, 2) Americans of Turkish descent from families where Turkish has been kept alive, 3) Turks who have acquired or intend to acquire American citizenship, and 4) Turkish nationals, native speakers with an adequate knowledge of English.

Since scholarly studies in literature, especially literature as literature, not merely as a reflection of various social trends, require a sophisticated knowledge of Turkish which few American students without a background in Turkish will have the time or persistence to acquire, it is likely that students in the above categories, especially Turkish nationals, will come to constitute a significant portion, perhaps most, of a Turkish department's graduate students in American universities.

An economical alternative to selecting students who already know Turkish, would be to select by special examination, students who have never been exposed to Turkish but who have the kind of non-Turkish language background that experience has shown would assure their rapid learning of Turkish to a large extent independently or by the more traditional, low-cost, low-instructor and technical input methods now in place, that is, students with a background in a highly inflected language such as Greek, Latin, Russian, or German, or in linguistics. Finally to the extent that the university does teach Turkish, it should focus on teaching advanced reading skills, particularly those that will enable the student to engage in research in his field. For all these groups PBI has no relevance.

**Comment** It is true that the main task of the university has been and will continue to be to conduct research in Turkish culture and society, including the Turkish language and its literature, but the university must also teach basic Turkish, for it is not taught at the precollege level or in special evening schools, as for example, is the case with other LCTLs such as Hebrew or Japanese. If the university does not provide basic Turkish instruction, the serious study of Turkey will be accessible only to the categories of students noted above. This is too restricted a group in both background and number. The national interest requires that students in the United States with a standard American education, without any previous knowledge of Turkey, be able to begin their study of that country at the university and to view it from the wide variety of political, sociological, ethnographic, historical, and literary perspectives available there, perspectives that will in turn enrich the entire field of Turkish studies.

There is another important reason the university must provide basic Turkish instruction. Any American university that offers courses on the Near East must attempt to foster a view of the area that considers impartially all the interests and parties involved. It must promote the different languages on the basis of their relative importance in that area and on the wider world stage, not merely in accord with current student or local community interests. It would thus be quite improper for a university offering basic instruction in Arabic, Armenian, Hebrew, and Persian not to do the same for Turkish.

PBI is directly relevant for all levels of instruction, but particularly at the lower ones.

While the university must offer basic instruction in Turkish, it must, of course, also attempt to find more qualified students who already know it. To involve more Americans in Turkish studies, strenuous efforts must be made to get talented American undergraduates to begin their study of Turkish early in their academic careers so that they can later employ it as graduate students. In fact American high school students with an interest in Turkish studies should be encouraged and supported to attend summer consortia where Turkish is taught. They should also be enabled to attend courses in Turkish in regular sessions at the university in areas of the country where such an opportunity exists.

Students with a good background in another inflected language may make good students of Turkish, but there may not be enough of them to draw from.

**Objection 3.** The learning situation in the GIs and the university are completely different. PBI is fine for the former, impractical for the latter. The same results cannot be expected from both types of institutions: a) the GI student devotes all his time to the one language course he has been selected to study. He is not distracted by the need to study other subjects as well. The university student not only has other courses, he may even have another language course. b) the GI student is engaged in the study of that one language several hours *a day*. The university student can usually manage only 5 or 6 class hours *a week* plus an additional hour or so of language laboratory. c) The GI student has homework



only in that language. The university student has homework in several subjects. d) The GI student's class hours follow one another without the interruption of other subjects, so his learning is constantly reinforced. The university student studies several subjects concurrently. e) The GI student does not have to support himself financially while he is studying. The university student frequently has to support himself with a job in or outside the university, which also limits the time he can devote to his studies, of which the study of a language is only a part. g) The GI student is highly motivated because his salary depends directly on how well he does in his language course. The university student does not have such direct financial incentives.

