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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

Probably few would argue with the statement that American education in the 1970's is increasingly characterized by a focus on the learner: on his total cognitive, affective, and psychomotor being. This shift in emphasis from a teacher-centered classroom to a learner-centered one implies a more holistic, personal approach to the learning process and, at the same time, a more active, participatory role on the part of the learner. The emphasis has additional implications for the teaching-learning process. The adaption of instruction to the individual assumes that educators know more about what the learner brings and contributes to the learning situation: his learning styles, preferences, and strategies, and various individual factors such as personality, attitude, and creativity. New instructional materials, curricula, and methodologies that foster and facilitate a new learning atmosphere also demand new perspectives. Inherent in this focus is a different set of expectations, roles, and goals for each learner.

Foreign language education, along with other disciplines, has felt the impact of this new emphasis. Both the professional literature and textbook companies attest to it by the numerous articles, research projects, and textbooks that deal with student-centered foreign language learning, goals, and roles. Foreign language education conventions
at national, state, and local levels advertise themes and workshops that focus on the learner as a unique communicator in foreign language classrooms. Two considerations, however, ultimately arise: (1) what kinds of learners hold positive attitudes toward this personal approach to learning a foreign language, and (2) what kinds of students learn well in this type of classroom environment?

Problem Statement and Research Questions

However praiseworthy the current interest in individual differences may be, the paucity of empirical research investigating student attitudes and achievement in relation to personalized language experiences is reason for concern. In an article in which he discusses the need for student roles that provide experiences leading to positive self-concepts and success, Jarvis (1975a) comments upon some classroom techniques currently being employed in many learner-centered classrooms:

Unfortunately, we know relatively little about the various outcomes or consequences of these procedures; there is a glaring lack of empirical evidence, and this lack is particularly conspicuous in juxtaposition with the enthusiasm of many devotees of the philosophy. Most desperately, there is a need to understand what makes some of the techniques painful to some students who very obviously suffer or withdraw from them. Is it a function of personalities? Of the procedures? . . . For some students, it is conceivable that even a simple question about what makes him unhappy may be pain producing (p. 224).

It is this lack of empirical research that leads the present researcher to investigate the learner in relation to his classroom task in an effort to provide research data relevant to present efforts to humanize foreign language learning experiences. Specifically, this study will seek to determine relationships among certain personality factors,
foreign language aptitude, attitudes, and achievement, within a universe designated as a "learner-centered classroom" (see Definition of Terms below). It is anticipated that the data collected and their subsequent analyses will permit the investigation of the following research questions:

1. Are there any significant relationships between achievement in a learner-centered conversation and composition course and any or all of a set of predictor variables including selected personality factors, foreign language aptitude, and entry language proficiency?

2. Are there any significant relationships between attitude towards a learner-centered conversation and composition course and any or all of a set of predictor variables including selected personality factors, aptitude, and achievement?

Definition of Terms

Background

Before defining the term "learner-centered classroom," it will be helpful to examine some feelings a student may experience as a member of a language class. Stevick (1976) has conceptualized a prototype of student roles, based largely on personality theory, and has chosen the word "alienation" to describe feelings of foreignness and estrangement that may be encountered in a foreign language classroom. He posits that possible student alienation can be experienced across four boundaries,
the first being more germane to foreign language study than the others:

(1) The boundary between the native cultural group to which the student belongs and the target cultural group;

(2) The boundary between the "ignorant, powerless, and evaluated learner" and the "all-knowing, powerful, and evaluating teacher" (p. 6);

(3) The boundary between the student and other students with whom he must compete for the attention and approval of the teacher and from whom he also needs social and academic approval, resulting in conflicts from trying to please both teacher and other students; and

(4) The boundary between the student and self, between the performing self and the critical self who is observing the performance and scolding the self for its lapses--between the self who strives to be adequate and the self who has internalized others' ideas of adequacy.

Stevick suggests that all of these alienations have the potential for considerable student pain and therefore vulnerability. Consequently, several student strategies may be employed in an attempt at self-protection: (1) withdrawal--avoidance of class, teacher, and classroom participation; (2) aggression--anti-social behavior, turning against oneself; and (3) conformity--studying hard to defend oneself and to please the teacher. The author writes that all of these strategies for self-survival are detrimental to student learning and, more importantly, to the psychological development of a sense of wholeness and self-worth.

As the review of the educational literature will demonstrate (Chapter II), the above student alienations and self-defense strategies are characteristic of current educational experiences. Although Stevick's purpose is not to label the type of environment where these feelings
and interactions occur, a "teacher-centered classroom" has more potential for breeding these types of alienations, especially the last three.

Stevick asserts that threats and alienation between teacher and students must be decreased and, hopefully, removed, in order to (1) maximize student feelings of self-worth, (2) foster positive learning experiences, and (3) make the need for student defense tactics unnecessary. He offers suggestions for reducing alienation, suggestions that imply altering the traditional teacher-domineering and student-subservient roles and moving closer to what this researcher views to be a learner-centered classroom. Specifically, he suggests the following strategies:

(1) Minimize student tenseness—resulting from his alienation—so that he feels physically and psychologically secure and, consequently, more receptive to learning;

(2) Increase student involvement in the learning process: afford him choices in what he does and learns; and

(3) Maximize student independence and interdependence, so that he may learn from himself and from others.

The teacher must relinquish some of the control that dictates how and what students do and, in turn, encourage student initiative in what Stevick calls the student's "learning space," that is, in making his own choices.

What Stevick appears to be suggesting, along with many others (Boylan and Omaggio, 1976; Jarvis, 1975a; Maslow, 1970, 1971; Postman and Weingartner, 1969; Rogers, 1960), is a new and reversed role that places the learner at the center of the teaching-learning process, a role that
Jarvis (1975a) characterizes as resembling that of

...a "self-understanding communicator." It is a role implying an awareness of what one knows and does not know and a willingness to share thoughts with others. It is a role that implies that students will be given ample opportunity and the appropriate instructional conditions for exchanging thoughts and sentiments with others—an exchange that inevitably results in examination of their own ideas, feelings, and beliefs (p. 223).

Operational Definition of a Learner-Centered Classroom

The various components of the operational definition of a learner-centered classroom and their relationships are illustrated in Figure 1 and explained below.

Figure 1. Components of Operational Definition of a Learner-Centered Classroom
Curriculum. The following educational objectives were created to facilitate student growth in the areas stated below:

COGNITIVE AND PSYCHOMOTOR DOMAINS

1. The student should grow in his ability to use the Spanish language for oral and written communication.

AFFECTIVE DOMAIN

1. The student should possess feelings of self-esteem.

2. The student should perceive and receive the esteem and respect from others.

3. The student should develop a sense of esteem for others and appreciation of differences in others.

4. The student should possess feelings of belonging to a group.

5. The student should develop and assume a sense of responsibility for making decisions regarding his own learning.

6. The student should feel psychologically free and secure in all classroom interactions.

7. The student should feel that he is free to work to his fullest potential.

The literature supports the view that a confluent and symbiotic relationship exists among the affective and cognitive domains. Krathwohl et al. (1971) state that cognition and affect can never be completely separated—one is, to a great extent, the effect of the other. They write:

Basically, the question posed by modern behavioral science research is whether a human being ever does thinking without feeling, acting without thinking, etc. It seems very clear that each person responds as a "total organism" or "whole being" whenever he responds (p. 7).

Rokeach (1960) writes that the two domains actually form a unity since each cognitive behavior has its affective counterpart and vice versa.
Although the literature recognizes this kinship and maintains that educational cognitive objectives in large part contain hidden affective objectives, the latter may often be relegated to mere serendipitous outcomes. Krathwohl et al. would agree with the above, but they would further add that, given certain conditions, the development of some cognitive behaviors has the potential for creating negative or destroying positive affective behaviors, with an inverse relation between the two domains resulting. They assert that the development of affective outcomes reaches its maximum potential when affective behaviors are systematically included in educational objectives. Jacob's (1957) research casts doubt upon the automatic development of affective behaviors via cognitive objectives. He posits that if affective objectives are intentionally included in educational objectives, and appropriate learning experiences provided for, the affective behaviors are more likely to develop than if left to chance.

The above educational objectives for a "learner-centered classroom," therefore, have included the affective domain in terms of desired psychological outcomes, in the hope that its inclusion might further facilitate students reaching goals in all three domains. As a result, it was hoped that the learning atmosphere in the present study would more closely approximate a learner-centered than a teacher-centered classroom.

**Instruction.**

**MATERIALS**

The curricular materials for Spanish 105 consisted of two types of reading materials: (1) a book of contemporary Hispanic short stories and (2) a packet of short readings adapted from Hispanic magazines,
newspapers, and books. The readings were thematically diverse, designed
to meet the multiple interests of students and instructors. The students
were not held accountable for the content of any readings since they
were intended to serve as a vehicle for the expansion of language skills
through oral and written communication and self-expression. Therefore,
the real course content of Spanish 105 consisted of the daily information
the students provided in reaction to what they had read. This being the
case, the students were told that they would be evaluated on (1) their
personal contributions into class activities and (2) the development of
their language skills, rather than on the acquisition of knowledge about
extraneous information. To meet this end, all student participation and
messages were strongly encouraged and positively reinforced via (1)
small-group activities that provided for maximum individual input and
(2) teacher acceptance of substantial contributions despite the presence
of linguistic errors and/or views conflicting with those of other class
members.

INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES

A wide variety of learning activities was employed in Spanish
105:

1. whole-class, small-group, and paired discussions;

2. role plays, simulations, skits, debates;

3. oral presentations and discussions prepared and conducted by
   students;

4. interviews of classmates or guest speakers;

5. rank ordering, valuing activities;

6. creation activities: student plays, stories;
7. cultural presentations by guest speakers and follow-up discussions;

8. short syntheses of common student grammar errors (once or twice weekly by instructors);

9. weekly writing seminars;

10. bi-weekly written reaction paragraphs to topics in the readings;

11. weekly formal compositions;

12. individual 30-40 minute mid-term and final speaking tests.

STUDENT OPTIONS

The students were aware that at any time during the course they could offer suggestions to change the syllabus and to substitute classroom activities for those offered by the instructors, an option that was frequently exercised. They had the freedom to choose their own topics on all oral presentations, speaking tests, and compositions; in all cases, multiple suggestions were offered by the instructor upon request.

STUDENT CREATIVITY

Numerous opportunities were provided for students to express their imagination and creativity in the target language, e.g., the creation of student stories, plays, and skits; the telling of jokes and made-up anecdotes; the freedom to write compositions of any genre (poetry, plays, science fiction, exposition); and the use of open-ended written and oral activities such as debates, role plays, etc.

ERROR CORRECTION

Linguistic errors were regarded as necessary and normal steps in the process of acquiring oral and written communicative proficiency; therefore, they were not only tolerated but encouraged without negative value judgments on the part of the instructors. In oral interactions,
the linguistic quality of student messages were subordinate to the successful communication of their views and opinions. Oral utterances that conveyed meaningful messages in spite of linguistic errors were not interrupted for correction unless requested by a student. Instructor assistance was offered in cases of noncommunication. All written errors were indicated by the instructors. Those errors considered to be within the students' linguistic range were indicated but not corrected per se; those beyond the students' range were either corrected or were referenced to a grammar review book (see "Evaluation" below for more detail).

CLASSROOM ENVIRONMENT

The physical classroom was flexible and mobile: students and instructor generally sat in a circle or semi-circle to facilitate face-to-face interaction. This set-up was easily rearranged for small-group activities. The classroom atmosphere was informal: students spoke when they wished to without the necessity of raising hands or seeking the instructor's permission. The classroom activities and discussions were largely student directed, the instructor attempting to "blend into the background" after having initiated an activity.

Student and Instructor Behaviors. The following student and instructor roles characterized Spanish 105; they are first described and then exemplified in behavioral terms.

(1) The instructors functioned primarily as facilitators and guides for student learning. They set up activities thematically related to daily readings and tended to withdraw from an active role to one of a listener, floater, and guide. By so doing, the instructors encouraged the students to assume a self-directive, leadership role.
Example: Reading on superstitions

The activity begins with a short, whole-class discussion on student views of superstitions in general. The instructor places a list of various parapsychological phenomena on the board. Students self-select for a small-group activity. Tasks: (a) define and/or clarify the meanings of the phenomena on the board; (b) discuss views regarding these phenomena; (c) share personal experiences or those that someone else has had with one of the phenomena; and (d) be prepared to share an interesting bit of information with the entire class. During this small-group activity, the instructor moves from group to group to offer assistance, clarification, or encouragement. Whole-class discussion: students volunteer something they found interesting from the small-group activity.

(2) The instructors designed activities that encouraged student interaction in order to learn from and about each other, as well as foster a sense of belonging to a group.

Example: Reading on the humanization of animals

There is a short, whole-class discussion on the tendency of North Americans to humanize and identify with animals. Paired activity: finish the following statement: "If I could be any animal, I'd like to be a ______ because ______." Students attempt to infer what their partners are like as people from their choice of animal. Whole-class sharing activity: class members venture guesses as to what animal each student may wish to be, based on how well they already know each other. Each student reveals his choice of animal, and the class discusses whether they are surprised or not and why.

(3) The instructors designed activities that encouraged the expression of divergent thinking, personal judgments, opinions, and beliefs that would most likely differ from those of other students in the class.

Example: Reading on futurology

Small-group activity: students are given a list of 11 people identified by their age, race, profession, and some personal characteristics. Assumed is an impending nuclear holocaust. Task: arrive at a group consensus on five of the eleven people who will begin the human race again, and offer reasons for each choice. Whole-class discussion: a member from each group lists on the board the five people chosen, and the entire class debates the choices. The instructor floats during the small-group session as an active listener and clarifier. He may also care to contribute
opinions during the whole-class discussion.

(4) The instructors encouraged the expression of diversity and were non-judgmental, accepting, and supportive of differing student beliefs and opinions. They often played the role of devil's advocate to meet this end.

Example: Reading on the Public Welfare System

The instructor begins a whole-class discussion by eliciting student views of the Public Welfare System as it presently exists. As students offer opinions, the instructor, taking no position, asks if other students agree or disagree. The instructor encourages the students, when possible, to elaborate on their positions. Various techniques of acceptance and positive reinforcement are employed, e.g., nodding, smiling, winking, hmm-ing, "an interesting point of view," "I hadn't considered that before," "what do others think," etc.

In the case of discussing short stories, the same strategies were employed. The instructors would, however, offer clarifications when a faulty interpretation of a story—and not a student's personal judgment—was in question.

In the case of written work, the instructors also encouraged and accepted personal points of view. Clarification was offered for problems relating to the use of language and style, but no judgment was passed on substance. The instructors always commented on positive aspects of a paper, e.g., improvement, clear expression of ideas, originality of topic, creative presentation, good use of subjunctive, etc.

(5) The instructors at times interceded as managers in student conflict situations, e.g., when a student might be hostile or be having difficulty understanding/accepting the beliefs of another. In such a case, the instructors attempted to guide the students to discover the reasons behind the conflict, to evaluate the reasons, and to arrive at
an understanding and/or acceptance of opposing ideas instead of passing judgment on a personal level. Depending on the group dynamics of a class, a debate might have followed this example:

**Example: Reading on superstitions**

**Mark:** I'm very superstitious. I believe that if someone takes my picture, it removes part of my soul.

**Ted:** That's stupid! You know that just isn't possible.

**Mark:** Stupid? Hey, I really believe that.

**Instructor:** Well now, let's consider these beliefs for a moment. Ted, are you superstitious?

**Ted:** Heck no, not at all. I think the whole thing is really silly.

**Instructor:** U-hum. Now, Mark, can you tell us what causes you to hold your belief about picture taking?

**Mark:** Well, my grandparents, who came from _____, believed it. And so do my parents because we never have had our picture taken. So, I guess that's why I believe it too.

**Instructor:** Well then your belief would make a lot of sense for you. Ted, how does your family regard superstitions?

**Ted:** Oh, they don't believe in them at all.

**Instructor:** Well then, it would seem that your position is also very logical for you too, wouldn't it?

**Ted:** Yeh, I really hadn't thought of it like that before.

(6) The instructors also shared their own ideas and opinions as did the students. This might have occurred when students asked them questions when the instructors felt they wanted to offer an opinion, as
part of an activity (e.g., the instructors could have paired off with a student in the animal activity above), when the instructors became temporarily involved with a group while floating, or as a means of beginning an activity.

Example: Reading on unusual pasttimes and events

Paired activity: The students are to think of one thing that they have done that probably no one else in the class has ever done. They tell the event to their partner and discuss it. The instructor begins the activity with an example: "Once, I and some high school friends painted the water tower in my hometown with black paint. It was right before graduation, and we wanted to do one last crazy thing together before we all went off to college. We got into a lot of trouble as a consequence, and almost didn't graduate! Would you or have any of you ever done such a thing? Why?"

(7) The instructors took care not to suggest activities in which students would be forced to reveal personal information that they did not wish to share. Activities were structured so as to offer flexibility or options in responding.

Example: Reading on modern uses of computers

Paired activity: The students are given a computer dating service form in Spanish. They are asked to complete the form for themselves or someone else. The pair then compares the results to ascertain whether they or another person might be compatible dates. The students are free to talk about themselves or someone else and to offer any or no personal information.

(8) The instructors functioned as guides and resource persons during the weekly writing seminars, encouraging the students to develop analytical and critical composition skills and to become more acutely aware of language use, style, syntax, and lexicon. The week before the formal seminars began, the instructors led a practice session in which they demonstrated various methods used to critique a composition. Also stressed was the need for sensitive interpersonal skills while cri-
tiquing a peer's paper.

**Example:**

Every Wednesday one or two students turn in a formal composition. The instructor chooses several paragraphs that exemplify certain composition areas appropriate for critiquing and types them on a ditto master. On Thursday, the students are given a copy of the ditto. Their task is to analyze and correct these paragraphs for the following day's seminar. During the seminar the students begin with general comments regarding overall style, composition skills, clarity in expression of ideas, etc. They then analyze the compositions a paragraph at a time, often relating their analysis to the opening general comments. The instructor assumes an active role to clarify points of language or composition and to prevent the omission of any important points.

(9) The instructors and students established some specific course goals on the first day of class. An information and interest sheet was completed by each student and the results were discussed at length. To the extent that the inclusion of specific student goals was feasible in a departmental course, they were built into the curriculum and daily activities.

**Example:**

Some specific student goals are: speaking entirely in Spanish in class; emphasizing "every-day" vocabulary helpful in traveling; having opportunities for creative writing; wanting to read literature; including a heavy dose of Hispanic day-to-day culture in the course.

(10) The instructors attempted to be flexible and to encourage student input into the prescribed syllabus and daily activities.

**Example:**

The instructor may have a role-play planned for a daily activity. The students may indicate that they do not care to role play that topic. With alternate suggestions from the students, they may decide on a debate or a whole-class discussion. In such an instance, the instructor accommodates their preferences.
Example:

When feasible, the syllabus may be altered for reasons suggested by the students and/or instructor. For example, if a specific class discussion is unfinished at the end of the hour, and the students wish to continue it the next day, this may be substituted for the next day's assignment. Likewise, if a particular reading on the syllabus is of little interest to a specific class, it may be substituted by another reading and/or activity upon the suggestions of both instructor and students.

(11) The instructors, in their role of evaluator, clarified at the beginning of the course the minimal criteria to be met for achieving varying levels of success while at the same time ascertaining student perceptions of success and their personal aspirations for the same. Information related by the instructors included: the details of the evaluation system, the amount of work required, the instructors' expectations for the students, strategies for how the students might best achieve their own level of aspirations, classroom operating procedures, and the various options open to the students.

(12) The instructors trusted the integrity of the students and assumed that they would be responsible for their own learning. The instructors likewise respected students' own systems of priorities.

Example:

When students are responsible for presenting an oral report or turning in a composition according to a specified day on the syllabus, the instructor does not "check-up" on them; he does, however, offer assistance if requested. Likewise, if students infrequently come to class unprepared, the instructor does not question their reasons.

In cases where the above procedures were not feasible and repeated non-productivity was a source of concern for the instructors and/or students, a two-way conference was requested.

(13) The instructors attempted to be empathetic and understanding
of the students' individual interests, abilities, personal problems, needs for encouragement and extra help, etc.

Example:

A student tells the instructor that she is an extremely shy person and, therefore, feels reticent to speak in class. Further discussion reveals that the student feels inhibited by her weak language skills, and also has very definite and specific interests. In such a case, the following might be suggested: (1) a biweekly conversation practice outside of class with the instructor to provide the student with more self-confidence and practice in free speaking, and (2) the deliberate integration of this student's interests in classroom discussions and activities.

Evaluation: Assumptions and Procedures. The following assumptions about evaluation formed the basis for the evaluative procedures described and employed in Spanish 105.

(1) The students who typically enroll in Spanish 105 enter with a wide range of travel experiences, varied language and course backgrounds, and disparate linguistic and proficiency skills. Therefore, and because evaluation for 105 is concerned with the students' ability to develop communicative skills in oral and written Spanish, assessment of these proficiency levels was based on an improvement in quality and quantity—in terms of the students' individual growth and development.

The critical factor in this system is the recognition that each student's starting point will be different from those of others. The criterion for evaluation is a self-comparison: where an individual ends, in terms of his language proficiency, in relation to where he began. For example, a "B" does not necessarily represent the same proficiency level for all students. Likewise, a student may receive an "A" and still exhibit areas of weakness.

(2) There were no paper and pencil tests nor other procedures
which inherently compared students to each other, to an established norm, or to an arbitrarily set standard. Therefore, there was no built-in competition for grades or favors.

(3) Evaluation was viewed as a constant, ongoing process related to growth and development—not a procedure administered only at determined points in time. Therefore, students who began slowly or entered with language deficiencies were not penalized with cumulative grading procedures. For example, grades given for compositions or for daily class work were not mathematically averaged but rather employed to identify trends in improvement.

(4) Because students were held responsible for their own learning and how much they chose to learn, there were no quizzes or other procedures to ascertain the amount or extent of their work. Recognizing, however, that tests may also offer the benefit of feedback that some students desire, the instructors provided constant feedback to students regarding their individual progress in the following manners:

a. almost daily comments were provided on written paragraphs and compositions;

b. frequent informal comments were provided to students after the class hour;

c. biquarterly written evaluations were given to the students. They contained the instructors' perceptions of student progress at that point in time (4th and 8th weeks) and suggestions for improvement. Although grades were indicated for both oral and written work, they did not form part of the final course evaluation;

d. an "open-grade-book policy" encouraged students to view the evaluations for their daily class work; and

e. part of the oral mid-term and final exam sessions was devoted to a sharing of both student and instructor perceptions of individual progress.
The instructors did intervene in the role of facilitator when they felt that a student's progress or lack of same would not appear to allow him to reach his personal goals as stated at the beginning of the course.

(5) One half of the total course evaluation was based upon the students' oral communicative proficiency. A daily evaluation of oral class work was recorded for each student, using a numbering system of 1-5 (5=maximum) based on quantity and quality of oral work, and improvement of both. These numbers were employed to make trends in student performance more visible; they were not mathematically averaged.

Students took an oral midterm and final exam in the instructor's office. Half of the exam consisted of an informal two-way conversation. The other half was a formal, prepared talk on one of two topics chosen by the students. After the talk, the instructors and students informally discussed the topic. Evaluation of the exam was based on quantity, quality, comprehensibility, and fluency of messages.

(6) The other half of the total course evaluation was based upon the students' ability to communicate in written Spanish. Two to three times a week, the students wrote reaction paragraphs related to the daily readings. These ungraded paragraphs allowed the freedom to err and experiment with self-expression in Spanish. The students were also asked to correct the errors and to resubmit the paragraphs.

Formal weekly compositions received a written grade based on quality, quantity, and improvement. Students had free choice of topic, although topics were suggested upon request. In order that the students would feel free to experiment with the language and with expressing their ideas, and still be able to learn from their errors, they had the
option to rewrite any or all compositions and thereby to raise their grades. Any error considered to be within the students' range of linguistic knowledge was simply circled or underlined, thus allowing them to discover the principles underlying their corrections.

(7) Because the instructors did not usually correct linguistic aspects of oral messages in classroom discussions, assign grades to paragraph writing, or supply corrections for all written errors, ample opportunity existed for the students to assume a more active role in being critics and evaluators of their own progress.

