

Krashen, S. 2009. Hypotheses about free voluntary reading. In J. Mukundan (Ed.) *Reading of ELT Materials III*. Selangor Darul Ehsan, Malaysia: Pearson Malaysia. pp. 181-184.

d Language Learning: A
515-518.

stage.
try and Learning. London:

re: *An Activities Book (New*

Teaching Poetry Day by Day.

Hypotheses About Free Voluntary Reading

Stephen Krashen

I am not claiming that the following hypotheses are true. They are, after all, hypotheses. Thus far, they are supported by the evidence, and there is no counter-evidence. Research directed at finding supporting evidence or evidence contrary to these hypotheses will advance the field. This means that they are “good” hypotheses, right or wrong.

These hypotheses assume the correctness of: the acquisition-learning, natural order, Monitor, comprehension (including the Reading Hypothesis), and affective filter hypotheses, for both aural and written language, first and second language, and acquirers of all ages (Krashen, 2003, 2004).

The Forgetting Hypothesis: Language acquisition occurs most efficiently when we are so interested in the message that we “forget” it is in another language. This hypothesis follows from earlier hypotheses: “Forgetting” requires that the message is comprehensible and that anxiety be low. In addition, the Forgetting Hypothesis requires that the message be not only interesting, but compelling, which focuses all attention on the message, so that thoughts of anxiety do not even occur.

The Forgetting Hypothesis is influenced by the concept of “flow”, (Csikszentmihalyi, 1993). Flow is the state people reach when they are deeply but effortlessly involved in an activity. In flow, the concerns of everyday life and even the sense of self disappear – our sense of time is altered and nothing but the activity itself seems to matter. “Forgetting” and flow occur in reading when readers are “lost in a book”, when they are aware only of the story or the message in the text. It is when this happens that language acquisition occurs most effectively. Note that this position is the opposite of the “focus on form” or “focus on forms” points of view.

The Effortless Reading Hypothesis: The best reading for language development is easy reading, reading that seems to be completely comprehensible without struggle. Effortless Reading may be a prerequisite to “Forgetting”.

Getting lost in a book is only possible when comprehension is not a barrier. Thus:

Effortless Reading > Forgetting

The Effortless Reading Hypothesis is consistent with Laufer (1992): For optimal vocabulary development, at least 95% of the words in a text need to be known, which suggests that optimal acquisition requires a high level of comprehension.

The Unawareness of Acquisition Hypothesis states that readers will not be aware that they are improving while they are reading, but will only be aware of reading interesting books.

I suspect that those who “forget” they are reading in another language are also unaware that they are acquiring. Thus:

Forgetting > Unawareness of Acquisition, and thus: Effortless Reading > Forgetting > Unawareness of Acquisition

Evidence for this hypothesis are cases in which: (1) acquirers are “surprised” to discover that they had acquired something they didn’t know they had acquired; and (2) were aware of their competence but didn’t know where it came from.

Here are two examples:

Y. Cohen (1997) attended an English-language medium school in her native Turkey, beginning at age 12. The first two years were devoted to intensive English study, and Cohen reports that after only two months, she started to read in English, “as many books in English as I could get hold of. I had a rich, ready made library of English books at home ... I became a member of the local British Council’s library and occasionally purchased English books in bookstores ... By the first year of middle school I had become an avid reader of English.”

Her reading, however, led to an “unpleasant incident” in middle school:

“I had a new English teacher who assigned us two compositions for homework. She returned them to me ungraded, furious. She wanted to know who had helped me write them. They were my personal work. I had not even used the dictionary. She would not believe me. She pointed at a few underlined sentences and some vocabulary and asked me how I knew them; they were well beyond the level of the class. I had not even participated much in class. I was devastated. There and then and many years later I could not explain how I knew them. I just did.”

Lin, Shin and Krashen student who came to th
Her high school readi
the academic year, the
During the summer, So
then gain some.

The answer to this my
pleasure reader, readin
however, little time for p
reading was not a delit
it for pleasure. The disc
later, after she had been

The Comprehension Checkin
less readers understand
asks readers to rememl
which means less engage
a consequence, less “for
More comprehension cl

It is predicted that bo
Checking are related to

Table 1 presents the ki
in reverse order of the
comprehension. Those
goal of ensuring that st

TABLE 1: Types of 4

1. Nothing required optional.
2. Required writing:
3. Summary writing
4. Comprehension q
5. Comprehension q

The presence of comp
we do not trust the rea
selected reading is unpl
into work”.

ension is not a barrier.

with Laufer (1992): For the words in a text need on requires a high level

aders will not be aware t will only be aware of

n another language are

Effortless Reading >

quirers are "surprised" r didn't know they had but didn't know where

edium school in her ars were devoted to er only two months, nglish as I could get books at home ... I ary and occasionally first year of middle

ent" in middle school:

wo compositions for ious. She wanted to personal work. I had e me. She pointed at and asked me how I lass. I had not even and then and many st did."