**Comment** The differences enumerated above cannot be ignored. They do not, however, constitute arguments against the adoption of PBI as a method. They only suggest the need for an approach different from that in the GIs. In certain skills the university student will naturally progress less rapidly than his GI counterpart, and his progress will be spread over a longer period. Therefore when he begins his study of Turkish he should be told approximately how long and how hard he may expect to work to reach a particular level and be encouraged to participate in intensive summer courses to accelerate his progress. Because more time and more different kinds of activities come between each of his Turkish language classes, more review segments will have to be introduced into each class. To meet his more urgent need for reading proficiency, reading and grammar may have to be moved up in the sequence and be organized more systematically than has sometimes been the case in proficiency oriented classes. Whenever possible audio, visual, and computer material must be made available to him not only in a media facility but also to take home, so that he can make the best use of his out-of-class and away-from-school time. This material must be interactive so that he will have constant feedback on his progress, even in the absence of a teacher. The student should be discouraged from taking other demanding language courses at the same time he is taking Turkish, particularly when he is just beginning and has other non-language courses as well. This means that every student entering a Turkish program should fill out a questionnaire which will indicate

what other courses he is taking, how many, the extent of his motivation, and also his previous experience with Turkish, if any. Only after PBI and proficiency based testing have been introduced at a university and the student understands the relationship between the two so that he can relate his efforts to the results expected of him, may the results of proficiency based testing be fairly used to evaluate him.

**Objection 4.** Even if the goals and methods of PBI were desirable for Turkish at the university, its proponents have never indicated specifically what levels of proficiency can or should be attained in a university setting. What level of proficiency can a student be expected to reach after one or two years of instruction and in which particular areas of competence [listening, speaking, reading, or writing]? What level of proficiency is acceptable for a given degree in the language as a speciality [BA, Ph.D, etc.]? What level is acceptable for a given degree in other fields in which a language examination is required? Until such fundamental concerns are addressed, one should proceed with caution in accepting any new method.

**Comment** Today as the proficiency guidelines for Turkish are being completed, their implications for specific course content are becoming the focus of attention. Naturally a reconsideration of goals is leading to a re-evaluation of the means needed to attain them. Members of AATT, the proficiency guidelines committee, and other teachers are seeking the answers to the questions above in consultation with experienced teachers of Turkish in the traditional as well as in other methods and with teachers of other less commonly taught languages both outside and inside the government. Yet since the general guidelines are not based on any particular course or method but on certain goals and on what is known about how languages are acquired, an experienced teacher aware of these goals and acquainted with the literature on PBI can, even without the final Turkish guidelines in hand, envisage how these goals might be realized in the standard university course sequence, begin to plan his courses accordingly, and consider their implications of degree requirements.

**Objection 5.** There are almost no materials available for Turkish PBI or testing. Most of those that are, have been prepared for students in GIs and are not appropriate for students elsewhere. Anyone intending to adopt PBI will therefore have to produce materials himself. Since universities do not give credit to a professor for this kind of work, the professor in a Turkish program would have to sacrifice time from his research and may ultimately jeopardize his position at the university. And where are there instructions as to how these materials should be written?

**Comment** There is a dearth of PBI materials for Turkish, but some do exist and more are being prepared. While perhaps most of those now generally available have been prepared for GIs, they can be used effectively elsewhere under other conditions as well. They may be adopted as is, be mined for materials on particular topics, or serve as a model for the creation of new materials. But it would be a serious mistake to conclude that all Turkish instructional materials produced for Turkish without PBI specifically in mind, and in fact before PBI was even thought of, are now suitable only for the scrapheap. Very frequently they can be used as is, some may only need to be modified, supplemented, or their elements re-sequenced. The reading selections used last year may be read again this year, but the new students may be asked to use them in a somewhat different way. To help create new materials and adapt old ones a whole new literature on PBI material development is emerging. Proficiency based instructional materials created for other languages, especially English, will frequently provide good models.

Of course in Turkish, as in all LCTLs, duplication of effort must be avoided. No one should set out to create materials without first determining what is already available or being produced. This newsletter, by keeping the would-be developer abreast of new texts and technology, will assist him. Once a year it could also summarize what has been done and what still needs doing. Such summaries would not only avoid duplication but help materials developers prove to funding agencies that a need for a certain kind of text indeed exists. Incentives for promoting the sharing of works before they are published and for getting publishable works in print

and distributed must also be sought.