Assumptions and Limitations

Sample Size

The sample for this study consisted of all three intact sections of Spanish 105, a conversation and composition course, at The Ohio State University. The projected number of potential subjects for the study, based on the departmental figures from the same academic quarter of the previous year, was approximately 60. However, for reasons unknown, there was a total of only 32 students enrolled in the three classes during the quarter in which this study was conducted. This small N greatly limited the statistical procedures that could be employed and also rendered more difficult the ability to interpret obtained data and to detect significant relationships that may have existed among the variables. It is believed, however, that observed relationships may at least suggest specific, noteworthy trends.

Generalizability

Strictly speaking, the findings of this research can be meaningfully
interpreted only with respect to the members of the three classes participating in the study, since these students were not randomly selected from a larger universe of subjects. To the extent that intermediate-level conversation and composition courses at other universities fit the present model for a learner-centered classroom, including the curriculum, evaluation, and teacher and student components, the generalizability of this study can be cautiously extended.

Nature of Subjects

Abiding by the guidelines concerning ethical research procedures as set down by the Human Subjects Committee of the university in question, the present study was explained in its entirety to the three classes chosen to participate. The students were given the option of taking part, being assured that their decision would in no manner affect their course standing or final grade. Because all students agreed to participate, it may be assumed that a selective bias was not in operation for those involved in the study.

It should be noted that all three instructors involved in this study (of whom the researcher was one) felt that these particular classes were of overall lower quality—in terms of entry language proficiency, end-of-course improvement, quantity of work produced, and general motivation level—than other sections of the same course that they had previously taught. (Instructor A had taught the course five times; Instructor B, seven times; and Instructor C, three times.) To the extent that these observations are valid, there is further reason for exercising caution in interpreting results and generalizing findings.
to similar populations.

Nature of Classroom Environment

It is assumed that Spanish 105 was, in fact, a learner-centered classroom as defined above in the Operational Definition. This assumption is supported by the fact that the subjects in the study did indeed perceive the course to be learner-centered, as indicated by their responses on a Likert-type scale designed for this purpose (Appendix B) and administered at the end of the course.

Implications and Benefits of the Study

There is little doubt that the concern within the foreign language teaching profession for providing the best and most meaningful experience for all students is a valid and urgent concern. It is hoped that the present research study will generate important data that may: (1) provide insights and directions into individual learner differences in the hopes of affording optimum opportunities for the growth and development of all students; (2) provide crucial input into decisions that are currently being made regarding curriculum planning, choice of classroom materials, textbook preparation, and teacher training; (3) offer empirical validation for some present intuitions about personalizing instruction, and (4) indicate which—if any—particular "personalized" classroom techniques are related to effective learning and positive attitudes.

In addition to these concerns dealing with the learner and his learning environment, it is hoped that this research will contribute: (1) valid and reliable measures for testing and evaluating the productive skills when used in a free, communicative setting in an intermediate
level language course, as well as measures that can be adapted to other levels of proficiency; (2) a valid and reliable measure of attitude towards a "learner-centered" language class that can be used in replications of this study, adapted to other levels of foreign language study, and/or adapted for use in learner-centered classes that are not foreign language specific; and (3) a model--described in behavioral terms--for a learner-centered conversation and composition course that may be applied to the design of other such classes. Finally, this study may also help to give direction to and serve as a foundation for future research studies in the area of learner differences, perhaps including or substituting additional learner variables such as preferences in learning styles, desire to study foreign languages, and self-concept.

**Overview**

Following are the procedures for the remainder of this research study: in Chapter II, a review of the literature relevant to the research variables and assumptions is presented. In Chapter III, the procedures employed in the study are described, including the source of data and the procedures and instruments used to collect them. A presentation of the statistical analyses of the data and findings is presented in Chapter IV. In Chapter V are a brief summary of the study and a discussion of the findings, implications, limitations, recommendations for further research, and conclusions.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Because of the nature of this study, three specific areas of research will be reviewed. First, the background and rationale for the current interest in learner-centered education will be described. Also included are some contemporary manifestations of this trend in the foreign language education profession. Second, selected learner factors believed to be related to the ability to learn a foreign language will be described. Specifically reviewed will be attitude, aptitude, and personality traits. Third, second language testing and evaluation will be discussed. Because most of the testing literature produced in the audiolingual era has no direct bearing on the present study, this part of the review will be limited to the comparatively recent literature on testing the speaking and writing skills in free, communicative situations.

Learner-Centered Education

Background

When the Russians launched Sputnik in 1957, the American educational system embarked upon a national program of reform that was designed to mass educate its constituents in critical subject-matter areas tied both to national defense and to the growing needs of a technical society: foreign languages, mathematics, and science. The enactment by Congress of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 was one immedi-
ate manifestation of a perceived role for education in international relations. Typical innovations were curricular reform, research, and experimentation; new textbooks, equipment, and laboratories; building construction and expansion; and teacher re-education via summer institutes. The focus was clearly on educating more students better than before, and the ultimate goal was the acquisition of content and/or skills. To meet this goal, subject-matter teaching techniques were stressed but the approach to teaching children remained basically unchanged (Chastain, 1976). Disick (1975) writes that this period [until the middle 1960's] was one where education was

...viewed not only as a patriotic activity but also as a means for obtaining a good job, financial security, and the "Good Life" [p.8].

Many social changes that characterized the middle and late sixties were to greatly alter American education. A general national malaise--expressed in terms of dissatisfaction and unrest--was felt across the country. The youth, weary and frustrated with international affairs as exemplified by the Viet Nam War, voiced an increasing mistrust of government, which in turn generalized into questioning the value of all social institutions. From this discontent, a leit motif that was to have an indelible impact on educational systems in the 1970's emerged: the worth of the individual in the total social structure. Translated to the educational scene, one finds a doubting, rebellious, "new" or "now" student, demanding relevance, values, and sense in his life, while questioning the educational system of which he is a part.

Looking back on this short period of educational reform, many critics conclude that public schools were not qualitatively better by the
end of the NDEA era than they were before. Smith (1974) blames a re-
form that was based on the premise that all students learn in the same 
way at the same time. The reforms were designed for everyone:

New Math was for all students (and teachers). Flex-
ible scheduling was for all. The schools would move 
from one program for every student to another program 
for every student. And this was an impossible goal 
(p. 9).

It was precisely this monolithic approach to education that was to 
conflict sharply with the new prizing of the individual.

Recent Trends in Education

The educational literature of the last decade attests to pleas 
for a "humanistic" reform—one in which teachers, methodologies, and 
curricula focus on and exist for the learner. Numerous book titles of 
this period bear witness to the nature of current criticism and con-
cern: Free the Children, Crisis in the Classroom, Our Children Are 
Dying, Death at an Early Age, Murder in the Classroom, How Children 
Fail, School Is Dead, and The Lives of Children. A quote from Postman 
and Weingartner (1969) illustrates some of the salient and poignant 
concerns of various humanist educators, popularly called "romantic 
critics":

The institution we call "school" is what it is because we have made it that way. If it is irrelevant, as Mar-
shall McLuhan says; if it shields children from reality, 
as Norbert Wiener says; if it is based on fear, as John 
Holt says; if it avoids the promotion of significant 
learning, as Carl Rogers says; if it induces alienation, 
as Paul Goodman says; if it punishes creativity and in-
dependence, as Edgar Friedenberg says; if, in short, it is 
not doing what needs be done, it can be changed; it 
must be changed (p. xiv, emphasis original).

Referring to these critics, Disick (1975) offers the following
summary of their dissatisfactions with public education and its curricula:

The schools, they said, stifled creativity, discouraged curiosity, and repressed spontaneity. They bred fear, distrust, and anxiety. Rather than offering students opportunities to explore and discover both the world and themselves, schools placed the highest value on rigid discipline and strict conformity. Instead of encouraging all students to develop their innate abilities, schools operated like Robin Hoods in reverse: They rewarded the rich and took from the poor. Students with intellectual talents succeeded under the system, but those whose socioeconomic or personal background rendered the school environment uncongenial to their needs were robbed--of their self-esteem and of their chances for advancement through education (p. 9).

Alternative education. One response to this discontent has been the growth of alternatives to the existing educational system. The Free School Movement, one such alternative, sprang up in the mid-sixties as a reaction to public schools. Described in detail by Dennison (1969), Kozol (1972), and Graubard (1972), they are schools--often inspired by Neill's Summerhill--established at the grass-roots level by concerned teachers, parents, and children to meet the individual needs of learners via alternative curricula, modes of instruction, organizational structures, and alternatives to schooling. Although differing in many external respects, these schools share some basic common denominators: open experimentation occurs in an atmosphere free of the "traditional" chain of arbitrary authority and discipline; the student is the center of the learning process and, as such, is responsible for decisions regarding his own learning--what, when, where, how, and why; all learning is on an individual basis; students are "free" to learn or
not to learn; and learning occurs only when the learner is ready or wants it— it is his action, and the teacher is present to help facilitate this action. Dennison (1969) negates what he considers a damaging myth of education: that learning is a result of teaching. In a Free School, therefore, all learning begins and ends with the experiences of the child and the curriculum is geared to these experiences.

Although many of these schools have closed, Disick (1975) states that they nevertheless have had considerable social impact by increasing public awareness of the inadequacies of the public school systems and the need for educational reform, while at the same time offering some models upon which to build.

Proponents for other alternatives, such as Smith (1974), suggest diversifying the public schools so as to create within the system options that provide choices for students, teachers, and parents. Some such alternatives might include: open schools, schools-without-schools, schools-within-schools, learning centers, continuation schools, multicultural schools, and free schools (within the public system).

**Future shock.** Current recognition of a disturbing phenomenon called "future shock" is causing concern over public education and, in particular, its curriculum. Aptly defined by Postman and Weingartner (1969),

> Future shock occurs when you are confronted by the fact that the world you were educated to believe in doesn't exist. Your images of reality are apparitions that disappear on contact (p. 14).

Toffler (1970) points to the transient nature of our highly technical society—a society in which all semblance of stability and endurance
is absent and the only certainty is the inevitability of change. The thrust of modernization upon American life and institutions has led many (Chastain, 1967; Jarvis, 1975b; Postman and Weingartner, 1969; Rogers, 1960; Toffler, 1970) to suggest that our present educational structure does not adequately equip individuals to make choices in an ever-changing society since they typically are not afforded the opportunities to learn self-perception, self-determination, and self-direction. These writers propose a curriculum that not only is diversified, but also will teach students to learn how to learn instead of what to learn, the assumption being that today's careers, information, and knowledge may tomorrow become obsolete. Chastain (1976) speaks to this point:

The contemporary world is changing fast. Will what a student learns now be of any real value in 20 years? If not, the course content is not nearly so important as the skills that the student is acquiring. In short, learning how to learn in a rapidly changing society is infinitely more beneficial than specific knowledge that the student may be gaining. In order to implement this goal, educators are calling for instructional programs in which students are active participants in what and how they learn (p. 32).

The facilitation of this learning environment described by Chastain implies major restructuring of philosophies and curricula regarding the role a learner assumes in his own education. The present study is one attempt to reflect this concern.

Learner-Centered Education: 1970's

Expanded roles and curricula. It seems safe to state that the majority of the classrooms across the country today could be characterized as "teacher-centered" classrooms in which one person is the pivotal point of reference, controlling all aspects of instruction.
Postman and Weingartner (1969) offer some caustic observations on what a student actually does and how he interacts with a teacher in such an environment:

Well mostly, they sit and listen to the teacher. . . . Mostly, they are required to remember. They are almost never required to make observations, formulate definitions, or perform any intellectual operations that go beyond repeating what someone else says is true. They are rarely encouraged to ask substantive questions, . . . It is practically unheard of for students to play any role in determining what problems are worth studying or what procedures of inquiry ought to be used. . . . So, what students mostly do in class is guess what the teacher wants them to say. . . . Teacher asks. Student answers. . . . Have you ever heard of a student taking notes on the remarks of another student? Probably not. Because the organization of the classroom makes it clear that what students say is not the "content" of instruction. Therefore, it will not be included on tests. Therefore, they can ignore it (pp. 19-23).

The role a student assumes in this type of atmosphere has been viewed as negative by many educators (Barber, 1966; Jarvis, 1975a; Stevick, 1976). Boylan and Omaggio speak to this role:

Any environment we create is a product of our expectations—what we ask of our students and what they expect from us. If we examined the student role in many of our classrooms today, we might get an insight into what our expectations are. Too often, that student role tends toward subservience. In a very subtle way, we teachers often tell students by the nature of our questions and our statements to them that we are not interested in their thoughts or opinions; what matters is what the book said, or what the teacher said. . . . Too often, students are not expected to say something important (p. 1).

Many 1970 educators are proposing a complete reversal of this role, an expanded and active role in which all students participate more fully in decisions regarding what and how they best learn. Concurrent with this active participation, instructional conditions
should provide learners with opportunities to become what Jarvis (1975a) has described as a "self-understanding communicator" (p. 223).

This student role to which Jarvis refers, in which each learner becomes aware of who and what he and others are, is intrinsically tied to the image he has of himself:

The many roles that each of us enacts have a profound influence upon our self-concepts, an influence that seems to derive principally from two sources: (1) our success within the various roles we enact, and (2) the very nature of the roles. From the bits and pieces of success and failure accrued within roles each of us builds a mosaic of what we believe we really are (p. 222).

One assumption in learner-centered education is that the more voice students have in all aspects of their own learning, the greater the potential for positive self-concepts, success, and self-fulfillment. At the heart of this type of student role, is the a priori prizing of individuality, pluralism, and diversity (Smith, 1974). And it is this diversity that will dictate accommodating learners having different learning needs and interests via a curriculum which offers greater student responsibility in decision-making and multiple options in learning modes.

**Foundations in humanism.** The notion that a positive self-image has a dynamic influence upon self-understanding and self-fulfillment has a solid base in modern humanist psychology. The present "humanistic" education movement advocating this position finds support in psychologists such as Maslow (1970, 1971) and Rogers (1960). Both Maslow and Rogers place the student at the center of the learning process, with goals and programs and other people occupying a subordinate but
supportive position.

Maslow (1971) views humanistic education as having five major goals: (1) to help the student to discover his own identity and vocational preferences; (2) to help the student become a wise decision-maker about his learning and life; (3) to help the student experience intrinsic motivation towards education and life; (4) to help the student satisfy his basic psychological needs for security, belongingness, dignity, love, respect, and self-esteem; and (5) to help the student to become all that he is capable of becoming, i.e., to self-actualize. Maslow (1970) has proposed a "basic needs theory" of human motivation that each human organism possesses and acts upon to achieve. These needs, in ascending order, are: physiological, safety, belongingness and love, esteem, and self-actualization. Based on this theory, it can be stated that a learner is more likely to realize self-fulfillment if he is in a learner-centered classroom where individual differences are respected.

Rogers (1960) is in accord with Maslow concerning the process of learner self-actualization. As regards the teacher's role in this process, Rogers considers "teaching" per se to be a "relatively unimportant and vastly overvalued activity" (p. 103) because it implies dictating to another what he should think or know. He views

...the facilitation of learning as the aim of education (p. 105, emphasis original),

and the teacher as the facilitator of this learning. More specifically, if one is to survive in an ever-changing society, this facilitation must be one of change and learning: a life-long process-type learning
which provides one with a sense of security amidst societal instability.

While discussing the teacher's role in affording learners with the "freedom to learn," Rogers states that

...the facilitation of significant learning rests upon certain attitudinal qualities which exist in the personal relationship between the facilitator and the learner (p. 106, emphasis original).

Rogers asserts that a teacher must possess certain personal qualities—completely apart from subject-matter knowledge and methodology—which in turn form attitudes and relay "messages" that are propitious to effective learning and personal growth. These qualities are: (1) realness; (2) prizing, acceptance, and trust; and (3) empathetic understanding, "realness" being the most important quality.

Disick (1975) cites the works of two others whose ideas have had an influence on modern education. Glasser (1969) proposes that the repeated, built-in failure of modern schools is the source of present educational problems because of the poor self-images that failure breeds in learners. He suggests strategies for the elimination of failure. McGregor (1960) offers a management view of human nature based on Maslow's basic needs theory. In one view, called Theory X, it is assumed that people are basically lazy, untrustworthy, and will work or be motivated only by intimidation. Applying this theory to the educational setting, students will be viewed negatively and become motivated only with threats of failure or low grades. In Theory Y, it is assumed that people are trustworthy, capable of creative, self-directed work, and actively seek additional responsibility to reach their full potential. This latter theory encompasses the posture
behind, and the raison d'être for, learner-centered education in the 1970's.

Manifestations of Learner-Centered Education in Foreign Language Education

Introduction. The interest in learner-centered education as described in previous parts of this section has had wide-reaching effects on all areas of the foreign language education profession in the 1970's. On the national level, the "visibility" of learner-centered foreign language education can be found in various sources. A perusal of the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages Foreign Language Education Series, since its conception in 1969, reveals titles whose themes focus on the learner from varying perspectives, as the locus of the educational process. The proceedings from regional and state conferences likewise contain themes centered on the learner. While consistently offering articles dealing with the learner, the professional journals have recently dedicated entire issues to learner-related issues. The ACTFL Annual Meetings for the last few years reveal the same types of themes and emphases. These many indications of learner-centered foreign language education, on both national and regional levels, are likewise representative of the conferences and professional publications found at the state and local levels.

Because of the inherent limitations of this section, the remainder presents a global overview of some general manifestations and trends of learner-centered education in the areas of foreign language education that have been most influenced. These trends are in perpetual states of
growth, progress, and metamorphosis.

Affective concerns. A generally accepted goal for foreign language classrooms in the 1970's has been the development of communicative proficiency that enables learners to express personally meaningful messages. A logical end-product of this goal has been the investigation and development of classroom activities that center on the individual and strategies that facilitate the acquisition of such proficiency. Many foreign language educators (Christensen, 1975, 1977a, and 1977b; Disick, 1973 and 1975; Disick and Barbanel, 1974; Galyean, 1976; Jarvis, 1975a and 1975b; Valette and Disick, 1972; and Wolfe and Howe, 1973) have reviewed the literature on humanistic education, investigated affective learning strategies and techniques designed to foster personal communication, discussed the rationale for their inclusion/exclusion in the foreign language curriculum, and offered suggestions regarding their implementation.

The affective strategies characteristic of early in this decade are, for the most part, borrowings and adaptations from two schools outside of foreign language education (Disick and Barbanel, 1974): values clarification and human dynamics. In the first, strategies are designed to teach one to discover what his own values are, a process deemed necessary to increase the potential for self-actualization. Examples of such activities are: rank ordering; values continuum, surveys, and grids; interviews; and strongly agree to strongly disagree reactions to controversial or emotion-laden statements (Simon, et al., 1972). The stress in these activities is on value-processing (rather than the content of people's values) and the subsequent willingness to
share one's values with others (Raths, et al., 1966).

Disick and Barbanel (1974) write that the basic psychological assumption underlying human dynamics is that "...each person has a basic need to actualize his innate human potential and is capable of doing so" (p. 204). The way to foster this goal is "...to teach individuals to increase their interpersonal effectiveness" (p. 204).

Human dynamics include

...the development of self-awareness and self-acceptance, sensitivity toward others, ability to trust and share, and creation of a positive self-image through discovery of one's strengths (Disick, 1976, p. 46).

Some examples of human dynamics strategies are personalized incomplete sentences, reflective listening, sharing one's feelings and experiences and responding appropriately to those of others, and the use of fantasy role play.

While most foreign language educators would probably agree that classrooms should be "humane" environments where learners feel comfortable, the rubric "affective" has generated confusion and concern in the profession because it connotes a myriad of things to different people. Many of these same educators have expressed strong reservations about some of the affective strategies just described. The primary concern is not whether the affective dimensions of learning should be part of instruction but rather the way and extent to which many of these strategies are being employed. Jarvis (1975a) speaks for many of these educators, his caution stemming from

...falling into the dangerous trap of defining communication as "bearing one's soul." I have serious misgivings about some of the procedures that are
usually associated with the 1975 version of the "affective" or "humanistic" education movement. Many of those procedures do indeed result in students' examining and clarifying values; many are totally congruent with the role I have chosen to advocate here. Others, however, result in acute pain for some students. . . . It is conceivable that even a simple question about what makes him unhappy may be pain producing (p. 224).

In a later article dealing with foreign language communicative experiences and activities that promote self-understanding, Jarvis (1975b) again addresses himself to this concern:

There does exist, however, a . . . collection of techniques that is not pleasant for all students. . . . If for example, I were asked how I would feel about religion on the day I was told that I had cancer, I would become an immediate dropout statistic. In the continuing absence of any trustworthy research data, my intuitions make me uncomfortable with this approach. . . . (p. 247).

In order to avoid techniques that are potentially embarrassing, painful, and damaging to students, Jarvis (1975a) advocates activities that (1) linguistically allow students to communicate and examine their own feelings, attitudes, and ideas in the second language and (2) are also structured in such a way that students have options: to talk about themselves, about things or people other than themselves, or, simply, to "pass." This caution has its basis in the "humanistic" concern over the needs of each individual, and would appear to be more representative of personalized language learning in the late 1970's than earlier in the decade.

**Materials development.** Innovation in the classroom ultimately is reflected in the development of instructional materials. Morrow and Strasheim (1977) state that teachers traditionally have felt the almost
compulsive need to supplement or adapt even the most systematically selected textbook with "home-made" materials. The types of teacher-prepared foreign language materials currently presented and displayed at professional meetings and conferences attest to an interest in the learner. In the last few years, textbook publishers have joined in the proliferation of materials whose main emphasis is on the learner, a clear recognition on the part of companies of the importance and seriousness of learner-centered education (Christensen, 1977a; Christensen and Wolfe, 1977; Hagiwara and de Rocher, 1977; Jarvis et al., 1976, 1977a, 1977b; Knorre et al., 1977; Lenard, 1977; Valette and Valette, 1976).

Teacher education. Training programs for prospective foreign language teachers have traditionally focused on teacher behavior, techniques, and methodologies, as demonstrated by the "recycling" carried out at N.D.E.A. Institutes in the 1960's. The assumption has been that what a teacher does—if done well—automatically insures higher student learning. Wolfe and Smith (1972) note, however, that research shows no significant correlation between student achievement and teacher methods and techniques. Foreign language teacher education is currently witnessing a shift in emphasis from specific teacher behavior to the training of teachers in the teaching-learning process, leading them to a self-perception capable of evaluating which teacher behaviors can facilitate individual learning.

Wolfe and Smith (1972) have reviewed the status of teacher education programs up to 1972. They point to "new" goals in education, stating that the "old" goals focused primarily on the development of
cognitive skills to the exclusion of affective or humanistic outcomes. The authors trace the foundations and development of humanistic teacher education and suggest specific, detailed curricular innovations for teacher education at both the pre- and in-service levels.

One year later, DeLorenzo (1973) reviewed the state of teacher education programs on the national level and asserted that:

Achievement and maintenance of high quality, relevant teacher education are two of the foreign language teaching profession's most pressing problems (p. 372).

He offers suggestions for dealing with and meeting these responsibilities.

In 1975, Wing examined more recent developments in teacher education. While specifically focusing on the competence and flexibility of future teachers, she places emphasis on their "freedom" to become more effective teachers in light of societal change and upheaval, freedom from

...traditional, hierarchical, and discipline-oriented constraints to a position characterized by personal commitment and responsibility (p. 287).

This role subsumes (1) the creation of a learning environment where students assume responsibility for their learning and (2) pre- and in-service teacher education programs that

...help the individual develop the necessary self-confidence and belief in freedom of choice (p. 287).

Curricular organization. Among the many curricular changes and innovations that have occurred in foreign language education in the last decade, the most significant one appears to be individualized instruction. Chastain (1976) writes:
The major educational movement of the early seventies has been without question towards "individualized" instruction. This is not a methodological, but a curricular approach to teaching, emphasizing the organizational framework of the class (p. 199).

The term "individualized instruction" has suffered a great deal of misinterpretation, often being confused with a methodology, academic permissiveness or unstructured learning, independent or individual study, lowering of standards, and abandonment of teacher responsibility. Many foreign language educators (Chastain, 1976; Disick, 1975; Jarvis, 1971; Phillips, 1973) concur that, broadly defined, individualized instruction refers to a process, an approach to the teaching-learning process, according to the needs, interests, and abilities of an individual student—choices are offered in the areas of learning pace, learning activities, and course content and objectives. In an individualized program, according to Jarvis (1971), one or more of these choices would be present. The underlying assumption is that each person learns at a different rate, in different ways, or for different reasons. The literature, however, points out that a prototype of a "typical" program is nonexistent, since the many possible variations inherent in each unique learning situation are the raison d'être behind the philosophy: that of providing for individual needs and differences.