Lin, Shin and Krashen (in press), present the case of Sophia, a high school student who came to the US with her family when she was in sixth grade. Her high school reading test scores showed a strange pattern: During the academic year, they declined, but over the summer, they increased. During the summer, Sophia would make up for the loss of the year, and then gain some.

The answer to this mystery was that Sophia was a dedicated summer pleasure reader, reading about 50 books during each summer. She had, however, little time for pleasure reading during the academic year. Sophia's reading was not a deliberate strategy for improving her English. She did it for pleasure. The discovery of the pattern of her exam scores occurred later, after she had been a summer reader for several years.

The Comprehension Checking Hypothesis: The more we check comprehension, the less readers understand and the less they acquire. Comprehension checking asks readers to remember what they are reading while they are reading, which means less engagement, less flow, less losing oneself in the text, and as a consequence, less "forgetting" that they are reading in another language. More comprehension checking also means less enjoyment of reading.

It is predicted that both *more frequent* and *more detailed* Comprehension Checking are related to less comprehension.

Table 1 presents the kinds of Comprehension Checking typically done, in reverse order of their predicted level of interference with flow and comprehension. Those closer to the bottom are more likely to have the goal of ensuring that students have actually read the book.

TABLE 1: Types of Comprehension Checking

1. Nothing required: discussion and writing about what is read is optional.
2. Required writing: how the reading is relevant to the reader
3. Summary writing
4. Comprehension questions: high level (gist)
5. Comprehension questions: low level (details)

The presence of comprehension questions can send the message that we do not trust the reader to actually do the reading and that even self-selected reading is unpleasant. Comprehension questions can "turn play into work".

The idea that compulsion is not ideal for learning in general is an old one: "Compulsory physical exercise does no harm to the body, but compulsory learning never sticks in the mind" (Plato, *The Republic*, Part VIII, book 7, pages 269–270; Translated by Desmond Lee, London: Penguin, second edition, 1974).

Consistent with this hypothesis is the finding that sustained silent reading, which does not require comprehension checking, typically produces results superior to traditional instruction.

Conclusions

These hypotheses claim that language development happens in small steps beneath the level of awareness, and occurs when the reader's attention is directed not at the language but at a message that the reader (or listener) thinks is very interesting.

They claim that grim determination and struggle are not part of the language development process; that there is no need for the delayed gratification that is core to skill-building. In fact, the hypotheses presented here claim that pain and struggle are an indication that language acquisition is not taking place (although conscious language learning might be).

They also maintain that the path of language and literacy development, while obeying universal principles of language acquisition, is individual, in the sense that different people have different interests and backgrounds. A text that results in flow in one reader will not necessarily have this effect in other readers.

References

- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1993). *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience*. New York: Harper Perennial.
- Krashen, S. (2003). *Explorations in Language Acquisition and Use: The Taipei Lectures*. Portsmouth: Heinemann. Also available through Crane Publishing Company, Taipei, Taiwan.
- Krashen, S. (2004). *The Power of Reading*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann & Westport, CONN: Libraries Unlimited.
- Laufer, B. (1992). How Much Lexis is Necessary for Reading Comprehension? In P.J. Arnaud & H. Béjoint (Eds.), *Vocabulary and Applied Linguistics* (126–132). London: Macmillan.
- Lin, S – Y, Shin, F., & Krashen, S. *Sophia's Choice: Summer Reading*. Knowledge Quest (in press).

Free Volun

Stephen Krashen

This paper presents a s
in our use of compute
wrong way is the hard

This view is heavily infl
we acquire language a
Wrong approaches as
Skill-Building Hypothesis
instruction, in fact, typ

I will first mention some
present a much simple
– doing free voluntary
locate printed material
is rarely mentioned as
may have the best pote

The Computer as

Nearly all application
development in the ear
on the *Skill-Building H*
consciously learning at
helps us "refine" our c
become "automatic".
evidence that skill-buil
knowledge about lang
(Krashen, 2003).

Inspection of articles j
instruction (CALICO)
their beginning, reveal
the computer program
typically deal with the
(Vol. 20, 3, 2000 of C