Text writers must indeed be compensated, and a way must be found to do this at the university, the main place, outside of GIs, where such tasks for the LCTLs are likely to be undertaken. Stanford University seems to be inclining toward such a policy (in general, not specifically in reference to Turkish).

**Objection 6.** The costs of PBI are too high. Its initial and continuing emphasis on developing speaking ability, requires not only extensive lab facilities, both audio and video, computer equipment, hardware and software and new texts, but also specially trained faculty. A university with a professor of Turkish whose speciality is literature and culture will have to train that professor in PBI, which will again take time away from the research for which he was presumably hired and for which he is retained, or it will have to hire a language teaching specialist, who as Walter Andrews has pointed out 'will...continue to be a poorly paid second-class citizen of academia' [Andrews 18]. Rather than incur such expenses, a university with an interest in Near East studies may decide to hire the language specialist and not hire a literature specialist when the latter retires.

**Comment** The initial costs of PBI need not be as high as often projected. The basic lab stations [audio and audio visual], computer hardware, and technological equipment are already available at most universities. Not much beyond that will be needed [perhaps a CD ROM installation]. All this equipment once in place is good for the long term. Proficiency based instructional material—some texts, audio and audio-visual materials and computer software—is already available and more is currently being developed [see objection 5 above].

But what about faculty? In the United States Turkish has been taught almost exclusively at the university level and by two complementary types of language instructors, the professor and his language assistant. [The following is a general overview. The details may differ from university to university.] The professor, the head of the Turkish section of a language department, was hired for his scholarly research, not

for his ability to teach the language, which is not to suggest that he was not eminently qualified to do that as well. Native speaker or not, he planned the program and taught courses from the most elementary to the most advanced, including courses in literature and Ottoman. In the introductory courses, with his limited time, he explained the basic grammar and structure of the language and tended to leave much or all of the oral drills, pattern practice, and free conversation to his assistant, the second type of instructor.

The assistant's main responsibility was to provide the student with practice in the actual use of Turkish, a vital component of PBI. His contribution in our universities has not received the recognition it deserves. Usually a Turk working for a degree at the same university, he had of necessity not always been fully trained for this task. He had, however, almost always studied English as a second language for many years. This meant not only that he knew English, but that he had been exposed to modern language teaching methods. If he was a student in another department and had had no special training in language teaching, he often worked under the close supervision of the professor. The most qualified assistant was usually a Turkish student in teaching English as a second language, linguistics, applied linguistics, or education.

Often the assistant did more than simply teach. Aware that the instructional materials he had been provided were insufficient or inadequate for teaching actual language use in the way that he had been taught English, he also prepared supplementary materials which, because they were in draft form, were usually not published or circulated to other universities. [The result, particularly at the elementary level, has been a duplication of effort.] This assistant, being himself a student, was a part time employee usually hired for only one or two years. Although usually dedicated, he could not be expected to devote as much time to the program as a regular faculty member responsible for charting progress in a department for many years and for keeping abreast of the latest developments in language instruction.

Both components, professor and assistant, have been essential to the success of Turkish programs. What changes would the introduction of PBI imply for them? Some fear

that a university administration, strapped for funds, would replace *both* with a *single* Turkish language specialist. He would have the well rounded, comprehensive training in language teaching that the assistant up to now has usually not received: training in Turkish language, language teaching in general, testing, and materials design. He might even be required to have practical experience as an apprentice to a professional Turkish teacher, perhaps in a GI. He would be not an assistant but the exclusive teacher in elementary and intermediate courses and thus have a status higher than that of assistant. He would be full time and be hired for an extended period and so have a long term commitment to his department. He would be the equivalent of the English as a Second Language Teacher as observed in many parts of the world today. Most important, being full time, he would be available to students outside of regular class hours and be able to further develop the PBI in the department.