The reader is referred to Chastain (1976), Disick (1975), and Phillips (1974) for expanded rationales and detailed explanations and examples of characteristics and components of individualized programs. In addition, Grittner and Laleike (1975) present a comprehensive approach to establishing the conditions for individualized instruction, setting up a program, preparing the students, creating materials, and
evaluating student and program performance. For a review of major
strengths and weaknesses of individualization, see Chastain

Research in learner factors. Schulz (1977) has expressed well the
rationale underlying the increased foreign language education research
into learner factors:

Educators have made great strides in acquiring know-
ledge, in analyzing, classifying and systematizing
it, in defining disciplines, in establishing educational
objectives, and in constructing model curricula. But
the basic stumbling block, the persistent troublemaker,
in our neatly conceived systems remains, ironically, the
human learner--the person for whom these efforts are
intended (p. i).

In an effort to penetrate the type of "troublemaker" that Schulz re-
fers to, Hosenfeld conducted research early in the 1970's investigating
students' learning styles and the strategies they employ when approach-
ing a new task. She reports (1975) that the need to understand what
students do as they complete a task is germain to the learning process
because

...it is not the task itself but what the student does
with the task that determines what is learned (p. 163).

In addition to Hosenfeld's research, related studies are presently being
conducted in the areas of cognitive learning styles and cognitive map-
ning (Lepke, 1977; Nunney, 1977; Reinert, 1977. Also see "Personality
Factors" in this section).

Frechette (1976) compiled a list of 300 completed foreign language
research studies from 1970-1976 to ascertain a pattern of concerns and
trends in foreign language education. Wing and Regimbal (1976) also com-
piled a bibliography of 147 doctoral dissertations dealing with the
teaching and learning of French, German, and Spanish, the primary criterion for inclusion in the list being a study's direct application to foreign language education in one of these languages. Their bibliography was designed to supplement James' *A Selective Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations in Modern Language Education* (1972), and covers the period from July 1971 to April 1976.

In summary, Jakobovits (1970) succinctly expresses the direction that present and future research efforts in foreign language education must take:

> Psychologists and educators have known for a long time that "active learning" is by far superior to "passive learning". . . . and we have rejected the notion of teaching language through some automatic conditioning process. Both of these considerations point to the crucial role of "learner factors" in language acquisition and to the importance of knowing just what the learner contributes to the learning process so that it can be taken into account in the teaching process (p. 107).

**Selected Learner Factors**

**Attitude**

One of the principal variables being investigated in this study for its possible relationships with foreign language achievement is attitude. Rokeach (1969) has defined attitude as a

> ...relatively enduring organization of beliefs around an object or a situation, predisposing one to respond in some preferential manner. It is the student's preference which governs his attitude (p. 88).

Despite the abundance of articles and research studies in the current educational literature that treat attitude and foreign language achievement, there is clearly no agreement on whether they are posi-
tively correlated, if at all, nor on the existence, direction and
strength of any causal effects that one may exert on the other. Lett
(1977) suggests that an important consideration in interpreting this
literature is first to ask "attitude towards what?":

Discussions of the relationships between "attitude" and "achievement," for example, can be
relatively meaningless if it is not clear which
attitudes are being related to achievement. . . .
(p. 270, emphasis original).

The answer to Lett's question is critical in attempting to understand
this literature because research findings become even more conflicting
and non-generalizable as the term "attitude" is applied indiscriminately
to varying factors, e.g., learning a second language, a certain language
class, the target culture, its people, etc. Presented in this part of
the review are studies that demonstrate the above lack of accord.

Leading proponents of attitude and foreign language success being
Their initial research (1959) involved administering tests of language
aptitude and attitudinal/motivational characteristics to a group of
English-speaking high school students in Canada. They reported that two
independent factors were significantly related to second language
achievement: cognitive ability (as measured by aptitude tests) and at-
titudinal/motivational variables. The latter variables were considered
to be just as important as aptitude in determining second language
learning success, though their relative strength seemed to be a matter
of the environment in which learning occurred:

In summary, it appears that differences in lan-
guage aptitude result in differences in the extent
to which the student can acquire second language skills dependent upon active instruction, whereas motivational differences influence the extent to which the student acquires skills which can be used in communicational situations (Gardner, 1973, p. 237).

Writing in support of Gardner and Lambert's findings, Kennedy (1973) reports that a student's attitude toward the group whose language he is studying will have substantial bearing on his success, for if he does not feel that his classroom experiences will eventually allow him to communicate with the target group, then "...he is not likely to learn the language however much practice he does" (p. 77).

Bartz's (1974) study found that positive attitude towards foreign language study was strongly related to achievement in communicative competence, but that attitude toward German people and culture was not correlated with the ability to communicate in German. Contrary to most of the Gardner and Lambert studies, Bartz's study was conducted in a monolingual community.

Savignon (1972) reported that attitude was intrinsically related to second language learning but suggested that success in language study leads to increasingly positive attitudes toward such study on the part of the learner. This influence was based on her findings that attitude toward the learning experience was progressively more related to final achievement as time progressed. Neidt and Hedlund's (1967) study corroborates the findings of Savignon.

Attitude and success for Smith (1971) appear to be intrinsically intertwined and reciprocally reinforced variables. In writing on the role of student attitudes in foreign language learning, he has categor-
ized and labeled various types of negative student attitudes prevalent in many foreign language class, and suggests that they are related to lack of success. In citing the Pimsleur et al. study (1962) along with others, he posits that all students have different reasons for studying a second language; the optimal manner to foster positive attitudes for a diverse group, therefore, is through a flexible and differential curriculum that ensures success for all learners.

Bartz and Schulz (1975) suggest that in discussing attitude as a predictor variable, one must first consider the context in which learning occurs:

...it must be pointed out that the Canadian quasi-bilingual community of the Gardner and Lambert study differed markedly from the setting in both the Savignon and Bartz studies. In a monolingual community without direct contact with target-language speakers and the target culture, attitudes toward the group whose language the student is learning might not be so important as the Canadian study indicates.

Oller (1976) concurs with this position when he writes that to a large extent, the context in which second language learning occurs determines the attitude of the learner and, therefore, his achievement, i.e., that the correlation

...tends to be stronger when the learners are in a social context where the density of opportunities to communicate with speakers of the target language is greater (p. 10).

He cites a study (Oller, Hudson, and Liu, 1977b) which reports a correlation of .52 between attitude and scores on an ESL proficiency test for Chinese Nationals who were graduate students in New Mexico. Similar findings were reported (Oller, Baca, and Vigil, 1977a) for a group
of Mexican American women studying in a Job Corps Training Center in New Mexico \( (r = .49 \) between attitude factors and an ESL proficiency test). From these two studies, Oller concludes that at least 24% of the variance in the criterion measures is accounted for by the attitude variable. However, when English was learned as a second language in the homeland of the language learners (Chihara and Oller, 1977; Asakawa and Oller, 1977), Oller found that no more than 8% of the variance in an EFL proficiency criterion could be explained by attitudinal factors.

Several researchers have concluded that the relative strength of the relationship between attitude and achievement is weak or even questionable. In the Pimsleur et al. (1962) article that reviewed studies on learner factors and foreign language learning, the authors conclude the section on attitude and motivation by stating that an interest either in languages in general and/or in one language in particular correlates positively with achievement, although the

... influence of this variable appears to be modest but consistent from the scanty evidence (p. 167).

Jakobovits and Gould (1973) investigated student attitudes towards a second language and its culture and people, and achievement in oral proficiency, and found that attitudes may or may not determine success in foreign language study. They suggest that other variables such as teacher's personality, student's study habits, socioeconomic setting, and instructional strategies may account for variance in achievement.

The assumption that attitude and achievement are positively correlated, regardless of the existence and direction of cause-effect relationships, is itself open to question, according to a number of re-
searchers. Bartz and Schulz (1975) note historical examples of people who have learned second languages under conditions accompanied by feelings of indifference or antipathy, e.g., students of the Army Special Training Program who learned German and Japanese during World War II. Mueller (1971) investigated the attitudes of university students toward basic French courses, and found a negative correlation between attitude and achievement, reporting that the better (A and B) students in university French classes being studied held the most negative attitudes towards the course. Carroll (1963) states that liking foreign language study is not significantly related to achievement. He writes that "...as long as learners remain cooperative and actively engaged in learning, whether they want to or not" (p. 1089, emphasis original), attitude differences will not greatly affect achievement.

Aptitude

Aptitude, another variable being investigated in this study, is widely considered in the literature as an important learner factor in affecting and predicting foreign language achievement. Among the most commonly discussed topics in this literature are: definitions of aptitude and identification of its possible component parts, commercial aptitude tests and how the subparts correlate with achievement, the percentage in total foreign language achievement explained by aptitude, and attempts at increasing aptitude and achievement scores by specific training.

Definition and component parts. Although foreign language educators are not in agreement on the identity of specific component parts of
foreign language aptitude (Hancock, 1972), there does exist some unani-
mity in defining the construct. Jakobovits (1970) offers the follow-
ing definition based on Carroll:

An inferred capacity which determines learning time under the most favorable conditions. The shorter the learning time, the higher the inferred aptitude. If the task is difficult and the learner's aptitude is sufficiently low, learning time may be indefinitely long. Aptitude is conceived to be specific to partic-
cular tasks and depends on possession of certain characteristics by the learner. These characteristics may be either innate (or genetically determined) or they may be dependent upon prior learning of a specific sort or prior exposure to certain situations (p. 95).

According to Carroll (1963), language aptitude as measured by tests appears to consist of four identifiable abilities:

1. **Phonetic coding**: the ability to code and store sounds to later be retrieved;

2. **Grammatical sensitivity**: the ability to recognize grammatical functions of words in context;

3. **Rote memorization**: the ability to learn a large number of words in a short period of time;

4. **Inductive language learning ability**: the ability to infer new linguistic patterns from new linguistic contexts (p. 1088).

Valette (1970) concurs with Carroll as regards the first three components.

Aptitude testing. The two most widely-used commercial foreign lan-
guage aptitude tests are: the **Modern Language Aptitude Test** (MLAT) (Carroll and Sapon, 1958, 1959) and the **Pimsleur Language Aptitude Battery** (LAB) (Pimsleur, 1966). The primary purposes of these instru-
ments, according to the authors, are prediction and diagnosis. To that end, the tests attempt to identify specific abilities that have compa-
ratively high correlations with foreign language success. The MLAT is intended for use with high school, college, and adult populations. Because the LAB has no known validity beyond high school age, it was not considered for use in the present study. Following is a brief breakdown on the MLAT's component parts, based on Valette's description (1967):

Modern Language Aptitude Test

Part 1. **Number Learning:** Students learn numbers in a new language. This part measures auditory memory and auditory alertness.

Part 2. **Phonetic Script:** Students learn phonetic script and select the correct transcription for words spoken on the tape. This part measures sound-symbol association ability.

Part 3. **Spelling Clues:** Students select the correct meaning of coded English words (a high-speed section). This part measures English vocabulary and, to some extent, sound-symbol association.

Part 4. **Words in Sentences:** Students handle diverse aspects of grammar in English, without using specific terminology. This part measures sensitivity to grammatical structure.

Part 5. **Paired Associates:** Students memorize pairs of words. This part measures ability to learn rapidly by rote (p. 185).

The complete MLAT takes about 60-70 minutes to administer while the short form (parts 3, 4, and 5) requires about 30-35 minutes. See Chapter III for a more complete discussion of the short form and the test's reliability coefficients as reported in the Manual (1959).

**Aptitude and achievement.** Pimsleur (1966b) reports that when correlating the LAB with standardized achievement tests, the amount of variance explained by aptitude varied from 22 to 74 percent. Jakobovits (1970) writes that in various other studies investigating the re-
lationships of aptitude and achievement (Carroll, 1965; Carroll and Sapon, 1959; Flaugher, 1967; Gardner and Lambert, 1961; and Pimsleur, Sundland, and McIntyre, 1964), the approximate variance in achievement explainable by aptitude was 30 percent, with intelligence = 20, perseverance and motivation = 33, and others = 14. These findings are consistent with Carroll's (1974) widely respected model of school learning where learning is seen as a function of multiple variables that include aptitude, intelligence, and perseverance. Jakobovits' estimates regarding the relative importance of aptitude as a predictor of success are supported also by certain key studies reported by Pimsleur (1964), Carroll (1967), and Arendt (1968), as well as by an earlier study by Hascall (1961). (See Larsen et al. (1942) for findings that do not corroborate these of the above studies.)

In the Pimsleur et al. (1964) ex post facto study, which was part of Pimsleur's initial LAB research, he administered the LAB to 285 students in the hopes of diagnosing learning problems of underachievers and identifying characteristics and special abilities that constitute foreign language aptitude. Table 1 summarizes Pimsleur's (1966b) correlations between language grades and various predictor variables.

These results are in general accord with the findings of Jakobovits. Of interest is that when the aptitude battery and gradepoint average are combined, the multiple correlation accounts for over half of the total variance and more than twice that of IQ.
Table 1
Correlations Between Language Grades
and Various Predictor Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>Correlations with Language Grades</th>
<th>% of Variance Explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IQ</td>
<td>r = .46</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Grade</td>
<td>r = .57</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade-point Average</td>
<td>r = .62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aptitude battery</td>
<td>r = .62</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA plus aptitude battery</td>
<td>r = .72</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Pimsleur, 1966b)

In a massive status study designed to measure the foreign language proficiency levels of college language majors at the time of graduation, Carroll (1967) investigated possible factors associated with variations in student performance. Of the variables found to be related to foreign language proficiency, aptitude ranked fourth in strength of prediction. Carroll concluded that aptitude was significantly associated with the levels of attained skills, but that the relative strength and the extent of the relationship were not very strong or discernible.

Arendt (1968) studied the effectiveness of pretest measures in predicting success in first-year French and German. Among the many predictive measures employed was the MLAT, long form. Criterion measures were a standardized achievement test and year-end foreign language grades. He reports numerous correlations and multiple correlations of various
predictor measures with year-end grades and the four skills tested. A major finding was that other variables, tests, and test combinations were more accurate in predicting success in individual skill areas than was MLAT alone, even though the MLAT was the best single predictor of eight of ten sub-scores on the achievement test.

Hascall (1961) investigated the relative predictive value of certain variables to success in high school foreign language study, examining the achievement of 800 first-year students over a two-year period. Among many predictive measures administered (for acquired skills, aptitude, interests, and personal factors), he used three aptitude batteries. Predictive measures for "acquired skills" included (1) teachers' grades in the English course immediately preceding foreign language study and (2) selected scores from the Stanford Achievement Tests. Scores from these tests, along with other variables, were correlated with scores from two criterion measures: (1) teachers' end-of-year foreign language grades and (2) standardized achievement tests. Final correlations suggested that aptitude was one of the three best predictors of foreign language success, along with the Stanford Achievement Tests and students' grades in previous English courses. Aptitude accounted for 26 percent of the variance for girls and 34 percent for boys (criterion = teachers' grades); it was responsible for 21 percent of the variance for the total group (criterion = standardized achievement tests).

Aptitude training. Several studies have involved special aptitude training in an attempt to increase aptitude and achievement scores. Yeni-Konshian (1965) gave special training in auditory discrimination to students weak in auditory perception skills in hopes of ascertaining
whether measurable aptitude could be increased. She administered parts II and III of the MLAT as pre- and posttest measures to an experimental and a control group, the latter receiving no special training. The experimental group scored significantly higher than the control group, leading her to conclude that aptitude as measured by tests can be improved with special training. There were no indications, however, whether such increased aptitude would affect achievement.

Hatfield (1966) investigated whether controlled, supplementary training in auditory skills would raise achievement levels of beginning language students. He administered such training and, at the end of the first semester, learned that the experimental group received language grades that were significantly higher than those of the control group (having received no special training); this significant difference, however, did not last throughout the school year, even though the experimental group had slightly higher grades on the average.

Politzer and Weiss (1972) conducted an experiment to determine (1) whether foreign language aptitude as measured by the LAB and MLAT could be increased by specific training and (2) whether such increases in aptitude resulted in higher foreign language achievement. There were significant differences between control and experimental groups for scores on aptitude and language tests. However, the study gave little indication that the effects of concurrent aptitude training and language study were appreciably greater than those of other language study or aptitude training alone.

**Personality Factors**

Personality factors—another component of the learner being inves-
tigated in the present study—are also considered, via the literature, to be responsible for part of the variance in learner achievement. Research in foreign language education has tradionally focused on (1) cognitive student variables (Chastain, 1976) or (2) instructional variables when planning, carrying out, and measuring the results of foreign language teaching programs (Clark, 1972). Only recently has the profession begun to research and identify certain affective-social variables and the ways in which they affect learning. Chastain (1976) speaks to this:

It is now generally accepted that the separation of a student's cognitive capabilities from his emotional, psychological state is impossible (p. 69).

The literature shows that a wide range of cognitive styles exists and suggests that the way these styles differ from person to person in a learning situation is, in great part, a function of individual personality variables (Alvord and Glass, 1974; Brown, 1973; Chastain, 1976; and Farnham-Diggory, 1972).

Despite the apparent symbiotic relationship between the cognitive and affective domains, Chastain (1976) feels that the sparse attention afforded affective-social variables is due in part to the difficult nature of obtaining consistent results, determining and controlling the exact variables necessary, and, ultimately, convincing the "scientific mind in search of empirical support for education practice" (p. 69) that such support does exist. Nevertheless, researchers in both foreign language education and other fields are beginning to examine empirically isolated personality traits or groups of traits in their relation to learning.
Rationale. In her book on cognitive processes, Farnham-Diggory (1972) writes that teachers cannot really expect to educate minds that are not minds of persons, since it is impossible to separate personality from thinking and, therefore, learning. She identifies some personality dimensions critical in classroom learning and present in students of all ages:

1. persistence, impulsivity, and hyperactivity;
2. anxiety and defensiveness;
3. passive and dependent behaviors;
4. assertiveness, aggressiveness, and hostility;
5. egocentrism and self-esteem;
6. cognitive styles of analysis and organizing information.

She discusses manifestations of each trait and their effects on learning, and presents empirical research dealing with them.

Nida (1957-58) writes that educators have all too often attempted to account for failure in foreign language learning by examining "outside" or "external" influences, such as exposure to foreign language study, curriculum, teachers, etc. He suggests that there are many unexplored areas and posits that psychological problems traced to a person's childhood experiences, although not purported to be the major hindrances in learning a foreign language, can account for failure. Some problem sources he cites are:

1. resentment for a foreign language owing to a deeper resentment against the "foreignness" of one's parental background, against which a person has previously reacted;

2. a deep-seated fear of language failure and of making mistakes,
stemming from early experiences of having spoken a "substandard," less prestigious dialect; and

3. childhood attitudes (subconsciously taught and reinforced) of linguistic ethnocentrism toward the foreign pronunciation and language of a linguistic out-group, the latter being viewed as "strange," "queer," or "wrong," and, therefore, lacking in prestige.

Writing about language acquisition processes, Brown (1973) urges an interdisciplinary approach to second-language research in the formation of a comprehensive theory of language acquisition. Basing himself in current psychological theory and empirical research in second-language learning, he offers a compelling rationale for intensive and expanded research into affective variables considered to be related to language learning. Referring to the affective domain, he states:

We must acknowledge that while all the optimal factors may be operating in the attempted solution of a given task, the learner can fail because of an affective block. . . . Today there is an increasing awareness of the necessity to examine the human personality to find answers to perplexing problems in language learning (pp. 231-232).

Citing some of the sparse empirical studies treating affective variables in second-language acquisition, Brown suggests the following as areas of continued research: egocentric factors, social factors, and cognitive styles. He concludes that an interdisciplinary approach to research is necessary because language is a complex process within a complex organism, and that this complex of variables has an interactive effect both within the learner and with the learner and external variables.
Personality traits and cognitive styles. Brinkman (1973) investigated the extent to which cognitive styles (defined in his study as "conceptually set" and "factually set" styles) are related to personality traits. The results of his study showed that the conceptually set learners scored significantly higher (p < .05) than the factually set group on selected scales of the California Personality Inventory. The researcher concluded that (1) the conceptually set and the factually set learners displayed idiosyncratic modes of learning and thinking which were indicative of their overall pattern of behavior and personality, and (2) learning style goes beyond simple subject-matter acquisition. A person's learning style is a measure of his cognitive style, the latter representing differences in personality organizations as well as those that are genetically and environmentally determined.

In a research study that has particular relevance for the present study, Baker et al. (1974) attempted to determine which personality types tend to prefer specific modes in instruction. Findings showed that students preferring the conventional lecture class (83%) were classified by a dislike for uncertainty, a dependency upon others and their opinions, a certain deal of caution and insecurity, a need for structure, and a low degree of perseverance. Those choosing the independent study mode (3%) were characterized as more intelligent, curious, and persevering, and in need of autonomy. Students who favored small-group discussion sessions (11%) tended to display a high interest in social interaction, a more serious academic attitude, and a high desire for fun activities. An inference to be drawn from this study is that knowledge of preferences in learning styles and individual personality
traits can serve to optimize the chances of individual success.

**Personality traits as predictor variables.**

**SELF-CONCEPT**

A positive self-concept is a personality factor frequently linked to academic achievement. Chastain (1976) states:

Given the insecurity often experienced by second language learners, one would suspect that a strong self-concept would facilitate second language learning (p. 69).

This thought is in accord with Jarvis' (1975) notion that nowhere else in a school curriculum is a student so stripped of familiar cues as in a second language class, thereby increasing the potential for insecurities and heightening the need for positive self-esteem.

Alvord and Glass (1974) conducted a massive study to ascertain possible relationships between self-concept and academic achievement. The subjects consisted of all Iowa public school students enrolled in science classes in grades four, seven, and twelve. Self-concept was measured by the Self-Appraisal Inventory and the criterion measure was the National Assessment of Educational Progress science exercises. Significant positive correlations were found at all three grade levels between self-concept and science achievement.

Prawer (1974) studied the relationship between academic performance in foreign language study and self-concept as a foreign language student. A modified, self-concept questionnaire--designed to measure perceptions of one's ability to do well in foreign language study (SCFL)--was administered to first-level students, and correlations were obtained between SCFL scores and foreign language grades, grade-point average, and IQ.
Among the various findings, Prawer noted a very high correlation between SCFL scores and foreign language grades (.90). She draws strong inferences that, regardless of high statistical significance, should be cautiously interpreted in a correlational study, especially where the concept variable--self-concept--is narrowly defined, e.g.:

The level of accomplishment, as manifested in the FL grade, will influence the self-concept as a foreign language student (p. 9),

and:

...self-concept as a foreign language student and the foreign language grade are mutually reinforcing variables (p. 9).

MOTIVATIONAL AND EMOTIONAL FACTORS

A number of empirical studies in foreign language education have attempted to predict achievement via personality factors or to investigate relationships between the two. Cox (1955) studied the nature of certain personality variables--namely, motivational and emotional factors--associated with success and failure in learning a second language. On the basis of an intelligence and a language aptitude test, a personality inventory, the Rothwell Interest Blank, and psychological interviews to determine students' motivational and emotional stability and their attitudes toward course and instructor, the researcher found: (1) no significant relationship between course results and easily identified personality variables, (2) high scores on the personality inventory (high scores indicating personality disorder) tending to be related to poor course performance, and (3) scores on the Rothwell Interest Blank suggesting a hypothesis that poorer students might have higher status aspirations and poorer ability than superior students. It was
thought that this high status drive could be associated with low ability and emotional instability. Cox concluded with a statement which, nearly 20 years earlier, is in complete accord with the Brown article previously cited:

Any theory of complex human learning has to take account of many variables, ranging from relatively clear-cut factors such as intelligence to more intangible attributes like emotional adjustment. Failure to consider these important variables has been at least partly responsible for the large gap between learning theory and educational practice (p. 64).

Westcott (1974) posited that certain emotional reactions accompany efforts to learn a foreign language and, in turn, become a part of the total experience. He explored those emotional experiences as described by high school students, and attempted to determine the extent to which personality factors contributed to those experiences. He administered the Adjective Self-Description personality inventory to a group of beginning language students and the MAPA (Motivation, attitude, peer influence, anxiety, etc.) five times throughout the semester to determine attitude change over time. Two groups from the total number were identified at the end of the study: those who had experienced emotional satisfaction and those who had experienced emotional turmoil. An analysis of variance revealed that while there were significant personality differences between the two groups, the cluster of variables called "personality" did not contribute significantly to the total variance.

PERSONALITY TYPES

Interested in the effects of personality on language achievement, Dunkel (1947) hypothesized that the "compulsive" personality type—the
rigid, meticulous kind who pays close attention to details—would have a better chance of success on a university language placement test. On the basis of the Rorschach test, students of the compulsive personality type were identified. Results on the placement test, however, showed no differences between the compulsive group and the other members.