So why not have *only* a Turkish language specialist [TLS]? Because the TLS and the professor concentrate on a different set of skills. The TLS may use literature in teaching, but in doing so his focus is on primary skills that must be mastered before the higher skills and a real appreciation of Turkish literature can emerge. To be efficient he must have special training, a period of apprenticeship, and a lot of natural patience. A love of literature or language is not sufficient. The field of second language teaching came into being precisely because such a professional was needed. A professor of literature, on the other hand, usually finds the work of a TLS unrewarding. He wants students who already have the basic skills so that he can go on from there. This means that a TLS and a professor in Turkish literature are *both* necessary. Indeed the university can no more legitimately eliminate a professor in Turkish literature than it can a professor in English literature and retain only teachers in basic English composition and rhetoric. Furthermore in a university with broad offerings in area studies the professor of literature, in addition to his literature classes, also teaches Ottoman at various levels and advanced Turkish texts in history and the social sciences. One person would not have the training or time to carry out all these duties effectively.

Ideally, then, a university would have a TLS *in addition*

to the professor, but so far the funding for such a solution on a permanent basis has not been available. The most practical alternative is to introduce the current faculty, both professor and assistant, to PBI principles and techniques during the regular academic year by means of a regular perhaps weekend lecture-conference series. Here experts would demonstrate PBI methods and professors and teaching assistants would give their own reactions and discuss their own problems. In such meetings professors could share with PBI experts and developers their views on such issues as proficiency in reading and the role of literature in language instruction, a serious concern among Turkish teachers which, for practical reasons, is of less interest in GIs. This was done at UCLA and, I believe, greatly benefited the teaching of all attendees. Because the series was for teachers of all languages, the costs per language or department were low. A second alternative, already I think, planned, is to organize special summer sessions in PBI. The funds for such training could come from those agencies promoting PBI and other organizations or sections of the university concerned with standards or course development. Another possibility is for Turkish departments to strengthen their ties with applied linguistics departments and to encourage Turkish students in linguistics to serve as assistants in the Turkish department and/or to develop PBI-Instructional materials for Turkish as part of their regular linguistics course work. All these alternatives will bring proficiency based instructional principles into more Turkish classes.

**Objection 7.** Because of their high costs, PBI programs will be instituted at only a few universities. Consequently only students already there or those already planning to study Turkish or some aspect of Turkish civilization will have access to Turkish studies. Thus the total number of students in the United States who can be exposed to Turkish studies will be reduced. In the days when the Peace Corps was still active in Turkey this would not have mattered. Today, when there is no such source of interest in Turkey, this would constitute a severe restriction.

**Comment** As has been noted above, PBI programs need not be as expensive as originally thought. Therefore Turkish

programs should continue to be maintained as now at several places in the country, preferably at universities where programs in Turkic related studies, such as Near Eastern Studies, Central Asian Studies, Balkan Studies, Chinese studies, Byzantine studies, Ethnomusicology, Islamic Art, and so on, are firmly established.

**Objection 8.** PBI puts too much emphasis on speaking. Why should a person who does not want to learn to speak Turkish be forced to? Why not just have a reading course for him?

**Comment** While PBI emphasizes speaking, particularly at the beginning levels and assigns it an important role at all levels of instruction, it is by no means an oral-only approach. It does not neglect the other skills of listening, reading, and writing. Indeed although the different skills may be measured separately, they are interrelated, and the emphasis on speaking facilitates the learning of the other skills. Of course some students may not want to learn to speak. We should, however, encourage them to do so. We know from experience that those students who have not learned to communicate in Turkish will later regret their inability, particularly when they find themselves in a Turkish speaking area. Nevertheless, special Turkish reading courses, such as are available for the more commonly taught languages, may be instituted. Computer assisted reading instruction will eventually enable us to meet this need at a low cost.

**Objection 9.** New movements in language teaching such as the proficiency movement, always focus on the beginning levels of language teaching and in another few years are replaced by the newest fad. Thus, much effort and vast sums of money are devoted to elementary instruction to the neglect of instruction at higher levels where changes in methods and materials may be even more needed and where the better, more committed students who will actually contribute to the field are usually found. In English as a Second Language this is not so detrimental since the demand is so great, but in the LCTLs this situation cannot be tolerated. Today, for example, there are various materials for first and second year Turkish but almost none for more advanced lev-

els or for Ottoman, which can not be ignored even for rather recent history.

**Comment** Since the proficiency movement aims to develop proficiency at all levels in *all* the basic language skills, developers of proficiency materials will eventually produce texts for the higher levels as well, particularly once materials for the elementary stages of language instruction have been developed. It is natural, however, that they will first focus on the elementary levels since they will form the basis for the advanced ones. Yet we should guard against devoting too many of our limited resources to one particular level of proficiency or to one particular type of material, and especially against duplication when such a variety of materials is needed.

**Objection 10.** PBI, at least as is evident from some materials now prepared for it, does not strike the correct balance between the presentation of set phrases or question-answer sets [which are usually practiced until they are memorized] and grammar. Granted that grammar should be subordinated to situations and notions, but these materials do not present it as clearly, systematically, or logically as it has been presented in other more traditional methods, but rather piecemeal and apologetically. Instead, for example, of simply presenting a whole paradigm and getting on with it, PBI presents part of the paradigm in one lesson, another part in another, and another part still later. While this may be fine for children not accustomed to seeing general patterns, it is irritating to university students, especially those with previous language learning experience. They inevitably ask to see the paradigm all together at the beginning and frequently refer to the more traditional grammars. Another valuable feature of older methods that PBI appears to neglect is pattern practice. Should it not have a greater role?

**Comment** PBI aims at proficiency. It is not a rigid system that dictates in minute detail *how* that proficiency must be achieved. It may be adapted to the needs of the particular teacher and student. If a teacher feels that a topic is poorly presented in a text, even if that text is labeled 'proficiency oriented', he may rewrite it to suit himself or use another text-

book for that topic. If a student can grasp certain aspects of the grammar better as it is presented in some other text, he may refer to it. The criterion of student success, however, is whether the student can, after his study of the topic or at the end of the course, actually use what he has learned. At the university level a student may prefer a more tightly, traditionally organized grammar. If so, the teacher may provide it for him. The application of that grammar in context, however, not a discussion of it, would become the focus of class activity. If the teacher feels the need for pattern practice, he may do it, but again whenever possible in a context, perhaps a dialogue, that replicates a real life situation.

**Objection 11.** PBI, in its philosophy and as that philosophy has been revealed in certain PB textbooks, goes to extremes to meet the needs of the student. It thus puts an unduly heavy burden of responsibility on the teacher. At the beginning of each lesson the student is given a detailed overview of what he will learn. Then the topics are presented in a very carefully sequenced, indeed almost predigested, fashion, with the student being required at every point to practice what he has learned and to demonstrate his mastery. The presentation is constantly re-evaluated and then redone on the basis of student response, not merely in terms of what the student has actually been able to learn, but also on the basis of his emotional reaction to it. This approach represents the pernicious influence of teachings in modern departments of education.

The weakness of this student-centered approach is that the student becomes dependent on having his materials organized in a certain way, does not learn to select what is important, comes to depend too heavily on his teacher for processing the material, and concludes that Turkish is easily codified and much simpler than it actually is. While the PBI approach may be appropriate in primary school or even in junior high, it underestimates the ability of the university student to think for himself or generalize and thus undermines his critical and synthetic faculties. It also incurs unjustified expense in text and class preparation time. It is the extreme opposite of the caricature of the 'classical traditional method' where the professor lectures about the language but is not responsible for assuring that his student has actually mastered the language

for use. Both extremes are undesirable.

**Comment** PBI aims to teach language use rapidly, efficiently. For it to be successful, the student must have a clear idea of his goals and the material to be learned must be broken into smaller units and sequenced more carefully than was done in more traditional methods. Indeed the material should ideally be sequenced according to the *individual* student's own ability and progress, a procedure that is only now becoming practical with the development of various computer programs based on programmed learning.