With this hypothesis unsubstantiated, Dunkel then divided his data into two groups: those who scored higher than expected and those who scored lower than expected. A profile for each group revealed that the three subgroups of the high-scoring subjects were (1) rigid, meticulous, compulsive; (2) well-adjusted, mature; or (3) maladjusted, sublimating problems and channeling energy into school work. In the low-scoring group, where no subgroup patterns emerged, there were consistent patterns of considerable emotionality, innerconflict, and anxiety, as well as a tendency to spontaneity and fantasy. No statistics were provided.

Neufeld (1969) investigated relationships between personality, foreign language aptitude, anomie, and foreign language achievement. The Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16PF) was administered to randomly selected university students enrolled in intermediate level classes, and the 16 primary factors plus 4 second-order factors were entered as covariables with total achievement on the Modern Language Cooperative Achievement Tests as well as with scores on the subtests (speaking, listening, reading, and writing). No significant correlations between total achievement and personality traits resulted. The following observations, however, were reported: (1) persons who scored high in speaking tended to be more assertive, unconventional, and independent; (2) students scoring high in listening and reading comprehen-
sion were said to be better informed, more analytical, self-sufficient, and resourceful; and (3) those excelling in writing were identified as being tough-minded, realistic, and self-reliant.

Brewster (1971) investigated the inter-relationships between personality, language aptitude, and achievement. Employing the 16PF, she identified through analyses of variance the scales of this inventory that significantly distinguished between aptitude and achievement levels. On the basis of subsequent analyses, she found that five of the 16PF personality variables were "especially relevant to foreign language learning" (p. 68A). She described the successful language learner as being: persevering, intellectual, analytical, trusting, easy to get along with, adaptable, outgoing, resourceful, imaginative, creative, warm, and spontaneous. There was no indication of whether these traits were "relevant" to all aspects of achievement or only to certain skill areas, nor which criterion measure was employed for assessing achievement. Correlation coefficients were not provided in the abstract.

In Bartz's (1974) study investigating the relationship of certain learner factors with the ability to communicate in German, selected personality traits were studied and measured by the 16PF. The only factor on the 16PF that correlated significantly (p < .10) with the total battery of communicative competence tests was "introversion." Many other traits, however, reached significant correlations ranging from .05 to .10 levels with component parts of these tests.

The Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire. Because the 16PF has been employed in the present study as well as in others that correlate personality traits with foreign language achievement, it is de-
scribed here in detail.

The primary purposes of this test (1967) are prediction and classification rather than derivation of personality profiles. It is composed of 187 multiple-choice questions with three alternatives each, and requires between 45 to 60 minutes to administer. It yields scores on 16 Primary Factors and 4 Second-Order Factors, presented in Table 2.

**Table 2**

Primary and Second-Order Factors of the 16PF<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Reserved</td>
<td>vs. Outgoing (Affectothymia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sizothymia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Less Intelligent</td>
<td>vs. More Intelligent (Higher scholastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lower</td>
<td>mental capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scholastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mental capacity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Affected by</td>
<td>vs. Emotionally Stable (Higher ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings</td>
<td>strength)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Lower ego</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strength)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Humble</td>
<td>vs. Assertive (Dominance)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Submissiveness)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Sober</td>
<td>vs. Happy-go-lucky (Surgency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Desurgency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Expedient</td>
<td>vs. Conscientious (Stronger super-ego</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Weaker super-ego</td>
<td>strength)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strength)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Shy</td>
<td>vs. Venturesome (Parmia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Threctia)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Factor</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Tough-minded (Harria) vs. Tender-minded (Premsia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>Trusting (Alaxia) vs. Suspicious (Protension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Practical (Praxernia) vs. Imaginative (Autia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Forthright (Artlessness) vs. Shrewd (Shrewdness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Placid (Untroubled adequacy) vs. Apprehensive (Guilt proneness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Conservative (Conservatism) vs. Experimenting (Radicalism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Group-dependent (Group adherence) vs. Self-sufficient (Self-sufficiency)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Undisciplined Self-conflict (Low integration) vs. Controlled (High self-concept control)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&lt;sub&gt;4&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Relaxed (Low ergic tension) vs. Tense (High ergic tension)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second-Order Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&lt;sub&gt;I&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Introversion vs. Extraversion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&lt;sub&gt;II&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Low Anxiety vs. High Anxiety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&lt;sub&gt;III&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Tenderminded Emotionality vs. Tough Poise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q&lt;sub&gt;V&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Subduedness vs. Independence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1972, pp. 17-23.
The Manual (1972) reports test-retest reliability coefficients ranging from .23 to .93 for Form A. Construct validity of the factors has been refined by ten successive factor analyses of several thousand original items on various population samples, as well as by "cross-validation of the test items in their correlations with the factors on different adult population samples" (p. 11). Reported validity coefficients range from .35 to .94.

Testing and Evaluation

Introduction

Most foreign language educators readily accept the importance of testing in the total curriculum, especially in terms of the psychological "set" it establishes. Jorstad (1974) writes that every test communicates some type of message to students depending on its intended purpose. Similarly, Rivers (1976) claims that the type of tests given is the "set" that students will take away about a foreign language, e.g., if tests are consistently of fill-in-the-blank or multiple-choice types, then students will assume that these activities represent performance in a foreign language.

Given the very strong emphasis placed on developing linguistic proficiency in foreign language classes during the audiolingual era, testing instruments were typically composed of discrete linguistic items. With the advent of an additional emphasis—namely, communicative proficiency—the developing of new types of measures has come to assume a role of primary importance.

When the language-use area in question involves the student's direct interaction with a live interlocutor, that is to say, face-to-face communication, the
Theoretical and practical problems of valid achievement measurement assumes enormous proportions. Many recent writers have reiterated with increasing insistence the obvious but generally overlooked fact that the students' linguistic proficiency in a foreign language—as evidenced by accuracy of pronunciation, range of vocabulary, level of grammar control, and so forth—has only a tenuous and not easily established relationship to his communicative proficiency defined as his ability to "get a message across" with a specified ease and social effect (Clark, 1972b, p. 222, emphasis original).

The testing literature makes distinctions between types of tests according to their intended use in the classroom. According to Lowe (1976), an achievement test is

...a test of a limited body of material, usually directly after that body of material has been learned. On an achievement test, it is possible to attain a perfect score. And a strict achievement test is limited to questions or material just studied (p. 2).

The present study has employed a proficiency test, defined by Lowe as one of

...overall ability. The knowledge tested is everything known about the subject in question (p. 2).

Clark (1975) further divides proficiency testing into two subcategories: direct and indirect, the latter of which represents the nature of tests used in this study:

In direct proficiency testing, the testing format and procedure attempts to duplicate as closely as possible the setting and operation of the real-life situations in which proficiency is normally demonstrated. . . . Indirect proficiency tests, on the other hand, do not require the establishment of a highly face-valid and representative testing situation. In some cases, of course, an indirect test may involve certain quasi-realistic activities on the student's part (pp. 10-11, emphasis original).

The development and use of oral proficiency tests present serious problems and limitations. Three of the major problems in designing and
implementing such tests are: (1) the face validity of the testing situation—its psychological and situational reality; (2) the reliability in scoring the tests; and (3) efficient administration procedures (Clark, 1972b; Bartz, 1976). According to Clark (1972b), the more face-valid or direct a proficiency test is, the more difficult it will be to establish high scorer reliability. He also observes the inverse, that as a test becomes more indirect, controlled, and, therefore, easier to score, reliability naturally increases and face validity decreases. He suggests later (1975), however, that if an indirect measure correlates highly with a more direct proficiency test, then the former may be used as a surrogate measure of the overall proficiency. For example, Clark (1972b) discusses a study by Carroll in which a standardized proficiency test—the MLA Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students—was correlated with a more direct measure. Carroll found correlations ranging from .58 to .86 between the Foreign Service Institute oral interview and the four skills test of the MLA Proficiency Tests when administered to a group of 127 NDEA participants.

Clark admits to the use of indirect measures, such as in the Carroll study, only if their correlations with more direct tests can be established; nevertheless, one of the major disadvantages in using correlational substitutes is (1972a):

...that the statistical correspondences reported may not be accurate for students whose language background or instructional history differs appreciably from that of the original testing group, because their performance on the indirect test...may not "fit" their performance on the proficiency test in the same way as for the original group (p. 132).
Not totally satisfied with substituting indirect measures for direct ones, Clark (1972b) writes:

Developers of communicative proficiency tests in the years ahead will face the difficult problem of identifying a testing technique that adequately reflects the complex situation and psychological variables of real-life communication, while also permitting reliable and efficient testing in the school setting (p. 224).

Three years later, referring to recent applied research in adapting the oral interview test for classroom use, a more hopeful Clark (1975) writes:

Proponents of direct proficiency testing can be encouraged by the limited but tantalizing data which suggest that these techniques [interview-based tests] are competitive with current standardized speaking tests in terms of both scoring reliability and overall cost. The higher level of face validity of the direct proficiency techniques, together with the considerable motivational value inherent in work-sample tests of communicative ability, would commend these techniques to language teachers and testers alike for continuing investigation and increased practical use (p. 23).

Tests of Oral Proficiency and Rating Scales

FSI Oral Interview. The face-to-face oral interview was conceived and first used in 1956 by the Foreign Service Institute (FSI) and is presently employed in adapted versions by other governmental and educational agencies. Considered by Clark (1975) to be the most direct and face-valid form of present proficiency testing, it attempts to establish the overall advanced speaking proficiency of an examinee.

The general format consists of a 10-30 minute conversation in which two testers interview the examinee to establish the upper limits of his functional use in the target language. Techniques such as two-
way conversations, role playing, monologues, and interpreter situations are employed. At the end of the interview, raters evaluate the testee's proficiency according to a set of global proficiency definitions ranging from level 0 (no practical speaking proficiency) to 5 (ability to function as an educated, native speaker). The use of plusses between levels is permitted, yielding 11 possible ratings.

Upon completion of the test, FSI interviewers fill out a checklist of the examinee's specific strengths and weaknesses, rating him on a weighted, six-point scale with polar terms according to five factors: accent, grammar, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension. This checklist, however, is not linked to the proficiency definitions used to award the examinee an S (speaking) rating. Jones (Note 5) notes that it currently is used as a guide for training new testers and as a reminder to experienced testers of the critical performance factors. The list is also consulted in instances when two raters disagree or have doubts on the final rating awarded a testee (Wilds, 1975).

At the time of this writing, Wilds is reported to be conducting a reliability study involving 50 tests each in French, German, and Spanish, administered at the Foreign Service Institute and the Central Intelligence Agency. Preliminary results show very high consistency within agencies but somewhat lower across agencies (Jones, n.d.).

The oral interview test poses serious problems for use in a classroom situation, the most critical of which is the necessity for well-trained, experienced raters who perform almost daily to refine their techniques (Jones, n.d., and Wilds, 1975). Even if such skilled raters were available in academic settings, finding the facilities and the
time for testing would severely limit the interview's use. Wilds (1975) expresses concern over the stability of the performance of the interview, e.g., whether a testee's proficiency in the foreign language would fluctuate measurably from day to day and/or with the competence and efficiency of different sets of interviewers.

In addition to these constraints, Jones (Note 5) lists other pertinent, practical considerations:

(1) the test is expensive to administer; (2) the face-to-face situation can cause anxiety in the examinees; (3) the test cannot provide fine discriminations of proficiency (p. 4).

The lack of discriminatory power of the test is crucial to the foreign language classroom teacher, for although FSI raters can clearly distinguish between proficiency levels (differences that most likely would not be found in any one given language classroom), there is no valid discrimination within a given level, making the measurement of individual differences within classrooms virtually impossible.

Research in modifying and adapting the oral interview for classroom use, however, is presently being carried out by Jones, Clark, and Lowe (1976) and workshops are being offered to familiarize language teachers and supervisors with ways of testing oral language proficiency and to train them in administering and scoring tests.

Other approaches. Many innovations in oral proficiency testing and rating scales have emerged in the professional literature in recent years, albeit indirect or quasi-realistic measures. Bartz (1974) writes that Upshur, as early as 1968, reported on test developments to evaluate communicative proficiency. Several findings by Upshur of import to
future research were:

1. that time required to communicate is a highly sensitive measure, but we do not yet know the extent to which this represents retrieval time for lexical items, language processing time, or translation time;

2. that scores (especially amount of communication) do reflect a general language proficiency factor; and

3. that the test does provide information not available from discrete-point tests (in Bartz, p. 35).

Several recent research studies using tests designed to measure beginning-level oral proficiency have a direct bearing on the present study. In her study of university students of beginning French, Savignon (1972) devised a battery of tests to measure oral communicative proficiency. Components of this test were: (1) student discussion with a native speaker on a randomly assigned topic (four minutes); (2) student interview of a native speaker, after which the student writes in English what he has learned (four minutes); (3) student report about self and activities on a topic assigned during the testing situation, first in English and then in French (three minutes); and (4) student description of ongoing activities of a live actor (three minutes).

A six-point scale with polar adjectives from "none" to "great" was employed for the first two parts of the test (discussion and interview) and was used by the native examiner concurrent with the testing situation. The criteria rated in Part I were "effort to communicate" and "amount of communication." Evaluated with this same scale in Part II were: (1) comprehensibility and suitability of the introduction; (2)
poise and naturalness with which the student conducted the interview; (3) how much the rater understood of what the student said; and (4) comprehensibility and suitability of the conclusion. "Amount of communication" was assessed by awarding one point for each bit of correct information (written in English). The same six-point scale was used to rate "fluency" and "comprehensibility" in Parts III and IV. "Amount of communication" was assessed in the following manner: students received one point for each complete idea understood by the native speaker (Part III) and points were awarded for each item of correct information (Part IV). Although Savignon reported that the raters did have training sessions, there is no indication of any scorer reliabilities.

In a more recent study comparing discrete-point versus simulated communication testing, Schulz (1974) devised an end-of-course, four-part test battery for oral communication for first-quarter university French students. The test parts were similar to those used by Savignon: Part I-Interview, in which the examiner-researcher asked the student several questions about himself (four minutes); Part II-Interview, in which the student asked the examiner personal questions about the examiner (eight minutes); Part III-Description, in which the student described a series of ten pictures (six minutes); and Part IV-Reporting, in which the student talked on a topic presented during the examination period (four minutes).

In developing evaluative criteria for the scoring of the posttest, Schulz gave priority, as did Savignon, to communicative criteria over linguistic dimensions. She employed four criteria for evaluating all parts of the test: fluency, comprehensibility, amount of communication,
and quality of communication. A six-point scale was used for each cri-
terion, each level on the scales being specifically defined. The "flu-ency" scale offers an example of the types of internal levels of a scale: "1 = very many unnatural pauses..., 2 = quite a few..., 3 = some..., 4 = hardly any..., 5 = no..., and 6 = as effortless and smooth as speech of native speaker" (p. 143).

After several training sessions, two independent judges evaluated tape recordings of the tests and yielded high interrater reliabilities. Schulz reported the following reliability coefficients for parts of the test:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part I (Interview)</th>
<th>.93</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part II (Interview)</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III (Description)</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV (Monologue)</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean reliability</td>
<td>.92 (p. 70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliabilities for the scales of these tests were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fluency</th>
<th>.83</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of Communication</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Communication</td>
<td>.95 (p. 70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Schulz made several observations regarding these findings. First, she writes that the more structured and specific the test task, the easier it was for raters to agree on scoring (see Parts I and II). Second, the "fluency" scale was considered to be the most subjective and impressionistic to use. A "conversion chart" (p. 69) was employed for the other three scales by counting the number of acceptable re-
sponses according to the three scale criteria. That number was then converted to a point on the rating scales, allowing for more objectivity in rating. One possible objection to using amount of acceptable responses for the conversion is that a student who is talkative by nature and personality might spuriously receive a higher score by virtue of sheer quantity of information provided. Conversely, the more reserved but perhaps very proficient student would be less likely to score as high as the former.

In a study relating certain learner factors with the ability to communicate in a second language (German), Bartz (1974) developed a battery of tests of oral proficiency for high school students of level II and above. The four parts of this test very closely approximate those of Schulz, but without time limits. In Part I, a one-way discourse, the student is first presented a short paragraph to read in English, and then a list in English of the salient facts contained in the paragraph. His task is to tell the interviewer in German all that he can about the paragraph. In Part II, an oral description, the student describes a single picture first in English and then in German. In Part III, an interview, the student answers ten questions about himself. In Part IV, an interview, the student asks the interviewer nine personal questions which are written in English. He must also take notes in English on the examiner's answers for the purpose of assessing listening comprehension.

Three of Bartz's four six-point evaluation scales are identical to Schulz's: fluency, quality of communication, and amount of communication. The fourth scale, "effort to communicate," is in lieu of Schulz's "com-
prehensibility." Each of the six-point intervals for all scales was defined in specific gradation employing terms such as those Schulz used. Two independent native speakers of German were trained to evaluate the speaking tests and yielded a high interrater reliability of .99.

Bartz reports that "amount of communication" and "quality of communication" had the highest ($r = .89$) intercorrelation among the four scales. The "amount of communication" scale had the highest relationship to the total speaking test score ($r = .96$) and accounted for 92.16% of the total test score variance. The researcher made the following recommendations if it is impractical to use all four scales in a testing situation:

"...the Amount of Communication scale would serve as the best single estimate of the student's score" (p. 128). If only one test part can be administered, he recommends Part IV because Parts III and IV had the highest intercorrelation ($r = .87$) and Part IV had the highest relationship to the total battery of speaking tests ($r = .94$).

The speaking tests from the Savignon, Schulz, and Bartz studies were developed to evaluate language proficiency for first- and second-year students. Although the tasks required the students to produce free, communicative responses, the language attempted was not highly complex. In the Schulz and Bartz studies, then, it is reasonable to assume that minutely defined intervals on their scales would be amenable to evaluate small chunks of a language sample where an answer might be a 5-8 word sentence rather than a sustained conversation. Savignon chose more global definitions for her scales but, because no reliabilities were reported, it is not known how well her scales functioned in her own study or in relation to the other two. These three empirical studies
have made pioneer contributions in testing and evaluating the speaking skill at the elementary levels and have greatly contributed to the test development in this study. The literature does not, however, report similar research in test and scale development at higher proficiency levels for second languages other than English.

Compositions and Rating Scales

Considerations. A search in the literature for studies investigating the evaluation of "free" compositions in a second language has revealed little empirical research due, in part, to the "...tremendous lack of empirical evidence derived from controlled observations" (Briere, 1966, p. 14). There can be little doubt that of the four language skills, writing has generally been accorded the least importance and/or focus, even though it is employed in most classes from the first week. Whether this lack of attention reinforces the sparse knowledge in comparison with the other skills, or vice versa, however, is difficult to ascertain.

Most research dealing with the assessment of writing has tended to focus on testing discrete parts of a language, the underlying assumption being that such indirect measures reflect the total writing proficiency of a learner. Although these types of tests have long been employed because they can be objectively scored, current research supports the notion that indirect, discrete-item testing is not a powerful indicator of total proficiency.

General problems in evaluation. The professional literature is replete with concern over the inherent problems of grading compositions,
and although endless pleas for reliable evaluative methods are heard (Austin and Riordan, in Valette, 1969; Clark, 1972; Jorstad, 1974; Valette, 1969), the lacuna is still present. Primary reasons for this are rater subjectivity, low inter- and intra-rater reliability, the lack of specifically agreed-upon criteria by which to judge compositions objectively, and the excessive expenditure of time necessary to do so.

Valette (1969) addresses herself to the quandry of evaluative criteria by describing a hypothetical but plausible confrontation between teacher and composition:

> Once original compositions are assigned in the foreign language, the matter of scoring must be dealt with: how do you compare the composition written correctly in simple vocabulary and short sentences with the more imaginative composition which exhibits a deeper "feeling" for the flow of the language but at the same time contains several mistakes? (p. 353).

Multiple factors can enter into the evaluative procedure, e.g., breadth of vocabulary usage, quantity of information, overall linguistic quality, creation, attempt at linguistic complexity, etc. Some educators view "quantity" as the key criterion in composition learning as well as evaluation (Brière, 1966; Erazmus, 1960); others feel that "linguistic accuracy" should take precedence (Pincas, 1962; Brière, 1964; Henmon, 1929). Still others (Austin and Riordan, in Valette, 1969) suggest that the communication of a meaningful message is the most valid criterion:

> ...the composition should be judged primarily from the point of view of the monolingual native speaker: in this sense, errors that do not interfere with comprehensibility are judged less severely than errors that reduce or preclude understanding. Spelling mistakes that do not detract significantly from the message are overlooked. Idioms, phrases, and expressions that seem highly appropriate to the context are given extra credit (p. 353).
Various possible causes for the problems of subjectivity and reliability have been investigated. Interested in scorer reliability, Dexter (1935) studied the effects of fatigue or boredom on teachers' marks. He concluded that since teachers respond to these pressures in varying ways (e.g., some times grading leniently while other times strictly), the grade then tends to be a capricious product of a certain point in time. The teacher's personality, personal values, expectations, and personal involvement with students have also been found to influence the grades given to compositions. Starch and Elliot (1912) found that when copies of a high school English paper were sent to 180 teachers to be graded on a 100-point basis, a 39-point range resulted (75% response). The researchers concluded that the variability in scores was more a function of the individual raters and exam-type than of the subject area. In another study involving English compositions at the university level, Thompson (1955) found that the mean grades awarded by 31 instructors of the same Freshman English Composition course varied from 3.02 to 4.20 on a five-point system. Carter (1952) and Caldwell (1967) have shown empirically that when final course achievement and intellectual abilities were carefully controlled, the sex variable entered into final grade judgments, with females consistently receiving higher grades than males.

The research studies in the second-language education literature treating compositions suggest ways of evaluating compositions, but mainly as component parts of larger research designs. The literature in grading native-language compositions, however, offers some very detailed procedures that appear not to have been fully explored in second-la-
guage evaluation. Reported below are three findings in second-language research; afterwards, selected empirical studies dealing with native-language (English) compositions are reviewed.

Studies in evaluating second-language compositions. The method used in the following research studies for evaluating compositions is called "general impression." This method employs either a ranking of a group of compositions or assigning a scale number based on the impression (e.g., one to five). Criteria for the rankings or scale ratings are based on overall linguistic quality or overall communication of a meaningful message.

In a massive, pioneer study, Henmon et al. (1929) constructed composition rating scales in Spanish, French, and German. A description of the general procedures used in the French scale is indicated below as methodologically representative of the other groups.

The researchers created a scale that consisted of a series of compositions that could be used as a standard against which to rate other compositions. The "general impression--rank order" method, based on agreed-upon "general merit," was employed in choosing these scale compositions. Several judges read a large number of high school and college compositions, and placed them into one of eleven general quality groups (0 = worthless, 10 = highest quality). As would be expected, the majority of the compositions fell in the 4, 5, 6, and 7 piles. To maximize variance, the "0" Pile compositions were rewritten to be of even lower quality and the "10"'s were upgraded in quality. Several compositions were then chosen from each of the eleven piles and were sent to 140 teacher-judges. The instructions for ranking these papers read:
Arrange 42 compositions in order of general merit as French compositions. Consider... all the factors which enter into good French composition, giving to each factor only such weight as you think it should have (p. 35).

The mean rank for each of these 42 compositions was then calculated and the distance between each was compared in terms of certain standardized units. Chosen for the final scale were the 16 compositions whose distance from each other was equal.

Although the scale reliabilities were not reported for the Spanish and French scales, Henmon writes:

Agreement in the ratings of different judges has been shown above to be very close for the German composition scale... (p. 88).

The scales in the Henmon study present some concerns for the researcher of the 1970's. First, a "definition" for a given scale level based on a sample of one composition is open to wide interpretation and error. Second, no detail was provided regarding which criteria entered into "good French composition," an omission that diminishes practical application of the study's procedures. Third, an inspection of the length of the scale compositions revealed that the ones of lower quality were consistently short in all languages--three to five lines--and the higher quality compositions were long. Henmon did not report the extent to which scale ratings were affected by length.

James (1973) and Jorstad (1973) conducted research employing the "general impression--rating" method of composition evaluation, based on the successful communication of a message regardless of linguistic precision. James (1973) examined the validity of the MLA Cooperative For-
eign Language Proficiency Test (German) via correlations with researcher-developed observation instruments of speaking and writing. Compositions were scored on a five-point scale by native speakers of German, ratings being assigned on the basis of

...overall ability of the subject to communicate his ideas in German, rather (sic) on the basis of the degree of discrete point linguistic accuracy (p. 4059-A).

No significant overall relationships between the MLA writing test and the ratings on the writing scales were reported. This finding was not surprising considering that the MLA tests are primarily discrete-point measures and the ratings used in James' study measured communicative proficiency.

Jorstad (1973) investigated the validity of the MLA Coop (French) through correlations with researcher-made instruments and rating scales in speaking and writing. She obtained three types of compositions: an expository essay, a friendly letter, and a description of an unnamed object. Three native speakers of French were trained by the researcher and rated the first two compositions

...according to a scale designed to reflect a "gut level" impression of the extent to which ideas had been communicated, regardless of vocabulary, structure, or syntax (p. 4060-A).

Scoring for the third task, describing an unidentified object, was based on its successful identification by the raters. Jorstad reported a mean interrater reliability of .83 for the three compositions and a correlation of .67 between the MLA tests and composition ratings.

Studies in evaluating native language compositions. A perusal of the literature in native language composition rating leads to the numer-
ous and rigorous studies conducted in England since the 1920's. Compo-
sition rating is a serious problem directly related to the English edu-
cational system, where all children at the age of 11.5 years are
obliged to take a battery of qualifying exams used in grammar school
selection, among which is an essay. Although the majority of these re-
search studies focus on evaluating mass compositions on a national
level, concerns are similar to those found in the foreign language edu-
cation literature in this country. A close examination of this prolific
literature reveals little consensus regarding evaluation—there exist
studies reporting statistical significance for various methods.

Cast (1939, 1940) directed a comprehensive study to ascertain which
of four methods of marking compositions was the most reliable: (1) the
individual (examiner's own method), (2) the achievement of aim (on the
part of the student), (3) the general impression, and (4) the analytical
method (a breakdown of various component parts of a composition). Re-
results showed that

...examiners differ widely in their general stan-
dards and in the range of marks which they allot
to one and the same candidate (p. 58).

The general impression and analytical methods were also found to be
statistically superior to the first two, and the analytical method was
slightly superior to the general impression, but the difference was
small.

Hartog and Rhodes (1936) carried out a study in which 120 essays
were marked and remarked after a five-month interval by eight markers.
Each essay was rated on six discrete categories plus general impression.
Intra-rater reliability or "self-consistency" correlations ranged from
.46 to .72 over all seven categories. Mark-remark consistency was slightly higher for general impression than for all of the seven categories combined, ranging from .44 to .81. These results concur with those of Cast in that on the whole, not much greater precision of marking is obtained by details than by general impression.

Morrison and Vernon (1941) also conducted similar research with findings that tended to corroborate those of Cast and Hartog and Rhodes: that regardless of training and method, there were still wide discrepancies between the averages, range of marks, and the reliabilities of two groups of examiners employing differing methodologies.

Interested in marking efficiency, Wiseman (1949) found that since little difference exists between the general impression and analytical methods of scoring, and since the former is quicker than the latter, several markings of a composition could be made with the general impression method in the time it takes for one marking with the analytical method. Therefore, and in view of his finding higher correlations for intra- (.93) rather than inter-judge reliability, he suggests that the efficiency of marking should be judged primarily on markers' self-consistency.

Finlayson (1951) investigated test reliability. He posited that in addition to marker reliability, two other variables enter into the total reliability of a composition: the variability of children from day to day, and the suitability of a topic. He states that

...while mark-remark correlations are a measure of the reliability of marking, any overall measure of essay reliability must be a test-retest correlation (p. 127).
He therefore examined the marks on two essays of different topics written by the same children with a one week interval. A team of markers independently rated the first and then the second set of essays. Pooled mark-remark correlations for both sets of essays were .94, results that closely correspond to those of Wiseman. The mean test-retest correlation for the markers was .69.

Finlayson reported significant variations among markers and among children, noting that differences in performance from child to child is to be expected, and that differences among markers confirmed previous findings on individual assessment variability. He also noted that because the individual performance of children varies significantly from essay to essay, a sample of one may not be representative of overall writing ability.

Summary

This chapter has attempted to review the most pertinent and relevant research for the present study. The literature on learner-centered education indicates the complex nature of changes occurring in the American educational process at the present time and provides a theory base for the type of research carried out in this study. The research reported on learner factors and on testing and evaluation indicates the priorities of the profession in the 1970's, priorities that are in pristine stages of exploration. It is hoped that this study will offer a valuable contribution to our present knowledge about second language learners in our efforts to provide them with more personally meaningful and successful learning experiences.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES AND DESIGN

The chapter is divided into four sections: (1) Introduction to the Design, (2) Population and Sample, (3) Instrumentation, and (4) Main Study Procedures.

Introduction to the Design

This was an ex post facto, correlational study investigating existing relationships among selected personality traits, foreign language aptitude, attitude towards course, and achievement, in a fifth-quarter Spanish conversation and composition course at the university level.

Population and Sample

Characteristics of Pilot and Main Study Samples

The samples for the pilot and main studies consisted of six intact, fifth-quarter Spanish 105 Conversation and Composition classes at The Ohio State University. The three pilot classes and the three main-study classes met daily during Winter and Spring Quarters, 1976, respectively. Thirty-nine students were enrolled in the pilot classes. Based on departmental enrollment figures for Spring Quarter, 1975, a sample of 55 to 60 students was anticipated for 1976. Only 32 students, however, enrolled in the three classes Spring Quarter, 1976, yielding a much smaller N than was desired. The present research was explained in detail by the researcher to all main study classes and each student received a letter delineating the purpose and procedures of the study,
plus the extent of individual involvement. Students were asked to sign and return the letter if they agreed to participate (see Appendix B for a copy of this letter); all 32 students returned the letter.

The students who enroll in this five-hour course tend to be language majors and minors, or students who demonstrate interest in studying a second language beyond the 20-hour foreign language requirement at The Ohio State University. This study may therefore be generalized only to language groups in large university settings studying intermediate-level conversation and composition and employing instructional materials and methodologies similar to those in the present study. Furthermore, because of the small sample size, findings should be cautiously interpreted and extended. See Table 3 for some characteristics of the main-study group.

Cooperating Instructors and Instructional Materials

The researcher and two other instructors, all Graduate Teaching Associates in the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures, taught the six sections of Spanish 105 in the pilot and the main studies. All three are native-Americans with an excellent command of Spanish: one is a Ph.D. candidate in Foreign Language Education and two are Ph.D. candidates in Spanish Language and Literatures. Each had had four or more years experience in language teaching and at least one year of prior experience in teaching Spanish 105.

The same syllabus and course materials were employed in all 105 sections. A book of contemporary Hispanic short stories, Del amor a la revolución (Zayas-Bazán and Lozano, 1975) was used in conjunction with a packet of readings, most of which were adaptations of Hispanic magazine
Table 3
Some Characteristics of Main Study Sample (N=32)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class standing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reason for studying Spanish</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(several answers possible)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requirement for major</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports major</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like Spanish</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/travel</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ever lived, studied, traveled abroad</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ever studied other foreign language</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plan to study more Spanish</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
articles. These readings formed the basis for most classroom discussions, activities, and writing assignments.

General learning activities of Spanish 105 were: (1) a weekly writing seminar in which students critiqued passages of compositions written by class members; (2) a weekly oral presentation in which one or two students presented a topic of their choice and involved class members in follow-up conversation; (3) a weekly discussion of one short story; and (4) conversational activities based upon the readings provided for the students. (See Appendix B for a description of the course and instructional procedures, and a copy of the course syllabus.)

The three instructors worked together closely in designing the instructional materials and course goals, and were in complete accord regarding classroom methodologies and learning activities. They met frequently to share and coordinate ideas, and to discuss common problems and classroom procedures. It is therefore assumed that, apart from individual instructor variability and differences in class make-up, the basic instruction in the three sections was held as constant as possible.

Instrumentation

Variables

A review of the professional literature reveals considerable research relating various learner factors with the ability to learn a second language. Chapter II reviewed relevant studies on attitude, aptitude, and personality factors. This prior research, along with the following considerations, was taken into account in the selection of variables for the present study. The three variables selected for
correlation with achievement--personality traits, foreign language ap-
titude, and attitude towards course--were regarded by the researcher,
based upon personal teaching experience, to be among the crucial fac-
tors related to success in a conversation and composition course. Also,
from a pragmatic standpoint, these variables were immediately testable
either by already existing and appropriate tests or by instruments that
could be developed by the researcher. A prime consideration in this
selection was the need to establish realistic limits on the number of
variables that could be treated in a study such as the present one. The
literature review clearly shows that other learner differences are also
deserving of attention in their relation to second language success,
e.g., self-concept, cognitive styles, etc. These and other such factors
were considered and omitted because of the above considerations as well
as feasibility constraints. Table 4 presents the variables employed in
this study and the measures used to assess them.

Instrument Development

Because the 16PF and the MLAT are existing commercial tests, they
are described in Chapter II. Their specific use is discussed later in
this chapter under Main Study Procedures. This section treats only
those instruments developed by the researcher.

Pilot "Student Perception Scale" (SPS). The present study was
based on the premise that the classroom environment in which all learn-
ing and learning activities occurred was different from that of most
other foreign language classes, and could be designated as "learner-
centered." The question arose, however, whether the students in the
study perceived the differences that the three instructors assumed
Table 4
Variables Used in This Study and Their Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>How Measured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personality Factors</td>
<td>The Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Aptitude</td>
<td>The Modern Language Aptitude Test (Short Form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Towards Course</td>
<td>Self-Report Attitude Scale, Researcher-developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>Researcher-developed pre- and posttests of oral proficiency scored by researcher-developed rating scales.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written</td>
<td>Student written pre- and postcompositions scored by researcher-developed rating scales.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... (rest of the text)
concepts; these concepts, however, are only general codifications of experiences and observations. In attempting to define the measurement of the concepts, the researcher specifies a collection of related observations believed to be indicators of the attributes contained in the concept. The concept variable for the SPS was "learner-centered."

Following Babbie, a subsequent listing of many different subdimensions of this variable was developed, based both on "...previous research on the topic, as well as on the commonsense conceptions of it" (p. 134). The "previous research on the topic" that was employed to define operationally the concept variable and its subdimensions was: Maslow's (1970) basic needs theory and Rogers' (1960) model of a teacher as a facilitator of learning and the learner as a free, self-initiated, self-directed decision-maker (see Chapter II). The "commonsense conceptions" used for developing subdimensions of the variable were the teaching experience and intuitions of the researcher. Following is a list of criterial attributes, based heavily on Maslow and Rogers, considered here to be subdimensions of the concept variable, learner-centered:

1. **Self-esteem**: the desire for strength, worth, achievement, adequacy, mastery and competence, confidence, independence, freedom, and self-regard;

2. **Esteem from others**: the extrinsic need to be accepted by others, the desire for reputation, prestige, fame, glory, recognition, attention, importance, dignity, and appreciation;

3. **Esteem of others**: the acceptance of others and an affirmation of their right to be free, self-actualizing beings (a concomitant and outcome of 1 and 2);

4. **Belongingness**: the desire for an affective relationship with people, being a part of a group, and the feeling of togetherness;
5. **Responsibility for own learning:** the freedom to be a decision-maker, to have input into classroom activities, and a more active role in establishing goals;

6. **Psychological security and freedom:** the freedom to express ideas, to learn as one wants, to be one's self and be accepted; the feeling of security from anxiety, fear, rejection, external judgments, and superimposed authority;

7. **Self-actualization:** the desire for self-fulfillment, to become one's own potential, what one idiosyncratically is, to work to one's capacity in an environment that permits it.

Because these categories were arbitrarily chosen by the researcher and were all intended to reflect the same concept variable, it was assumed *a priori* that some overlap and duplication among categories would exist. A person, for example, who felt esteem from others (#2) might well feel the psychological security (#6) to express his own ideas without fear of rejection.

In order to insure the inclusion of all seven categories, statements relating to each one were generated. Each statement was written on a card and placed into one of seven piles labeled with the criterial attributes of "learner-centered." This procedure was repeated several times by the researcher, without access to the previous labelings. In the process, many statements were reworded, redefined, or discarded, and it was ultimately decided that in the majority of the cases the final remaining statements tended to fall consistently into the same one or possibly two categories, thereby justifying their acceptance. The overlap that existed was considered realistic given the real-world interrelatedness of some of the characteristics in these categories.

A seven-point Likert-type scale was developed containing 48
statements with which the students were to agree or disagree. It was administered during the last day of instruction, Winter Quarter, 1976, to the three pilot Spanish 105 classes. (See Appendix A for Pilot "Student Perception Scale.") Honest responses to the scale were assumed because after its administration, a volunteer from each class placed the scale copies in a locked safe in the office of the Department of Romance Languages and Literatures. The students were aware that the scales would not be seen by the researcher until after final course evaluations were submitted at the end of the academic quarter. A standard Likert-scale item analysis (Johnson-McCabe, n.d.) was performed to refine the scale, yielding a KR-8 total test reliability coefficient of .980. This item analysis program, provided by the Office of Evaluation, computes overall scale reliability based on Kuder and Richardson's (1937) formula 8 rather than on Cronbach's coefficient alpha (1951). However, the hand computations by the researcher indicate that the KR-8 yields a close estimate of the coefficient alpha, .979, the latter having been computed from the item variances and the total test variance outputs of the program. Reliabilities are presented in Table 5.

The item-total correlations ranged from .4556 to .8867, with a mean \( r \) of .7052. Since the lowest single item total \( r \) was .4556, all items on the pilot scale were retained for the main study scale (except for one item which was a duplicate), changes being made only in item wordings as per student suggestions.

The mean item response across all three pilot classes was 5.62, where 7 = strongly agree, indicating that as measured by this scale, the pilot group perceived Spanish 105 to be quite different from other
Table 5
Reliabilities of Pilot "Student Perception Scale" by Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>KR-2</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.978</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.979</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for foreign language classes. Table 6 presents the mean item scores and standard deviations of the scale by classes.

Table 6
Mean Item Scores and Standard Deviations on Pilot "Student Perception Scale" by Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Item Scores</th>
<th>Mean Item SDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pilot Attitude Scale. The researcher developed a six-point Likert-type scale to ascertain the students' reactions to the various specific course components which, in effect, would indicate whether they liked the course or not. This scale was, in fact, quasi-Likert because students were asked to indicate their reactions from strongly positive to negative instead of the strongly agree to disagree of a standard Likert scale. The content validity of this scale was assumed because each item referred to an existant component of Spanish 105, e.g., writing seminars, oral presentations, etc.

Referring to the Operational Definition of Spanish 105 (see Chapter I), scale items were generated in objective noun phrases or statement form about specific aspects of the course. "I feel that..." statements were avoided because they might have implied unfounded assumptions and created ambiguous interpretations on the part of the students and researcher. Also, an equal number of positively and negatively scored items of the standard Likert scale (Likert, 1932) was not included since the task was not one of agreement or disagreement but rather the direction and degree of reaction to real-world phenomena. A 70-item scale was developed. (See Appendix A for the Pilot Attitude Scale.) In order to maximize variance, a neutral mid-point was omitted.

The pilot group consisted of 20 students who had previously studied Spanish 105. The same three instructors asked these students to take the scale individually in the researcher's office. Each student was asked to indicate any item on the test that appeared ambiguously worded or not applicable. In order to cross-validate the scale, the researcher personally interviewed 50% of the students after administration and
discussed problem items with them in detail.

A standard item analysis of the pilot scale yielded a KR-20 total test reliability coefficient of .897 (coefficient alpha, .889). Inspections of the individual item-total $r$'s revealed a range from -.2009 to .7556, with a mean $r$ of .3753. Of the 70 scale items, 25 had $r$'s falling below .30, two being negative $r$'s and three having zero $r$'s caused by a maximum response of all 6's.

The item analysis also revealed a mean item-response of 5.43 on a scale of 6, where 6 = strongly positive. The mean item score and standard deviation are presented in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Item Score and Standard Deviation on Pilot Attitude Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many considerations entered into the final item selection for the main study scale. First, a selection bias appeared to be in operation because the pilot students who volunteered tended to be from an above-average group. A total mean response of 5.43 on a scale of 6 was deemed quite high. Also, the three items that had zero $r$'s involved positive reactions to the instructor; thus a score of 6 ("extra positive") did not seem unusual from "better" students. Another important selection
factor was the inability of the computer program to accommodate a blank answer: it instead averaged a zero into the total score and thereby lowered the individual r's.

A majority of the items with low item-total r's were found to be either (1) items indicated by the pilot group to be ambiguously or badly worded or (2) items that were not applicable to the group because some minor instructional components had been changed in the course. Of the items with an r under .30, five were very similar to five others with a higher r; therefore, the former five were deleted. The remaining 64 items were retained with some suggested wording revisions. The decision to use all of these items, despite some low r's, was made in light of the select group taking the scale and the high test reliability coefficient obtained with such a small n. It was believed that if a more representative sample had taken the scale, more natural variances resulting in higher item-total r's might have emerged for many of the low r items. In several specific cases, priority was given to content validity over the size of the item-total r, especially in the retention of items referring to changed aspects of the course.

The demographic section of the pilot attitude scale was retained without changes for the main study scale.

Speaking tests. A test is always subject to the question of face and content validity. In designing tests of oral proficiency for this study, caution was taken to create communicative tasks commensurate with behaviors practiced in classroom learning in terms of both the students' linguistic and communicative proficiency. At the same time, these simulated tasks were developed so as to resemble communicative situations
that might occur in real-life interchanges. Because the oral goal of Spanish 105 is the development of communicative proficiency and expression, it was assumed that the same types of activities used to develop this goal in the classroom should be used to measure oral proficiency.

The literature on testing revealed little research dealing with oral proficiency tests at the intermediate level of language proficiency, the studies of Bartz (1974), Savignon (1972), and Schulz (1974) having provided simulated proficiency tests and procedures for only the beginning language level. The students involved in these three studies, however, were more similar to those of the present study (in terms of proficiency level) than students in any other studies examined. Therefore, it was decided to employ similar tests of communicative proficiency but of a more advanced nature. This researcher believed that these test models merited further examination and investigation to determine the feasibility of their application to other than beginning-level language courses.

Based on the assumption that the communication process involves both the sending and receiving a message successfully, a four-part pilot test was developed in which the learner assumed both roles. Parts I and II required the student to send one-way messages, while Parts III and IV required both sending and receiving information. In Part I, a description, the student was asked to tell in Spanish the story that he inferred from a series of eight pictures. In Part II, a monologue, the student was asked to discuss a specified topic for which he was given a Student Copy (in English) containing the salient points to be included. Parts III and IV placed the student in role-play interview situations in
which he was to be both an information giver (III) and an information
getter (IV). In Part III, the instructor asked the students a series
of questions about a specified topic. In Part IV, the student inter-
viewed the instructor. The information he was to obtain was written in
English on the Student Copy. The student was requested to take short
notes about the essence of the instructor's response, converting any
Spanish notes to English at the end of the interview.

This speaking test was pilot tested by all three instructors two
weeks before commencement of the present study. Eight students from the
previous quarter 105 classes volunteered as subjects. The purpose of
this pilot was to ascertain test length and difficulty level and to de-
tect any problems of an administrative nature. All the instructors felt
comfortable with the test, as did the students according to follow-up
discussion, and no problems were encountered with administration, dif-
ficulty level, or timing (approximately 20 minutes). It was therefore
decided to employ the same pilot test for the pretest measure to be ad-
ministered during the first week of the main study. (See Appendix B for
the Instructor's Copy of the Speaking Pretest and the Student Copy.)

Because this pretest was piloted only to refine content and admin-
istration procedures, it did not involve the use of rating scales that
were later developed by the researcher. A detailed description of the
scales, their reliabilities, and the intercorrelations with the four-
part test are presented and discussed below under Main Study Procedures.

Composition. As the testing literature indicates, the most direct
manner of assessing free-writing proficiency is by means of a student-
produced composition. Thus, student compositions were written during
the first and last weeks of the quarter as the pre- and postcriterion measures. As with the speaking test, rating scales were developed by the researcher. These scales and all reliabilities are discussed in detail below under Main Study Procedures.

Main Study Procedures

Data Collection and Scoring Procedures

The main study "Student Perception Scale" (SPS), Attitude Scale, and Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) were administered to students in class during the last two weeks of instruction, Spring Quarter, 1976: the former two were given by the respective instructors and the latter was administered by the researcher to each individual class.

Main study "Student Perception Scale." The development of this instrument has been discussed in detail. This section is limited to an analysis of the scale's reliability performance in the main study. After administration of the main study SPS (see Appendix B for Main Study "Student Perception Scale"), the same procedures were followed as with the pilot scale for safeguarding the results until after the end of instruction. The seven students absent the day the scale was given later took it in their respective instructors' offices. These scales were also put into sealed envelopes and kept confidential.

The scales were later hand-coded and keypunched by the researcher, and a standard item analysis (Johnson-McCabe) was performed. Inspections of the data revealed item-total \( r \)'s ranging from -.1011 to .8659, with a mean \( r \) of .6297. Of the 47 scale items, five fell below .30, one being a negative item. The KR-20 total test reliability coefficient was
.974 and coefficient alpha, .971, very closely approximating these same 
$r$'s of the pilot SPS. Table 8 summarizes all the reliabilities of the 
Main Study "Student Perception Scale."

Table 8
Reliabilities of Main Study "Student 
Perception Scale" by Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>KR-8</th>
<th>Coefficient Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.976</td>
<td>.969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.981</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean item-response across all classes was 5.75 on a scale of 7, 
where 7 = strongly agree. This mean was a little higher than the 5.62 
of the pilot SPS, and again indicated that Spanish 105, as measured by 
this scale, was perceived to be different from, i.e., more "learner-cen-
tered" than, other foreign language classes. A summary of the mean item 
scores and standard deviations of the scale by classes is presented in 
Table 9.

Main study attitude scale. The main study attitude scale was re-
fined according to the methods already discussed and was administered. 
(See Appendix B for the Main Study Attitude Scale.) The same procedures 
for insuring the confidentiality of student answers were followed.
Table 9

Mean Item Scores and Standard Deviations
of the Main Study "Student Perception Scale" by Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Item Scores</th>
<th>Mean Item SDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subsequent to coding and keypunching by the researcher, a standard item-analysis was performed, revealing item-total r's that ranged from .2970 to .8784, with a mean r of .6068. Of the 65 final items comprising the scale, only one fell below .30 and six below .40. These results, along with a considerably higher mean item-total r than that of the pilot scale (.3753), serve to validate the procedures discussed and followed in the final selection and retention of items from the pilot scale. The data also yielded a KR-8 total test reliability coefficient of .972 and a coefficient alpha of .970 indicating that the scale, as a whole, was much more reliable than the pilot scale (KR-8, .897 and coefficient alpha, .889). Table 10 offers a summary of all scale reliabilities of the main study attitude scale by classes.

The item analysis also revealed a mean-item response of 6.17 on a scale of 7, where 7 = strongly positive, indicating that the main study students did indeed hold a positive attitude towards Spanish 105.
six-point scale was actually employed for the main study scale, but the scores were converted to seven points during hand coding in order to accommodate possible blanks or student creations of a mid-point, as occurred in the pilot scale; no such cases arose, however. The main study mean is somewhat lower than that of the pilot scale (5.43 on a scale of 6). These results were anticipated and are indicative of the more natural variance found in the three main study classes than in the select group who volunteered to take the pilot scale. Table 11 presents the mean item scores and standard deviations in the main study attitude scale by classes.

**Modern Language Aptitude Test.** Chapter II has already presented a detailed description of the five parts of the MLAT. This standardized, objective test, as described in the Manual (Carroll and Sapon, 1959):

...has been designed chiefly to provide an indication of an individual's probable degree of success in learning a foreign language. It is particularly useful in predicting success in learning, but it is also useful in predicting success
in learning to read, write, and translate a foreign language (p. 3).

Table 11
Mean Item Scores and Standard Deviations on Main Study Attitude Scale by Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Item Scores</th>
<th>Mean Item SDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Group</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The short form of the MLAT (parts 3, 4, and 5) was employed in the present study in order to minimize instructional time spent for testing purposes. Furthermore, the Manual reports the predictive validity of the short form to equal that of the long (p. 14), while reliability coefficients for the population in question are nearly equal for both forms. Table 12 presents reliability coefficients, means, and standard deviations of the MLAT for the long and short forms based on a college population. Table 13 summarizes the reliability coefficients, means, and standard deviations for the subtests of the MLAT on a college population.