Furthermore the limited class time available must be spent in activities most profitably carried out with a teacher, that is, in activities that are relatively unstructured and spontaneous. This means that out-of-class time must be limited to activities the student can do by himself or with the aid of special equipment, that is, to those activities that can be most highly structured. Thus grammar explanations, whether initially presented in class or not, must be available as reading homework and for on-computer study and drill and must be written clearly enough to require only minimal further elucidation. Whether clarity has been achieved only student performance in class will tell, and student feedback will determine how the explanations will be rewritten. Such feedback is especially important when we are faced with changes in the background and ability of our student body. The style of these explanations may well be influenced by, and therefore resemble those in the best computer manuals. Most students today are computer literate and the purpose of a grammar and computer manual is the same: to enable the learner to carry out certain functions. This may sound like an overstructured, deadening approach. It is not: carefully structured out-of-class study frees class time for spontaneous, creative activities.

\*\*\*

Above we have considered several objections to introducing PBI at the university. Perhaps the most serious are based on a too rigid view of PBI. PBI is relevant not only to speaking, but to all skills and applicable to a wide variety of learning situations. It is appropriate at the university level, but it cannot be applied there exactly as it has been in the GIs out of which it has developed or in lower level schools:

different areas of competence will be emphasized in a different time frame. It will make use of any of a wide variety of techniques and methods, innovative and traditional, that serves its goal. It will require new texts, but it will not consign to the scrapheap all texts not specifically labeled 'proficiency' or produced for other methods or under other labels. It will not achieve certain of its goals as rapidly in the university as it might in a GI. It should not be expected to produce miracles, but the experience of teachers in GIs and some other institutions that are applying it in some form suggests that it will be more effective for its goals than other methods not based on the same organizing principle. It will not be as expensive as sometimes projected, but the extra costs it will entail, particularly in the initial phases, will be justified. Can we really expect to get something for nothing? In any case PBI presents a challenge that the university should attempt to meet.

Ralph Jaeckel  
University of California, Los Angeles

## References

- Andrews, Walter. (1990). "Proficiency Based Teaching: The Shrinking of Turkish Studies and the Death of Turkish Literature." *AATT Newsletter* 7, Spring.
- Liskin-Gasparro, Judith E. (1984). "The ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines: A Historical Perspective". In Higgs, Theodore V. *Teaching for Proficiency, the Organizing Principle*. Lincolnwood, Illinois: National Textbook Company.

## 12. Ve Saire

This is an urgent call for help with the preparation of the Newsletter. Anyone who could spare some time is asked to contact the Secretary at the earliest convenience.

Further please remember that the Curriculum Development project needs several volunteer members teach-

ing at universities to test the prepared units. Those interested should contact one of the developers of the units or the Secretary.

Your input on the proposed committees (see above #1 Annual Meeting) is most welcome and will serve for further discussion of the issues.

There will be another Questionnaire this summer to update information on the members. If you are currently not on e-mail, please seriously consider acquiring access to BITNET through your institution. This service is still free to you and it is most useful for quick communication. Some news items and announcements which have deadlines are best transmitted via e-mail.

Please be on the lookout for new members and encourage advanced students who are considering to remain in the field of Turkish Studies to become student members.

And, last but not least, a final reminder of membership dues is included in this mailing to those who have not yet submitted their dues.

Erika H. Gilson  
Princeton University

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*



### AATT MEMBERSHIP FORM

Name \_\_\_\_\_  
 Institution \_\_\_\_\_  
 Department \_\_\_\_\_  
 Mailing Address \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

FACULTY: \$ 15.00	STUDENT: \$ 7.00
Position/Title _____	Degree Sought _____
_____	Expected Date _____

Regular: \$25.00	INSTITUTIONAL:
	Supporting: \$200.00+
	Sustaining: \$500.00+

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM WITH YOUR PAYMENT TO:  
Erika H. Gilson, Executive Secretary-Treasurer  
3 Hawthorne Drive, Cherry Hill, NJ 08003-2221