The researcher administered the MLAT to the individual classes on the same day during the ninth week of the quarter. With respect to administration time, the Manual (1959) states that there is little
evidence to show that previous language training affects MLAT scores, although a post-1959 research study (Politzer and Weiss, 1972) suggests that MLAT scores can be improved by language study.

Table 12
Odd-Even Reliability Coefficients, Means, and Standard Deviations of the Modern Language Aptitude Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>College Men (N=136)</th>
<th>College Women (N=101)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r^a$</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>112.70</td>
<td>124.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r$</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>68.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>13.30 (p. 17)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ Carroll notes that these reliability coefficients do not reflect the inclusion of Part III, a speed test. Correlations were computed using the split-half technique (corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula), a technique more appropriate for power rather than speed tests. Therefore, III was omitted since it is "...sufficiently speeded to make inappropriate any estimate of reliability which is based on internal consistency" (p. 16). When the researchers computed reliability coefficients including Part III, the results proved to be substantially the same as when Part III was omitted.
Table 13

Odd-Even Reliability Coefficients, Means, and Standard Deviations of Parts of the Modern Language Aptitude Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Part</th>
<th>College Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Men (N=136)</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td></td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Administered separately; N's= 108 and 64, respectively.

All instructions for administering the test were closely followed. The commercial MLAT tape was used to give instructions and standardize the time and testing conditions. Total testing time did not exceed 30 minutes. All but one student was present on the day of administration; she later took the test under the same conditions in the Listening Center of The Ohio State University. Students recorded their answers on IBM answer sheets; the Testing and Evaluation Center of The Ohio State University machine keypunched and scored the answers.

**Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16PF).** A detailed description of the 16 Primary Factors and 4 Second-Order Factors as well as the reliability and validity coefficients reported in the 16PF Manual (I.P.A.T., 1972) are presented in Chapter II.

This inventory was chosen for the present study because: (1) it
taps constructs believed to be related to general classroom achievement (see Chapter II); (2) it is easily administered, handscored, and interpreted by a researcher without the assistance of specialized personnel or machines; (3) there are precedents in the literature for successful use of this inventory in studies investigating selected personality traits and foreign language achievement; and (4) three psychological testing specialists at The Ohio State University, after individual consultation with the researcher, suggested that the 16PF was probably the most appropriate for use in this study. Bartz (1974) notes the caution that the 16PF is not intended for derivation of personality profiles on individuals but rather for classification and prediction purposes. The present study has attempted only to correlate personality factors with other measures of learner differences, an application that falls within the parameters of the instruments' intended purposes.

The subjects in the study volunteered to take the 16PF outside class time. The test was administered by the researcher during the ninth week of the quarter in the Listening Center of The Ohio State University; all administration procedures outlined in the Manual were closely followed. Because the 16PF is not a timed inventory, the time required for administration ranged from 40 to 70 minutes.

Following the instructions for scoring found in the Manual, the results were hand tabulated by the researcher and individual student profiles were derived for the 16 Primary Factors and the 4 Second-Order Factors.

Speaking tests. Both the speaking pre- and posttests were administered to students on an individual, half-hour basis by the three
respective course instructors. The pretest was given during the first week of instruction and the posttest, during the last week. In all but two make-up instances, testing took place in private conference rooms or the Listening Center in order to minimize possible distractions. The students were aware that the tests would be tape-recorded and that the results would not constitute a part of their course evaluation. In order to standardize testing procedures, all instructors had test directions plus the questions and answers for the interview situations on an Instructor's Copy.

After the pretest had been administered, the three instructors found that Parts III and IV (interviews) were rather long and, at times, tedious. They felt that equally valid data could have been obtained with fewer questions. This observation was most likely overlooked in the piloting of this test because the pilot group, who tended to have a higher language proficiency than that of the main study group (having already finished the course), encountered no difficulty in completing the tasks in little time. To make the posttest less time-consuming and, perhaps, less anxiety-producing for the students, Parts III and IV were made considerably shorter. (See Appendix B for Instructor's Copy of the Speaking Posttest and the Student Copy.) Except for the change in length and content of the testing situations, the posttest had the same format as the pretest and required the same student behaviors.

At the end of the study, the researcher edited all teacher instructions from the speaking test tapes in order to facilitate the raters' subsequent task. Care was given not to remove any natural pauses that comprised part of the actual messages conveyed by the students. Two
separate sets of master tapes were made for the pre- and posttests, one set for each of the two independent raters. Student tests were randomly sequenced for each of the four sets of tapes using a table of random numbers.

**Compositions.** At the end of the first week of the quarter, all students wrote a composition as part of normal classroom instruction. The topic, based on a reading assignment for that day, was uniform for all. Before the three instructors graded the compositions, xerox copies were made for the purpose of subsequent ratings. In the ninth week of the quarter, the students wrote the last of their weekly compositions. The topic for this composition was unspecified as were all topics except for the first assignment. Again, xerox copies were made for future ratings.

**Speaking rating scales.** Several existing rating scales were examined in Chapter II. It was concluded that in their total, present form, none was appropriate for this study, especially in terms of the definitions used for the specific scale levels. The criteria considered to be the most appropriate for discriminating between the varying levels of oral proficiency in the present study were:

1. Quality: fluency;
2. Quality: vocabulary/precision;
3. Quality: vocabulary/breadth;
4. Quality: structure;
5. Comprehensibility;
6. Quantity: task-oriented;
Because Parts III and IV (interviews) involved two-way interchanges between the students and instructor, an additional criterion was added for those parts:

8. Listening Comprehension.

The criteria "fluency," "vocabulary," "structure," and "comprehensibility" are common to many existing rating scales and were also applicable to the present study. "Vocabulary/breadth" was included in an attempt to identify students who had between a functional and an ample vocabulary in a course where vocabulary acquisition was stressed.

Many rating scales in the current literature include "quantity" or "amount" of information in the rating task. Upshur (1974) reported that "...scores (especially amount of communication) do reflect a general language proficiency factor..." (in Bartz, 1974, p. 35). Bartz (1974) recommended, as a result of his research, that "...the Amount of Communication scale would serve as the best single estimate of the student score" (p. 128), because this scale had the highest correlation ($r=.96$) to his total communicative competence speaking test. In Bartz' study, "amount of communication" was defined as that quantity or total amount of information provided by the student that was relevant to the communicative situation. Pending further research into learner factors, however, the validity of including "amount" of information in rating scales, especially when a student receives a grade, is still questionable. For example, it is an accepted truism that some people are more or less "talkative" than others in their native language. The extent to which this phenomenon is related to personality characteristics has not been considered here; nevertheless, the existence of this phenomenon
poses the following questions: is a student's ability to provide "X" amount of information in a second language solely a function of his overall language proficiency, and, if "amount" of information is a criterion for evaluating a student, is he being judged only on his ability to communicate? These seem to be legitimate queries, especially for raters who tend to be more impressed and influenced by students who "ramble" than by those who complete a task very adequately but succinctly.

"Quantity" of information was therefore included in the present rating scales to be able to correlate the scores with those on measures of personality traits and aptitude. It was hoped that relevant findings might (1) better explain relationships between the extent to which one speaks (quantitatively) in a second language and other learner factors, especially personality traits, and (2) suggest directions for the use of this criterion in further research as well as in classroom settings. Because almost all students in the present study were able to complete (at least minimally) the communicative tasks required in the four test parts, it was decided to add to "quantity/task-oriented" an extra criterion, "quantity/extra task-oriented," namely, that amount of information judged by the raters to have been more than necessary to complete the required task.

Each evaluative criterion was rated on the following six-point scale, with X and Y being defined in detail for each scale in "Definitions of Performance Factors for Evaluating Pre- and Post Oral Exams." (See Appendix B for these definitions and for a copy of the Evaluation Sheet for rating the speaking tests.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>:</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>:</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>:</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely X</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>Quite X</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>More X than Y</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>More Y than X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely y</td>
<td>:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because of the level of the students' language proficiency and the nature of the tasks required—most tests lasted from 20 to 30 minutes and involved sustained conversations—globally defined intervals were adopted for rating purposes rather than intervals with specific definitions.

All tapes were rated by two independent judges, both experienced teachers and Ph.D. candidates in Foreign Language Education at The Ohio State University. One is a native speaker of Spanish and the other possesses an excellent command of the language. Two training sessions were held to orient the judges to the scales and to evaluate independent trial ratings. These judges rated four practice tapes made by previous Spanish 105 students. The only criteria on the total rating scale for which there were indications of low interrater reliabilities were "vocabulary/breadth" and "quantity/extra task-oriented." These difficulties were anticipated because of the vagueness inherent in both criteria. After a session dedicated to defining more clearly their attributes, it was decided to keep both criteria in the hopes of providing some experimental information: "breadth," because it was thought by the researcher's "real world" experience to be one of the criteria that distinguished among levels of student oral proficiency, and "quantity/extra task-oriented," for the reasons already cited.

The judges were asked to rate the pretests before the posttests for
the following reasons: (1) the researcher wanted the raters to establish their mental standards on the pretest for each of the six-point global intervals, across all criteria of the rating scales. It was believed that if a rater began by rating the posttest and consistently scored students very low, the six-point scale would allow no room for the natural variance anticipated when she began to score the pretest, and (2) it was thought that, from a psychological point of view, a fatigue factor would enter less into the rating task using this order because of the length of the pretest. Interrater reliabilities for the scales of the pretest and the posttest ranged from -.07 to .77. These reliabilities are displayed in Table 14.

The interrater reliabilities for the parts of the pretest and the posttest ranged from .38 to .74. Table 15 summarizes these reliabilities.

Inspections of the intercorrelation matrix (Table 16) of the four pretest parts show that Parts III and IV are correlated the highest ($r=.82$) and that Part IV had the highest relationship to the total pretest ($r=.92$).

The intercorrelation matrix (Table 17) of the four parts of the posttest revealed that Parts II and III are most interrelated ($r=.82$) and that Part II correlated the highest with the total test ($r=.93$).

Inspections of the intercorrelations of the eight pretest scales with the total test revealed that the "fluency" and "vocabulary/breadth" scales were the most highly related ($r=.89$) and that the "vocabulary/breadth" scale also had the highest correlation to the total test ($r=.95$). All $r$'s are displayed in Table 18.
Table 14
Interrater Reliabilities for Scales of Speaking Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality: fluency</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality: vocabulary/precision</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality: vocabulary/breadth</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality: structure</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity: task oriented</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity: extra task-oriented</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The eighth scale, "listening comprehension," was not included in this table since the researcher calculated these scores from the answers written on the Student Copy of the exam.
Table 15
Interrater Reliabilities for Parts of Speaking Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Part</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part I</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts I &amp; II</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts III &amp; IV</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Test</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16
Intercorrelation Matrix of the Four Test Parts of the Speaking Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7618</td>
<td>.6686</td>
<td>.7074</td>
<td>.8705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.7509</td>
<td>.7399</td>
<td>.9017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.8174</td>
<td>.9016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.9162</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17

Intercorrelation Matrix of the Four Test Parts of the Speaking Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7593</td>
<td>.7479</td>
<td>.6195</td>
<td>.8614</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8150</td>
<td>.7694</td>
<td>.9252</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7655</td>
<td>.9232</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.8881</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The matrix for the eight posttest scales with the total test show that the scales for "vocabulary/precision" and "structure" were most interrelated ($r=.89$) and that, again, the "vocabulary/breadth" scale demonstrated the highest correlation ($r=.94$) to the total test. Table 19 outlines all correlations.

A closer look at both Tables 18 and 19 discloses that scale number 7, "quantity/extra task-oriented," had comparatively low correlations to the total tests (pretest, $r=.63$; posttest, $r=.52$), indicating that, in comparison with the $r$'s for the other scales to total tests, neither test was heavily biased toward students who are "extra talkative."

Composition rating scales. Rating scales were designed for the present study that reflected, to a certain degree, various methods described in the review of the literature. It was thought that the general impression method alone, using a 1-5 point scale, for example, would conceal much of the variance and would yield little diagnostic data. It was therefore decided to employ rating scales in which both global and
Table 18

Intercorrelation Matrix of the Eight Scales of the Speaking Pretest and the Total Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8a</th>
<th>Total Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8010</td>
<td>.8934</td>
<td>.8408</td>
<td>.8870</td>
<td>.3176</td>
<td>.5620</td>
<td>.5192</td>
<td>.9421</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8657</td>
<td>.8188</td>
<td>.7619</td>
<td>.2443</td>
<td>.3877</td>
<td>.4742</td>
<td>.8752</td>
<td>.9471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.8270</td>
<td>.8538</td>
<td>.3977</td>
<td>.6030</td>
<td>.4672</td>
<td>.9121</td>
<td>.9356</td>
<td>.4124</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.8648</td>
<td>.2841</td>
<td>.4472</td>
<td>.5042</td>
<td>.9121</td>
<td>.5906</td>
<td>.6271</td>
<td>.5646</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.3941</td>
<td>.5646</td>
<td>.5144</td>
<td>.9356</td>
<td>.1812</td>
<td>.5514</td>
<td>.4124</td>
<td>.0844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = fluency; 2 = vocabulary/precision; 3 = vocabulary/breadth;
4 = structure; 5 = comprehensibility; 6 = quantity/task-oriented;
7 = quantity EXTRA task-oriented; 8 = listening comprehension

discrete ratings would be required, since some of the studies reviewed revealed equally reliable rater consistencies for both the general impression and analytical methods. The following criteria were chosen:

Global Ratings

1. Comprehensibility
2. Complexity of linguistic attempt
3. Composition skills
4. Breadth of vocabulary
Table 19

Intercorrelation Matrix of the Eight Scales of the Speaking Posttest and the Total Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Total Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8071</td>
<td>.8332</td>
<td>.8792</td>
<td>.8844</td>
<td>.4292</td>
<td>.3298</td>
<td>.1875</td>
<td>.9299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8561</td>
<td>.8943</td>
<td>.7481</td>
<td>.4386</td>
<td>.2352</td>
<td>.1612</td>
<td>.8864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.8064</td>
<td>.8510</td>
<td>.4222</td>
<td>.4419</td>
<td>.2309</td>
<td>.9407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.7970</td>
<td>.4198</td>
<td>.2801</td>
<td>.1476</td>
<td>.9089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4857</td>
<td>.3340</td>
<td>.2043</td>
<td>.9047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1282</td>
<td>.3534</td>
<td>.4844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2522</td>
<td>.5166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Vocabulary Rating

5. Precision of usage

Verb Ratings

6. Subject-verb agreements

7. Choice of tense/mood

8. Formation

Additional Structural Ratings

9. Agreements in general (less verbs)

10. Other grammar (less verbs)

11. Spelling/accents

12. Overall syntax
Many considerations influenced the selection of these scales. "Comprehensibility," one of the most common evaluative criteria utilized, was included to determine the extent to which a student's message would be understandable to a native speaker of the second language, despite linguistic errors. Other factors, however, may affect this global judgment. The poorly organized but "understandable" paper, for example, has the potential of being rated lower, even though the lack of organizational skills may not affect the message of a paper. Therefore, "composition skills" was included as a global rating in the hopes of learning the extent to which it may correlate with ratings on the other scales.

Because the 32 pre- and 32 postcompositions greatly varied in length, degree of difficulty, and choice of topic, "complexity of linguistic attempt" was chosen as another global rating. It was thought that a "low level" attempt, e.g., the student whose paper does not exceed the basic subject-verb-predicate type construction or employ a variety of verb tenses, might spuriously inflate higher ratings on a scale such as "comprehensibility." Information as to how this scale might also correlate with the discrete scales was considered to be potentially useful for future research as well as for the classroom teacher. It was also believed that this scale might help explain why a student's ratings varied from one composition to the other and whether the nature of the topic and length of the paper were related to the complexity of linguistic attempt.

The length of a composition may also influence the rating task and does, to a large extent, affect the number of potential errors. In
order to discover the extent to which length is related to the various
global and discrete ratings, the number of words on each composition
was counted. The use of this counting will be discussed below.

Creativity was considered as another criterion because its pre-
sence or absence tends to influence raters and/or classroom teachers.
It was omitted, however, because it did not seem so likely to affect the
accuracy of the global ratings to be used in this study—except perhaps
for breadth of vocabulary—as it would in a classroom situation where a
teacher usually awards a grade based on one general impression and rat-
ing.

A scale for "idioms" was originally included under "Vocabulary
Ratings" and later omitted. The raters encountered difficulty and dif-
ferences in determining exactly what constituted an idiom, despite dic-
tionary definitions. One problematic example in Spanish is the follow-
ing: en vez de (instead of) and antes de (before). The first was be-
lieved by both raters to be an idiom, but one rater thought the second
to be a compound preposition and not an idiom. Furthermore, the scale
was not believed valid for this study because a paper with no idioms
would receive a perfect rating while a paper with two out of four idioms
used correctly would receive a lower evaluation.

The remaining categories were divided into specific criteria and
defined with detailed examples in order to yield maximum diagnostic in-
formation.

The first four global criteria were rated on the following six-
point scale, X and Y being defined in detail for each scale in "Defini-
tions of Performance Factors for Evaluating Pre- and Postcompositions"
(see Appendix B for these definitions and the Evaluation Sheet used for rating).

A six-point scale was also used for the 5-12 discrete criteria; however, the procedures for arriving at scale interval levels were not the same as those for scales 1-4. (Definitions and examples for criteria 5-12 are also found with those for 1-4 in Appendix B.)

All students were assigned the same topic for the precomposition measure as part of normal classroom instruction: "The one desire you most wish to achieve in your life," while the postmeasure allowed a free choice of topic. These latter papers, therefore, tended to be more varied in terms of overall complexity than the premeasure. The order of the 32 pre- and 32 postcompositions was randomized, and they were then alternated so that the judges rated a pre- and then a post-, this pattern continuing throughout the 64 papers. This procedure was employed so that fatigue or any other variable would not adversely affect only one set of compositions. All papers were typed so that their appearance or penmanship would not enter into the rating task.

The compositions were rated by two independent judges, both experienced teachers with an excellent command of Spanish. One holds a Ph.D. in Foreign Language Education and the other is a Ph.D. candidate in Spanish Language and Literatures. Two training sessions were held:
the first, to explain the scales to the raters, and the second, to dis-
cuss their trial ratings on seven practice compositions written by pre-
vious Spanish 105 students. These were carefully chosen so as to re-
present a wide range in proficiency. During the second session, inter-
rater inconsistencies emerged on the discrete ratings because the raters
could not agree on global standards applicable to specific areas such as
subject-verb agreements. These problem areas were discussed at length
in an attempt to clarify the standards that should be applied by each
rater.

When the rating of the pre- and postcompositions began, both rat-
ers still felt uncomfortable with global definitions for discrete cri-
teria. It was therefore decided that scales 1-4 would remain on a
judgment basis while scales 5-12 would be arrived at by a counting and
percent system. The following steps were followed by the two judges.

(1) All compositions were read for scales 1 (comprehensibility),
2 (complexity of linguistic attempt), and 3 (composition skills), and
subsequently rated. This across-composition reading was employed to in-
crease the consistency in applying the same mental standards to the
same scales for all compositions.

(2) The total words in each composition were counted, omitting any
English words.

(3) Across-composition ratings again occurred for scales 5 (vocab-
ulary/precision), 9 (agreements less verbs), 10 (other grammar less
verbs), 11 (spelling/accents), and 12 (overall syntax). For scales 5,
10, 11, and 12 a percentage of correct usage was derived by calculating
the number of errors in each scale in relation to the total words in the
composition. For scale 9, the percentage of correct usage was derived by calculating the total number of agreement errors in relation to the total possible agreements.

(4) A tally sheet listing all possible Spanish verb tenses and moods was used for verb ratings 6 (subject-verb agreements), 7 (choice of tense/mood), and 8 (formation). The raters tallied the number of times every tense appeared. When an error occurred for scales 6, 7, or 8, it was entered into the error column next to the appearance column. Final percentages were arrived at by placing the number of errors over the number of occurrences. (See Appendix B for a copy of the Rater Tally Sheet.)

(5) A final across-composition reading was performed for a global rating of scale 4, breadth of vocabulary. It should be noted that the rating steps for scales 1, 2, 3, and 4 were done on separate rating sheets so that a rater would not look at or be influenced by previous ratings.

After the percentages were obtained for scales 5-12, they were converted to each 1-6 scale by subtracting the lowest from the highest percent obtained by any paper in the set of 64. The obtained range was divided by 6, and the result was subtracted first from the highest obtained percent and repeated five more times from the subsequent results, thus obtaining the boundary points between scale steps. Any paper with a percent that equaled the value of a boundary point automatically received the higher of the two intervals that the percent separated.

Upon inspection of the variance found in each scale interval range, it was decided to use the raw percents rather than the converted 1-6
ratings in view of the variance that would be lost by compressing all differences into six steps. It should be noted that the percent ranges obtained by both raters for scales 5-12 were different even though these ranges were objectively arrived at mathematically. This was anticipated because the identification of errors was often subjective, reflecting the fact that two people's knowledge of a second language or even their perception of what is "correct" or "acceptable" in that language will vary to differing degrees.

Interrater reliabilities for the twelve scales of the pre- and postcomposition ranged from .00 to .96. All reliabilities are summarized in Table 20.

Interrater reliabilities for the global versus countable composition scales revealed that the latter were higher on both the pre- and postcomposition. Table 21 displays these reliabilities.

Inspections of the interrater r's for parts of the composition scales show a range from .52 to .92 for pre- and postcompositions. Table 22 presents the interrater reliabilities for the four parts of the composition scales.

Inspections of the intercorrelations of the twelve scales with the total test show that scales 9 (agreements less verbs) and 11 (spelling/accents) were the most highly related (r=.79) and that the "vocabulary/breadth" scale demonstrated the highest r to the total test (r=.93). Table 23 displays all correlations for the pretest scales.

The matrix for the twelve posttest scales with the total test reveals that scales 1 (comprehensibility) and 5 (vocabulary/precision) were the most interrelated (r=.74) and that, again, the "vocabulary/
Table 20
Interrater Reliabilities for Composition Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pre-comp r</th>
<th>Post-comp r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of linguistic attempt</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition skills</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/breadth</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/precision</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of tense/mood</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb formation</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement (less verbs)</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar (less verbs)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling/accents</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall syntax</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The "breadth" scale had the highest correlation ($r=.80$) to the total test. Table 24 outlines all intercorrelations for the posttest scales.

**Summary**

Data collection procedures and some characteristics of the main study sample were described. All instruments employed in this study were described; instruments developed by the researcher were refined in
Table 21
Interrater Reliabilities for Global versus
Countable Composition Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pre-comp</th>
<th>Post-comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global (1-4)</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countable (5-12)</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22
Interrater Reliabilities for Parts
of Composition Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Part</th>
<th>Pre-comp</th>
<th>Post-comp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Ratings (1-4)</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary Ratings (4-5)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb Ratings (6-8)</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Structure Ratings (9-12)</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a pilot study prior to the main study. The development of rating scales
was also discussed in detail. Data emanating from both researcher-de-
veloped instruments and commercial measures were subjected to a number
of correlational procedures that are reported and discussed in the fol-
lowing chapter.
Table 23

Intercorrelation Matrix of the Twelve Precomposition Scales and the Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>Total Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.0350</td>
<td>.3084</td>
<td>.3034</td>
<td>.4043</td>
<td>-.1190</td>
<td>.1388</td>
<td>.2540</td>
<td>.3646</td>
<td>.2433</td>
<td>.1898</td>
<td>.4058</td>
<td>.3593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.4521</td>
<td>.5407</td>
<td>.3674</td>
<td>.4772</td>
<td>-.1451</td>
<td>-.0043</td>
<td>.3692</td>
<td>.3329</td>
<td>.4483</td>
<td>.2525</td>
<td>.4893</td>
<td>.6165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4754</td>
<td>.4385</td>
<td>.3126</td>
<td>.4955</td>
<td>.3188</td>
<td>.3989</td>
<td>.3370</td>
<td>.5691</td>
<td>.5425</td>
<td>.6165</td>
<td>.9321</td>
<td>.9553</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.4260</td>
<td>.5202</td>
<td>.2608</td>
<td>.3131</td>
<td>.6710</td>
<td>.4102</td>
<td>.6933</td>
<td>.3053</td>
<td>.9321</td>
<td>.5953</td>
<td>.2759</td>
<td>.2759</td>
<td>.4580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.3154</td>
<td>.2545</td>
<td>.3182</td>
<td>.5558</td>
<td>.6404</td>
<td>.5504</td>
<td>.1317</td>
<td>.5953</td>
<td>.2759</td>
<td>.2759</td>
<td>.4067</td>
<td>.4067</td>
<td>.8001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.1146</td>
<td>.0223</td>
<td>.5029</td>
<td>.6725</td>
<td>.5033</td>
<td>.2759</td>
<td>.2759</td>
<td>.2759</td>
<td>.2759</td>
<td>.4067</td>
<td>.8001</td>
<td>.8001</td>
<td>.8001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.1297</td>
<td>.2112</td>
<td>.1447</td>
<td>.2933</td>
<td>.2078</td>
<td>.4580</td>
<td>.4580</td>
<td>.4580</td>
<td>.4580</td>
<td>.4580</td>
<td>.4580</td>
<td>.4580</td>
<td>.4580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.2421</td>
<td>.2721</td>
<td>.5057</td>
<td>.4602</td>
<td>.4602</td>
<td>.4602</td>
<td>.4602</td>
<td>.4602</td>
<td>.4602</td>
<td>.4602</td>
<td>.4602</td>
<td>.4602</td>
<td>.4602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.5458</td>
<td>.7877</td>
<td>.2630</td>
<td>.8001</td>
<td>.8001</td>
<td>.8001</td>
<td>.8001</td>
<td>.8001</td>
<td>.8001</td>
<td>.8001</td>
<td>.8001</td>
<td>.8001</td>
<td>.8001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.5818</td>
<td>.4013</td>
<td>.5851</td>
<td>.8298</td>
<td>.8298</td>
<td>.8298</td>
<td>.8298</td>
<td>.8298</td>
<td>.8298</td>
<td>.8298</td>
<td>.8298</td>
<td>.8298</td>
<td>.8298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.3898</td>
<td>.8298</td>
<td>.4172</td>
<td>.4172</td>
<td>.4172</td>
<td>.4172</td>
<td>.4172</td>
<td>.4172</td>
<td>.4172</td>
<td>.4172</td>
<td>.4172</td>
<td>.4172</td>
<td>.4172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a 1 = comprehensibility; 2 = complexity of linguistic attempt; 3 = composition skills; 4 = vocabulary/breadth; 5 = vocabulary/precision; 6 = subject-verb agreements; 7 = choice of tense/mood; 8 = verb formation; 9 = agreements (less verbs); 10 = other grammar (less verbs); 11 = spelling/accents; 13 = overall syntax
Table 24

Intercorrelation Matrix of the Twelve Postcomposition Scales and the Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.0794</td>
<td>.2775</td>
<td>.3060</td>
<td>.3643</td>
<td>.5093</td>
<td>.5294</td>
<td>.5317</td>
<td>.4901</td>
<td>.4992</td>
<td>.2992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See footnote to Table 23 for scale labels.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSES AND RESULTS

This chapter is divided into three sections: (1) an introduction to the procedures of analysis, (2) an analysis of the findings as they relate to the two research questions, and (3) the summary.

Introduction to the Procedures of Analysis

This section presents and discusses the analyses performed on the data from the main study. These analyses have attempted to investigate the following two research questions stated in Chapter I:

(1) Are there any significant relationships between achievement in a learner-centered conversation and composition course and any or all of a set of predictor variables including selected personality factors, foreign language aptitude, and entry language proficiency?

(2) Are there any significant relationships between attitude towards a learner-centered conversation and composition course and any or all of a set of predictor variables including selected personality factors, aptitude, and achievement?

An analysis of these questions would immediately imply the acquisition and use of gain scores from pre- to postachievement so that how much one learns may be correlated with the other variables of interest.
Linn and Slinde (1977) write, however, that the use of gain or difference scores to identify amount of change is not only an inappropriate but risky procedure. A major constraint is the low reliability inherent in a difference score, implying that it is hazardous "...to make any important decisions about individuals on the basis of gains from pre- to posttesting periods" (p. 124), since these scores may indicate learning that, in actuality, did not occur. The authors underscore another problem:

A major disadvantage of the simple difference score is that it typically has a negative correlation with the pretest (p. 122).

That is, the higher a student's score on a pretest measure (and therefore the less chance he has to quantitatively improve on a postmeasure), the lower the possible gain score and, thus, the more negative correlation with the pretest—and possibly with correlates of learning. A third case against employing difference scores is the lack of common scale and trait at both testing periods. That is,

Even when the same test (or parallel forms) is used as the pre- and postmeasures, it is sometimes the case that different constructs are measured at the two points in time. For example, an item which measures problem-solving skill at one point in time may measure memory at a later point in time (p. 124).

Linn and Slinde, in refining and expanding upon prior research in this area (Cronbach and Furby, 1970), suggest that in lieu of gain scores, an alternative would be to focus on correlates of change that are capable of predicting the amount of change that has occurred. One procedure is the use of partial correlations, where the pretest (X) is partialled out of both posttest (Y) and all other predictor variables
this procedure overcorrected the partials to the point where many coefficients approached and, in some cases, exceeded 1.00. In order words, parts of the speaking test had a higher validity coefficient (i.e., $r_{xz}$) than the reliability coefficient (i.e., $r_{xx'}$). In addition, some corrections for attenuation could not be calculated because the squared correlations between the pre- and posttests were greater than the product of the two respective reliabilities, resulting in a negative square root term in the denominator of the formula. For example, when correcting the partial correlation for Part II of the speaking posttest with Part III of the MLAT, the following numbers appear in the denominator:

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) & \quad \sqrt{(.38)(.71)} - .542^2 \\
(2) & \quad \sqrt{.2698} - .2938
\end{align*}
\]

These last numbers show that the product of the two reliabilities (.2698) is less than the squared correlation between these two variables (.2938), resulting in the following negative quantity under the square root radical:

\[
\sqrt{-0.02396}
\]

The implication of these spurious corrected correlations is critical: it places severe constraints on interpreting any findings and understanding the nature of relationships. It is conceivable that because of the posttests' low reliabilities, learning may or may not have occurred. Furthermore, given another set of raters to judge the posttests, the interrater reliabilities could just as well be lower or
(W). They state:

If X, Y, and W have a multivariate normal distribution, then the partial correlation of Y and W with X partialled out is simply equal to the correlation between W and Y for any fixed value of X. This would often seem to be a coefficient of interest where the focus is on correlates of change from pre- to posttesting periods (p. 128).

Although the authors write that these partial correlations offer a way of "...identifying variables that can predict posttest scores of individuals with equal pretest scores" (p. 129), they caution that these same correlations will be greatly subject to the problem of unreliability in the measurement(s) of change:

Unreliability has the affect of attenuating correlations. This is true of all fallible measures but becomes of major importance when the reliability of a variable is quite low as is typically the case for measures of change (p. 128)

For this reason, the authors state, it is important to correct these partial correlations for attenuation in order to interpret them validly.

Partial correlations were performed in the present study to investigate the first of the two research questions, i.e., to be able to identify correlates of change capable of predicting change in achievement. Correction for attenuation of all variables was attempted on these partial r's, using the following recommended formula (Lord, 1974):

\[ r_{xy.z} = \frac{r_{xy} r_{zz} - r_{xz} r_{yz}}{\sqrt{r_{xx} r_{zz} - r_{xz}^2} \sqrt{r_{yy} r_{xx} - r_{yz}^2}} \]

In correcting for attenuation, it was found that the low reliability coefficients of the posttests created spurious corrected partials, i.e.,
higher.

While the importance of correcting for attenuation is clearly recognized and supported by the literature, the application of this procedure to the present study, given the attained reliabilities, would render the procedure meaningless and any results uninterpretable (Linn, 1978). Thus, only partial correlations, representing conservative estimates, are reported in this study, with the knowledge that results that are statistically significant and appear to be important, must be very tentatively interpreted.

It is logical to assume that further analyses would be carried out in order to determine the predictive power of the various learner factors, i.e., performing multiple regression (MR) analyses that might identify a collection of variables capable of predicting achievement better than any single variable. Data were not subjected to MR analysis, however, because of the small sample size (N=32) in the present study. The number of variables that can be entered into a MR equation is a function of sample size, and this severe limitation would permit only two, or perhaps cautiously, three variables on the right of the equation. Because the pretest would necessarily be one of these variables in almost all equations, only one or two would remain, thus rendering the analysis of little use considering the number of predictor variables being investigated in this study. Thus, in the present study, analyses were limited to inspections of the one-on-one correlations among the variables of interest, rather than continuing to the next step of seeking more powerful multiple correlations.
Analysis of the Findings

Research Question 1: The Relationships Between Achievement and Foreign Language Aptitude and Personality Factors

In order to investigate this research question, data obtained from measures of achievement, personality traits, and aptitude were subjected to various correlational procedures. The means and standard deviations secured from these measures are illustrated in Tables 25, 26, 27, and 28.

Attitude was not considered as a predictor variable in the investigation of this research question. The attitude measure developed by the researcher (see Chapter III) attempted to assess attitude towards the particular course under study and was administered on the last day of instruction. There was no pretest attitude scale given because, logically, the students in this study could not have held an attitude towards this specific course before taking it. Therefore, knowing whether students liked the course on the last day of instruction in no way can be considered a predictor of achievement, although a relationship between the two may well have existed.

Achievement in the present study has been divided into speaking and writing. Each aspect will be discussed below separately with respect to its correlations with aptitude and personality.

Achievement: speaking.

APTITUDE

Zero-order correlations were computed between parts and scales of the speaking posttest and the short form of the MLAT. These correlations are displayed in Table 29. Because of the number of significant relationships that resulted, partial correlations (with the appropriate
Table 25

Means and Standard Deviations of the Parts and Scales of the Speaking Test\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Part</th>
<th>Means(^b)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part I</td>
<td>28.31</td>
<td>34.37</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part II</td>
<td>27.95</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part III</td>
<td>34.20</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>32.89</td>
<td>40.28</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts I &amp; II</td>
<td>56.27</td>
<td>67.97</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parts III &amp; IV</td>
<td>67.09</td>
<td>80.78</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123.36</td>
<td>148.75</td>
<td>13.91</td>
<td>9.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Means(^b)</th>
<th></th>
<th>SDs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/precision</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/breadth</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity/task-oriented</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity/extra task-oriented</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening Comprehehnsion</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The reader is referred to Chapter III for the reliabilities of these test parts and scales.

\(^b\) The means of Parts I and II of the test are based on a maximum of 42 each, and Parts III and IV (including "listening comprehen-
sions"), 48 each. The scales are based on a metric of 6.
Table 26
Means and Standard Deviations of the Twelve Composition Scales$^a$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Means$^b$</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>SDs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprensibility</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of linguistic attempt</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition skills</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/breadth</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/precision</td>
<td>97.31</td>
<td>97.79</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>97.22</td>
<td>97.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of tense/mood</td>
<td>89.06</td>
<td>92.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb formation</td>
<td>97.25</td>
<td>97.66</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements (less verbs)</td>
<td>90.36</td>
<td>93.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar (less verbs)</td>
<td>95.08</td>
<td>96.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling/accents</td>
<td>95.52</td>
<td>98.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall syntax</td>
<td>98.76</td>
<td>99.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$ The reader is referred to Chapter III for the reliabilities of these test parts and scales.

$^b$ The first four scales are based on a metric of 6. The remaining scales are based on a metric of 100.
Table 27

Means and Standard Deviations of the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (Form A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₁</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₂</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₃</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₄</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₅</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₆</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₇</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₈</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 28

Means and Standard Deviations of the Modern Language Aptitude Test (Short Form)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>SDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part III</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part V</td>
<td>19.13</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.66</td>
<td>16.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

pretest partialled out) among these same variables were computed. The results are summarized in Table 30.

Inspections of this table reveal that nine variables correlated significantly with Part III of the MLAT, ranging from \( r = .370 \) (\( p < .05 \)) to \( r = .595 \) (\( p < .001 \)). The Total Speaking Test, Parts I, II, and the fluency and vocabulary/precision scales were all related to MLAT III at the .05 level; the structure scale was significant at the .001 level, and Parts I and II (combined) plus the vocabulary/precision and quantity/task-oriented scales reached significance levels of .005 with MLAT III. Of special note is that the structure scale is the only variable that achieved two additional significant correlations with the MLAT: with Part V and the Total MLAT (\( p < .05 \)).

Three other significant relationships also emerged: Part I (speaking) and the quantity/task-oriented scale correlated with the Total MLAT at the .05 level of significance (\( r = .440 \) and \( r = .513 \), respectively). The
Table 29

Zero-Order Correlations of Parts and Scales of Speaking

Posttest with Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) Short Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>MLAT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Part I</td>
<td>.537*</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.257</td>
<td>.412*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.359*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III &amp; IV</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.507***</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale

| Fluency            | .529***| .036  | .144| .316  |
| Vocabulary/precision | .499***| .173  | .163| .374  |
| Vocabulary/breadth  | .426*  | .113  | .229| .335  |
| Structure           | .565****| .164 | .210| .417* |
| Comprehensibility   | .457** | .046  | .116| .277  |
| Quantity/task-oriented | .465** | .171 | .276| .394* |
| Quantity/extra task-oriented | .048 | -.184 | -.081 | -.094 |
| Listening comprehension | .169 | .391  | .183| .330  |

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .005
**** p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>MLAT III</th>
<th>MLAT IV</th>
<th>MLAT V</th>
<th>MLAT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Part</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.440*</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.359*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>.440*</td>
<td>-.095</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td>.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>.488***</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III &amp; IV</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>-.200</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>.428*</td>
<td>-.111</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>.371*</td>
<td>-.220</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/precision</td>
<td>.503***</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/breadth</td>
<td>.370*</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>.595****</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.383*</td>
<td>.451*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity/task-oriented</td>
<td>.513***</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.357*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity/extra task-oriented</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.269</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>-.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.393</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.339</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Appropriate speaking pretest partialled out.

* P < .05
** P < .01
*** P < .005
**** P < .001
listening comprehension scale related to Part IV of the MLAT at the .05 level ($r = .393$). These latter correlations, however, do not appear to represent a discernible trend.

**PERSONALITY**

In Table 31 are displayed the zero-order correlations between parts and scales of the speaking posttest and the 16PF. A large number of significant correlations resulted, ranging from $r = .352$ ($p < .05$) to $r = -.604$ ($p < .001$), thereby justifying the investigation of further correlations while partialling out for the effects of the appropriate pre-test.

Inspections of the partial correlations of the speaking posttest with the 16PF reveal noteworthy findings, all of which are reported in Table 32. Not only did the quantity of significant partial correlations increase appreciably from those of the zero-orders, but they tended to occur with different personality factors and resulted in clearly discernible trends.

Factor M, "Practical vs. Imaginative," attained nine significant positive correlation coefficients with parts and scales of the speaking posttest, ranging from $r = .363$ ($p < .05$) to $r = .511$ ($p < .005$). At the .05 level, M correlated with parts I and II (combined), the Total Speaking Test, and the structure, vocabulary/breadth, and quantity/task-oriented scales. Correlations reaching the .01 significance level with M were Parts IV, II and IV (combined), and the vocabulary/precision scale. The fluency scale and factor M correlated at the .005 level. Evidence lending further support of the tendency of these findings is that test Part II and Part III had significant correlations with M at the .10 level,
### Table 31
Zero-Order Correlations of Parts of Scales of Speaking Posttest

with the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16PF)\(^a\)

| Criterion | A   | B   | C   | D   | E   | F   | G   | H   | I   | J   | K   | L   | M   | N   | O   | Q₁ | Q₂ | Q₃ | Q₄ | Q₅ | Q₆ | Q₇ | Q₈ | Q₉ | Q₁₀ | Q₁₁ | Q₁₂ | Q₁₃ | Q₁₄ | Q₁₅ | Q₁₆ |
|-----------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| Test Part |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| I         | -063| 065 | -127| -138| -125| -244| -180| 256 | -253| 137 | 140 | 170 | -396*| -083| -201| 019 | -181| 083 | -273| -154|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| IV        | -101| -080| -140| 006 | 094 | -204| -087| 414*| -169| 271 | -065| 204 | -251 | -032| -327| 159 | 072 | 143 | -277| 008 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Scale     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |    |
| Qty/TO    | 162 | 009 | 273 | 016 | 012 | 061 | 058 | 163 | -465**| 449*| 125 | 007 | -322| -026| -105| 076 | 005 | 154 | -315| -037|     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Qty/ETO   | -112| -037| -184| 156 | 195 | -167| -051| 250 | 078 | 048 | -019| 401*| -085| -059| -604***| 126 | -009| 266 | -344| 005 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| ListComp  | -112| 133 | 220 | 321*| 080 | 029 | 004 | 276 | 017 | 113 | -366*| 236 | 173 | 012 | 153 | 161 | 074 | 079 | -020| 220 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |

* \(P < .05\)
** \(P < .01\)
*** \(P < .005\)
**** \(P < .001\)

\(^a\) Decimals have been omitted.
Table 32
Partial Correlations of Parts and Scales of Speaking Posttest with the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (l6PF)

| Criterion | A | B | C | E | F | G | H | I | L | M | N | O | Q1 | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q11 | Q12 | Q13 | Q14 |
| Test Part |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| I         | -0.09 | 0.17 | 0.04 | 0.073 | 0.003 | -0.296 | -0.101 | 0.196 | -0.342 | 0.281 | -0.033 | -0.001 | -0.299 | 0.083 | -0.125 | -0.131 | -0.135 | -0.172 | -0.216 | 0.101 |
| II        | 0.294 | 0.090 | 0.046 | 0.033 | 0.256 | -0.210 | 0.006 | 0.302 | -0.207 | 0.342 | 0.147 | 0.209 | -0.244 | 0.035 | -0.322 | 0.030 | 0.059 | 0.030 | -0.319 | 0.013 |
| III       | -0.041 | 0.064 | 0.121 | -0.132 | -0.067 | 0.026 | -0.133 | 0.100 | -0.331 | 0.324 | -0.042 | -0.068 | -0.272 | 0.176 | -0.049 | -0.169 | -0.161 | -0.165 | -0.127 | -0.030 |
| IV        | -0.247 | -0.078 | -0.139 | 0.083 | 0.042 | -0.176 | -0.109 | 0.285 | -0.225 | 0.471 | -0.253 | 0.093 | -0.051 | 0.250 | -0.314 | -0.005 | -0.203 | 0.013 | -0.287 | -0.263 |
| I & II    | 0.160 | 0.012 | 0.010 | 0.076 | 0.159 | -0.292 | -0.046 | 0.281 | 0.324 | 0.385 | 0.056 | 0.104 | -0.287 | 0.114 | -0.244 | -0.072 | -0.045 | -0.105 | -0.310 | 0.100 |
| III & IV  | -0.166 | 0.004 | 0.005 | -0.024 | 0.032 | -0.187 | -0.148 | 0.199 | -0.314 | 0.469 | -0.193 | -0.011 | 0.158 | 0.301 | -0.190 | -0.119 | -0.228 | -0.108 | -0.221 | 0.164 |
| Total     | 0.017 | 0.011 | 0.086 | 0.051 | 0.086 | -0.219 | -0.098 | 0.264 | -0.367 | 0.501 | -0.091 | 0.311 | -0.229 | 0.272 | -0.232 | -0.125 | -0.149 | -0.151 | -0.298 | 0.185 |
| Scale     |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Fluency   | 0.080 | 0.023 | 0.129 | -0.042 | 0.087 | -0.149 | -0.016 | -0.286 | -0.335 | 0.511 | -0.047 | -0.160 | -0.193 | 0.327 | -0.028 | -0.264 | -0.112 | -0.281 | -0.200 | 0.274 |
| Voc/Pr    | -0.133 | 0.096 | 0.149 | 0.027 | 0.004 | -0.294 | -0.119 | 0.115 | -0.379 | 0.456 | -0.068 | -0.043 | -0.168 | 0.166 | -0.195 | -0.102 | -0.204 | -0.241 | -0.144 | 0.173 |
| Voc/Br    | -0.036 | 0.061 | 0.028 | 0.073 | 0.091 | -0.300 | -0.131 | 0.244 | -0.422 | 0.404 | -0.210 | 0.066 | -0.257 | 0.168 | -0.300 | -0.053 | -0.130 | -0.083 | -0.261 | 0.118 |
| Struct    | 0.002 | 0.280 | 0.221 | 0.139 | 0.040 | -0.087 | -0.083 | 0.077 | -0.211 | 0.363 | 0.087 | -0.198 | -0.169 | 0.178 | 0.026 | -0.192 | -0.065 | -0.272 | -0.033 | 0.204 |
| Compreh   | 0.093 | 0.059 | -0.054 | 0.073 | 0.143 | -0.126 | -0.017 | 0.174 | -0.243 | 0.253 | -0.070 | -0.400 | -0.363 | 0.014 | -0.101 | 0.018 | 0.023 | -0.043 | -0.108 | 0.050 |
| Qty/TO    | 0.106 | 0.037 | 0.204 | 0.051 | -0.366 | -0.027 | 0.061 | 0.107 | -0.378 | 0.447 | 0.220 | 0.029 | -0.214 | 0.191 | 0.027 | 0.047 | -0.138 | 0.110 | -0.357 | -0.014 |
| Qty/EFO   | 0.075 | 0.362 | -0.179 | -0.048 | 0.109 | -0.019 | -0.090 | 0.295 | -0.088 | 0.248 | -0.016 | 0.321 | -0.095 | 0.207 | -0.434 | 0.098 | -0.121 | 0.180 | 0.469 | 0.025 |
| ListComp  | -0.112 | 0.134 | 0.221 | 0.372 | 0.081 | 0.030 | 0.005 | 0.278 | 0.017 | 0.113 | -0.366 | -0.236 | -0.177 | 0.012 | -0.152 | 0.161 | 0.075 | 0.079 | -0.020 | 0.220 |
| Total     | 0.017 | 0.011 | 0.086 | 0.051 | 0.086 | -0.219 | -0.098 | 0.264 | -0.367 | 0.501 | -0.091 | 0.311 | -0.229 | 0.272 | -0.232 | -0.125 | -0.149 | -0.151 | -0.298 | 0.185 |

* P < .05  ** P < .01  *** P < .005
a Speaking pretest partialled out.  b Decimals have been omitted.
thereby indicating that the entire speaking test and five scales were highly related to this factor, ranging from the .10 to the .005 levels. A high, positive score on factor M indicates the following characteristics:

The person who scores high on Factor M tends to be unconventional, unconcerned over everyday matters, Bohemian, self-motivated, imaginatively creative, concerned with "essentials," and oblivious of particular people and physical realities. His inner-directed interests sometimes lead to unrealistic situations accompanied by expressive outbursts. His individuality tends to cause him to be rejected in group activities (Manual for the 16PF, p. 20).

Another strong trend resulted from these partial correlations, although not one possessing the magnitude nor quantity as the one just described. Factor L, "Trustworthy vs. Suspicious," correlated negatively with four of the speaking variables at the .05 level of significance: The Total Speaking Test, and the vocabulary/precision, vocabulary/breadth, and quantity/task-oriented scales. Further support for this tendency is the fact that six other speaking variables (Parts I, III, IV, I and II [combined], III and IV [combined] and the fluency scale) reached significance at the .10 level with factor L. Students scoring low on this factor are defined in the following manner:

The person who scores low on Factor L tends to be free of jealous tendencies, adaptable, cheerful, un-competitive, concerned about other people, a good team worker (Manual for the 16PF, p. 20).

Several other personality factors also reached levels of significance with the speaking scales, ranging from $r = -0.357$ ($p < 0.05$) to $r = -0.469$ ($p < 0.01$). Although there appears to be no definite trend represented, two of these seven correlations related negatively with
factor $Q_{III}$, "Tenderminded Emotionality vs. Tough Poise." A low score on this factor yields the following characteristics:

The person who scores low on Factor $Q_{III}$ is likely to be troubled by pervasive emotionality, and may be of a discouraged, frustrated type. He is, however, sensitive to the subtleties of life, likely to be artistic and rather gentle. If he has problems, they often involve too much thought and consideration before action is taken (Manual for the 16PF, p. 28).

Whether or not these particular results are representative of a viable trend beyond the chance level—given the large number of variables being correlated in this study—it is worth noting that in the Handbook for the 16PF (1970, p. 116), a low score on factor $Q_{III}$—a second-order factor—was significantly loaded by, among other first-order factors, a high score on factor $M$ and a low score on factor $L$, findings which are in perfect accord with those just reported.

**Achievement: writing.**

**APTITUDE**

Zero-order correlations were computed between scales and combined scale parts of the postcomposition and the short form of the MLAT. These correlation coefficients are displayed in Tables 33 and 34. On the basis of various significant correlations resulting, partial correlations were performed on these same variables with the effects of the precomposition score partialed out. Findings for both scales and parts are summarized in Tables 35 and 36. As noted in these two tables, seventeen variables (12 scales, total test, and four combined parts) were correlated with the MLAT; only nine significant coefficients, however, resulted from these many correlations, ranging from $r = .364$
Table 33

Zero-Order Correlations of Scales of Postcomposition with the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) Short Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>MLAT III</th>
<th>MLAT IV</th>
<th>MLAT V</th>
<th>MLAT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.332</td>
<td>.383*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of linguistic attempt</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition skills</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>.394*</td>
<td>.387*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/breadth</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.178</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/precision</td>
<td>.369*</td>
<td>.449**</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.481***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of tense/mood</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb formation</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements (less verbs)</td>
<td>.141</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.443*</td>
<td>.345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar (less verbs)</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.439*</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.411*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling/accents</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.295</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall syntax</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.226</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05  
** P < .01  
*** P < .005
Table 34

Zero-Order Correlations of Parts of Postcomposition with the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) Short Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Part</th>
<th>MLAT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globals (1-4)</td>
<td>.279</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.416</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary (4-5)</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs (6-8)</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td>.180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Structures</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Table 35

Partiala Correlations of Parts of Postcomposition with the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) Short Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Part</th>
<th>MLAT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globals (1-4)</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary (4-5)</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>-.081</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs (6-8)</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Structures</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9-12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Precomposition partialled out.
* $p < .05$
Table 36
Partial Correlations of Scales and Postcomposition

with the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) Short Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>MLAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of linguistic-</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attempt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition skills</td>
<td>.244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/breadth</td>
<td>.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/precision</td>
<td>.386*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of tense/mood</td>
<td>.189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb formation</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements (less verbs)</td>
<td>.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar (less verbs)</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling/accents</td>
<td>-.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall syntax</td>
<td>-.280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* Precomposition partialled out.

* P < .05
** P < .01
*** P < .005
(p < .05) to r = .503 (p < .005): eight correlations were at the .05 significance level and one, at .005. No significant r's resulted between the total postcomposition and the MLAT.

Two scales attained significant relationships with three of the four MLAT variables. The comprehensibility scale correlated positively with Parts IV, V, and the Total MLAT (all at p < .05). Vocabulary/precision reached p < .05 with Parts II, IV, and the Total MLAT, the last of which was at the .005 significance level. The three other significant relationships appeared to be scattered throughout the test.

Although no pattern emerged with the other correlations, the significant r of the grammar (less verbs) scale with Part IV of the MLAT does appear more logical than the other single relationships found because Part IV "...is thought to measure sensitivity to grammatical structure, and may be expected to have particular relevance to the student's ability to handle the grammatical aspects of a foreign language" (Manual, p. 3).

In comparing the relationships of both speaking and composition scales with the MLAT, it is interesting to note that the comprehensibility scale of the speaking posttest had no significant relationship to any part of the MLAT—a finding that was not anticipated—while the same postcomposition scale was one of the two that most highly related to the MLAT in a pattern. The vocabulary/precision scales, however, do share commonality: both showed a significant relationship with Part III of the MLAT (a part based, in part, on a student's knowledge of English vocabulary). This same scale for speaking barely missed significance with the Total MLAT (r = .351, p < .053) while the composition scale
correlated at the .005 level \((r = .503)\).

PERSONALITY

Zero-order correlations performed between scales and combined scale parts of the postcomposition and the 16PF resulted in 19 significant correlations ranging from \(r = .354\) \((p < .05)\) to \(r = .585\) \((p < .001)\). These figures are presented in Tables 37 and 38. Inspections of the subsequent partial correlations revealed an almost identical number of significant relationships as with the zero-orders, and with very similar magnitudes. These partial \(r\)'s also tended to occur with the same factors as did the zero-order \(r\)'s, contrary to the pattern that emerged from zero-order to partial correlations with the speaking variables and the 16PF. All partial correlations are reported in Tables 39 and 40.

The 20 significant relationships of the personality factors with the scales and their combined parts ranged from \(r = .355\) \((p < .05)\) to \(r = .574\) \((p < .001)\); 18 reached significance at \(p < .05\), one at \(p < .005\), and one at \(p < .001\). No factor of the 16PF correlated significantly with the total composition nor did there seem to be a strong pattern on the 16PF as there was with the speaking variables and the 16PF. Rather, isolated "pockets" of two or three factors emerged almost without order.

The factor \((M, "Practical vs. Imaginative") that related so strongly to the Total Speaking Test, parts, and scales, achieved four positive correlations with composition scales: composition skills, vocabulary/breadth, the globals (scales 1-4), and vocabulary (scales 4-5).

Factor L, "Trustworthy vs. Suspicious," the second most high-
ly related factor to the speaking variables, correlated negatively with
Table 37  
Zero-Order Correlations of Scales of Postcomposition with the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16PF)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>O1</th>
<th>O2</th>
<th>O3</th>
<th>O4</th>
<th>OII</th>
<th>OIII</th>
<th>OIV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of linguistic attempt</td>
<td>-250</td>
<td>027</td>
<td>-149</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>037</td>
<td>-108</td>
<td>038</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>-130</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-153</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>045</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-130</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>-120</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition skills</td>
<td>-235</td>
<td>029</td>
<td>-032</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>069</td>
<td>-201</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>-253</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>-015</td>
<td>-022</td>
<td>-001</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>-054</td>
<td>-092</td>
<td>-175</td>
<td>-167</td>
<td>031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/breadth</td>
<td>-199</td>
<td>-189</td>
<td>-156</td>
<td>035</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>-104</td>
<td>-191</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>-233</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>-153</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>032</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>-385</td>
<td>027</td>
<td>-217</td>
<td>051</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>055</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>077</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>071</td>
<td>-241</td>
<td>-108</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-153</td>
<td>-094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb formation</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>-191</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>-162</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>044</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-049</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>-082</td>
<td>-014</td>
<td>-161</td>
<td>089</td>
<td>076</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>-103</td>
<td>063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements (less verbs)</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>-141</td>
<td>-039</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>-096</td>
<td>-037</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>028</td>
<td>052</td>
<td>-038</td>
<td>-075</td>
<td>-252</td>
<td>-179</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar (less verbs)</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>008</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>*-201</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>-056</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>-049</td>
<td>063</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>-050</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>-113</td>
<td>-152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling/accents</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>-018</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>072</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>-107</td>
<td>022</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td>-115</td>
<td>098</td>
<td>-116</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>-030</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>-098</td>
<td>077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall syntax</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>-025</td>
<td>059</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>036</td>
<td>-103</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>050</td>
<td>-164</td>
<td>074</td>
<td>053</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>-285</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>-269</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01
*** p < .005
**** p < .001

* Decimals have been omitted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
<th>Q11</th>
<th>Q111</th>
<th>Q11V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Globals (1-4)</td>
<td>-162</td>
<td>-006</td>
<td>-028</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>-167</td>
<td>-170</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>-291</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>057</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>-270</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>-056</td>
<td>-055</td>
<td>-067</td>
<td>225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aet (6-8)</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>-075</td>
<td>-067</td>
<td>-295</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>-048</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>-047</td>
<td>037</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>-154</td>
<td>-234</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>091</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>-065</td>
<td>-204</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Structures (9-12)</td>
<td>084</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>-080</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>-019</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>093</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>-055</td>
<td>-043</td>
<td>-187</td>
<td>-155</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>038</td>
<td>040</td>
<td>053</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>099</td>
<td>-054</td>
<td>-127</td>
<td>-068</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-101</td>
<td>051</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>-191</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>-028</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>-112</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>-297</td>
<td>074</td>
<td>029</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>-123</td>
<td>057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P < .05  

* Decimals have been omitted.
Table 39

Partial* Correlations of Scales of the Postcomposition With

the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16PF)

| Scale            | A    | B    | C    | E    | F    | G    | H    | I    | J    | K    | L    | M    | N    | O    | Q1   | Q2   | Q3   | Q4   | Q5   | Q6   | Q7   |
|------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Comprehensibility| 127  | 146  | 201  | 138  | 34   | 255  | 083  | -235 | 207  | -182 | -252 | -175 | -177 | -012 | -130 | -206 | -289 | 191  | 099  |
| guistic attempt   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Composition skills| -297 | -015 | -022 | 145  | 017  | -115 | -037 | 099  | -258 | 312  | -093 | -064 | 008  | 416  | -041 | -110 | -251 | -201 | 034  | 349  |
| Vocabulary/breadth| -194 | -210 | -129 | 033  | 038  | -143 | -074 | 183  | -204 | 374  | -174 | 156  | -031 | 255  | -429 | 065  | -199 | 033  | -134 | 196  |
| Vocabulary/      | 241  | 206  | 194  | 133  | 293  | -022 | 211  | 355  | -414 | 222  | -025 | 039  | -227 | -091 | -122 | -048 | 213  | -142 | -124 | -015 |     |
| precision         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Subject-verb      | 377  | 056  | 335  | 301  | 357  | 114  | 336  | 512  | 003  | 016  | 078  | 042  | 158  | 072  | -241 | -108 | 321  | -154 | 095  | 226  |
| agreement         |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Choice of tense/   | 252  | -030 | -173 | -412 | -039 | -135 | -142 | -020 | -064 | 000  | 097  | 221  | -269 | 032  | 206  | 003  | 233  | 112  | -127 |     |
| mood              |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Verb formation    | 285  | -175 | -019 | -186 | 293  | 040  | 342  | 144  | -016 | -064 | 236  | -075 | -042 | -211 | 096  | -049 | 296  | -065 | 061  | -113 |     |
| Agreements (less  | 163  | 140  | -110 | -004 | 301  | -099 | 023  | 121  | 254  | -008 | 023  | -147 | -009 | -210 | -154 | 100  | 246  | 071  | 138  | 060  |     |
| verbs)            |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Grammar (less     | 387  | 231  | 084  | 036  | 213  | 160  | 223  | 347  | -092 | 194  | -112 | -026 | 037  | 087  | 022  | -033 | 196  | -091 | -062 | 135  |     |
| verbs)            |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Spelling/accents  | 255  | -010 | 013  | 198  | 574  | 092  | 448  | -129 | 096  | 147  | -081 | -264 | 141  | -097 | -216 | -119 | 444  | -169 | 126  | 252  |     |
| Overall syntax    | 009  | -001 | 126  | 121  | 186  | 227  | 108  | -151 | 042  | -034 | -142 | -258 | 189  | 083  | 346  | -288 | 132  | -290 | 396  | 166  |

* P < .05
*** P < .005
**** P < .001

* Precomposition partialled out.

b Decimals have been omitted.
Table 40
Partial Correlations of Parts of Postcomposition with the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16PF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>Q_1</th>
<th>Q_2</th>
<th>Q_3</th>
<th>Q_4</th>
<th>Q_11</th>
<th>Q_13</th>
<th>Q_14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Globals (1-4)</td>
<td>-266</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>-2.23</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>-2.261</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>-3.14</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>-3.111</td>
<td>-3.041</td>
<td>-1.108</td>
<td>-1.108</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary (4-5)</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>-1.73</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>-2.238</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>-4.24</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-1.60</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs (6-8)</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>-0.282</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>-2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Structures (9-12)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.209</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>1.151</td>
<td>-1.128</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>-1.35</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>-0.097</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>-0.099</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>-0.082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  

a Procomposition partialled out.  
b Decimals have been omitted.
only one composition scale: vocabulary/precision. Factor QIII, "Tenderminded Emotionality vs. Tough Poise," which previously showed two significant associations with the quantity speaking scales, figured here only once, correlating significantly with the overall syntax scale.

Four other factors revealed two or three significant relationships with varying composition scales. Factor A had three significant, positive correlations with the following scales: subject-verb agreements, grammar (less verbs), and the verbs (combined 6-8 scales). Those who score high on Factor A, "Reserved vs. Outgoing," are described as follows:

The person who scores high on Factor A tends to be goodnatured, easy-going, emotionally expressive (hence naturally Affectothymia), ready to cooperate, attentive to people, softhearted, kindly, adaptable. He likes occupations dealing with people and socially impressive situations. He readily forms active groups. He is generous in personal relations, less afraid of criticism, better able to remember names of people (Manual for the 16PF, p. 17).

Factor F also shows three significant positive relationships with composition scales. These scales are: subject-verb agreements, spelling/accents, and additional structures (combined 9-12 scales). A high score on Factor F, "Sober vs. Happy-go-Lucky," indicates the following traits:

The person who scores high on this trait tends to be cheerful, active, talkative, frank, expressive, effervescent, carefree. He is frequently chosen as an elected leader. He may be impulsive and mercurial (Manual for the 16PF, p. 19).

Factor I, "Toughminded vs. Tenderminded," correlated positively with two composition scales: vocabulary/precision and subject-verb
agreements. A high score on this factor is described as follows:

The person who scores high on Factor I tends to be tenderminded, day-dreaming, artistic, fastidious, feminine. He is sometimes demanding of attention and help, impatient, dependent, impractical. He dislikes crude people and rough occupations. He tends to slow up group performance, and to upset group morale by unrealistic fussiness (Manual for the 16PF, p. 20).

The only other factor significantly related to composition scales was Q₃, "Undisciplined Self-Conflict vs. Controlled," which achieved significant negative r's with vocabulary/breadth and vocabulary (combined scales). Low scores on Q₃ indicate the following characteristics:

The person who scores low on Factor Q₃ will not be bothered with will control and regard for social demands. He is not overly considerate, careful, or painstaking. He may feel maladjusted, and many maladjustments (especially the affective, but not the paranoid) show Q₃⁻ (Manual for the 16PF, p. 22).

For other factors that correlated significantly with only one scale part, see Tables 39 and 40.

**Summary of Research Question 1.** In this section, the results of zero-order and partial correlations between the achievement measures of aptitude and personality were reported. In response to this research question investigating significant relationships between achievement and selected learner factors, the following significant results are presented, based on the data analysis discussed in this section. The importance of these findings and their implications are discussed in Chapter V.
APTITUDE

Of the entire MLAT, Part III (knowledge of English vocabulary and sound-symbol association ability) was the best single predictor of the Total Speaking Test and several component parts, affording Part III of the MLAT the strongest association with communicative proficiency as measured by instruments used in this study. Part III also had significant r's with five of the eight speaking scales.

The Total MLAT significantly correlated with Part I of the speaking test as well as with two of the scales. Of the eight speaking scales, structure and the MLAT (Parts III, V, and Total) correlated most highly; the second highest correlation was the quantity/task-oriented scale with Part III and Total MLAT.

No part of the MLAT significantly related to the total postcomposition; the Total MLAT was, however, highly correlated with the comprehensibility and vocabulary/precision scales. The former also achieved significant correlations with Parts IV and V, and the latter, with Parts III and IV. Parts IV and V of the MLAT each had three significant isolated relationships with other composition scales.

In summary, Part III of the MLAT showed a consistent pattern of relating to achievement in speaking; as regards composition, the significant findings are limited to specific scales rather than to the test as a whole.

PERSONALITY

Factors M, "Imaginative," and L, "Trustworthy," showed the highest and most consistent correlations with communicative proficiency as measured by instruments used in this study. Both correlated
significantly with the Total Speaking Test: M attained five significant $r$'s with scales, and L, three with scales.

Personality factors were more dispersed as they related to composition scales. No noteworthy patterns emerged; Factor M, however—which correlated highly with the speaking test—attained four significant correlations, two with scales and two with combined scales. Factors A, "Outgoing," and F, "Happy-go-Lucky," each reached significance levels with scales and combined scales of the postcomposition. Factors I, "Tenderminded," and Q$_3$, "Undisciplined Self-Control," each attained significant $r$'s with two scales. Again, no significant results were present for the total postcomposition, those findings herein reported being limited only to specific scales rather than to the entire test.

In summary, two specific personality traits were found consistently to be related to achievement in speaking; as regards composition, no discernible pattern emerged that was associated with the total postcomposition.

Research Question 2: The Relationships Between Attitude and Foreign Language Aptitude, Achievement, and Personality Factors

In order to investigate this research question, data obtained from measures of attitude, achievement, personality factors, and aptitude were correlated. The mean item scores and mean item standard deviations for the attitude scale are reported in Table 41.

Inspections of the zero-order correlations of attitude with aptitude, personality factors, and achievement (Tables 42, 43, and 44) revealed no significant relationships. In fact, all correlation
Table 41
Mean Item Scores and Standard Deviations of Main Study
Attitude Scale by Classes\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Item Scores(^b)</th>
<th>Mean Item SDs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class A</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class B</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class C</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The reader is referred to Chapter III for the reliabilities of this scale.

\(^b\) Based on a metric of 7.

...coefficients were consistently low, the highest being $r = .298$ ($p < .097$) between attitude and the subject-verb agreement scale of the postcomposition. These findings, therefore, did not offer cause for further analysis via partial correlations (Linn, 1978) because the very low zero-order $r$'s would either emerge as partial $r$'s with much the same pattern or else produce spuriously high, negative partial correlations that would be uninterpretable (Linn and Slinde, 1977). The lack of significant relationships in response to this second research question and its implications will be discussed in Chapter V.

**Summary**

In this chapter, procedures of analysis were described, and limitations of findings, because of these analyses, were discussed.
Table 42
Zero-Order Correlations of the Attitude Scale with Parts and Scales of the Speaking Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Correlation with Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Part</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I &amp; II</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III &amp; IV</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluency</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/precision</td>
<td>.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/breadth</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity/task-oriented</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity/extras task-oriented</td>
<td>.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension</td>
<td>.143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 43
Zero-Order Correlations of the Attitude Scale with the Scales of the Postcomposition

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensibility</td>
<td>.140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complexity of linguistic attempt</td>
<td>.241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition skills</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/breadth</td>
<td>.224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocabulary/precision</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject-verb agreement</td>
<td>.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice of tense/mood</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb formation</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreements (less verbs)</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar (less verbs)</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spelling/accents</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall syntax</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 44
Zero-Order Correlations Between the Attitude Scale and the Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) Short Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MLAT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Scale</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.051</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zero-order and partial correlations were performed on most main study data in order to investigate the two research questions posed in Chapter I. These analyses indicated several significant relationships between achievement and selected learner factors. No significant relationships were found between attitude towards course and the other variables of interest in this study. These findings along with their limitations and implications are discussed in detail in Chapter V. Also presented are suggestions for future research.
Table 45

Zero-Order Correlations Between the Attitude Scale and the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire (16PF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Correlation with Attitude</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>-.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>-.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₁</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₂</td>
<td>-.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₃</td>
<td>-.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₄</td>
<td>-.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₁₁</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₁₂</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₁₃</td>
<td>-.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q₁₄</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter will be divided into four sections: (1) a summary, in which the objectives, procedures and results of the analyses are presented; (2) a discussion of the findings relative to the research questions, including tentative interpretations; (3) conclusions, limitations, and implications of the study; and (4) recommendations for future research.

Summary

Objectives and Procedures

The objective of this study was to investigate the relationships among certain personality traits, foreign language aptitude, attitudes, and achievement in a learner-centered intermediate Spanish conversation and composition course at the university level. An extensive operational definition of a learner-centered classroom is presented in Chapter I.

Data were collected from 32 university students enrolled in three fifth-semester conversation and composition courses, by means of:

1. a 47-item Likert-type "Student Perception Scale" (see Appendix B) developed by the researcher to ascertain whether the students in the study perceived their course to be different from most other other foreign language classes, i.e., "learner-centered" as measured by the scale;
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2. a 65-item quasi Likert-type attitude-towards-course scale
   (see Appendix B) developed by the researcher, including both
   attitude questions and a number of questions of a demographic
   nature. Data for this and the "Student Perception Scale" were
   keypunched by the researcher;

3. the 181-item **Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire**
   (Form A) (1967), administered and scored by the researcher;

4. the short form of the **Modern Language Aptitude Test** (Carroll
   and Sapon, 1959), administered by the researcher using the com-
   mercial MLAT tape for standardizing instructions, time, and
   testing conditions. IBM student answer sheets were keypunched
   and scored by the Testing and Evaluation Center at The Ohio
   State University;

5. pre- and posttests of oral proficiency developed by the re-
   searcher (see Appendix B); and

6. student-written pre- and postcompositions.

Both pre- and postachievement measures were scored by four indepen-
dent raters (two for speaking and two for writing) with researcher-
developed rating scales. (See Appendix B.) All data for these pre- and
postmeasures were keypunched by the researcher at the Ohio State Uni-
versity Instruction and Research Computer Center, where data analyses were
subsequently carried out for all test reliabilities reported in Chapter
III. Analyses performed and reported in Chapter IV were carried out at
the Digital Computer Laboratory at the University of Illinois. Data
were subjected to various correlational procedures in order to investi-
gate the two research questions in this study. The questions were:
1. Are there any significant relationships between achievement in a learner-centered conversation and composition course and any or all of a set of predictor variables including selected personality factors, foreign language aptitude, and entry language proficiency?

2. Are there any significant relationships between attitude towards a learner-centered conversation and composition course and any or all of a set of predictor variables including selected personality factors, aptitude, and achievement?

Results of Analyses

Research question 1. Zero-order and partial correlations were performed on data collected from measures of achievement, aptitude, and personality factors. The following significant relationships, as reported in Chapter IV, emerged between the predictor variables and achievement:

APTITUDE

1. Part III of the MLAT was the best single predictor of oral communicative proficiency as measured by the instruments used in the present study. Besides correlating significantly with the Total Speaking Test ($r = .428$, $p < .05$), Part III (MLAT) achieved eight other significant correlations with test parts and scales, ranging from $0.370$ ($p < .05$) to $0.595$ ($p < .001$). The Total MLAT achieved significance with only one test part and
two scales.

2. The Total MLAT score was not significantly related to the total postcomposition score. Furthermore, only two composition scales, comprehensibility and vocabulary/precision, obtained significant correlations ($r = .415$, $p < .05$ and $r = .503$, $p < .005$, respectively) with the Total MLAT. Part IV significantly related to the following scales: comprehensibility ($r = .385$, $p < .05$), vocabulary/precision ($r = .451$, $p < .05$), and grammar (less verbs) ($r = .402$, $p < .05$). Part V achieved significant correlations with the scales for comprehensibility ($r = .410$, $p < .05$), and additional structures (scales 9-16) ($r = .386$, $p < .05$).

PERSONALITY

1. Of the 16PF, two factors, M, "Imaginative," and L, "Trustworthy," achieved consistent, high $r$'s with oral communicative proficiency as measured by the instruments used in this study. Both correlated significantly ($r = .501$, $p < .005$, and $r = .367$, $p < .05$, respectively) with the Total Speaking Test; Factor M had nine significant correlations with test parts and scales, ranging from .363 ($p < .05$) to .511 ($p < .005$), and Factor L achieved five, ranging from -.342 ($p < .05$) to -.422 ($p < .05$).

2. No significant relationships were found between the 16PF and the total composition. Several personality factors correlated significantly with various composition scales and combined scale parts, although no strong trends were noted.
Research question 2. Zero-order correlations were performed on
the data collected from measures of attitude, aptitude, personality
factors, and achievement. There were no significant correlations be-
tween attitude and the other variables, thereby nullifying the planned
computation of partial correlations on the same data. Based on this
analysis, therefore, attitude towards course was not significantly
related to any of the predictor variables.

Discussion of Research Questions

Research Question 1

Speaking.

APTITUDE

Despite the low reliabilities found on the speaking posttest and
its scales, Part III of the MLAT attained high significant correlations
with the Total Speaking Test and eight other test parts and scales. The
following is a description of Part III of the MLAT:

**Spelling Clues.** Scores on this part depend to
some extent on the student's English vocabulary
knowledge. This subtest also measures the same
kind of sound-symbol association ability as
measured in Part II, Phonetic Script, but to a
lesser extent. It is highly speeded (Manual, p.3).

The part of this description that is of particular interest to the
present study is the reference to English vocabulary knowledge. The
fact that Part III emerged as the best predictor from among the parts of
the aptitude battery simply implies that students possessing the abili-
ties described above were more likely to experience success in second
language learning as defined and measured in this study; these aptitude
test parts, however, while possessing diagnostic power, do not predict
specific areas of future strength in that learning process. Yet it is curious that this aptitude predictor should contain a vocabulary component in light of the fact that knowledge of Spanish vocabulary has been highly related to communicative ability throughout this study.

Breadth of vocabulary, as measured by scales designed for this study, was found to have the highest correlation to both the Total Speaking Pretest (r = .95) and Posttest (r = .94), a finding that reiterates the strong relationships between vocabulary and speaking ability. This is not surprising when taking three factors into account. First, the verbal communication system in any language is based upon words. Successful performance on all four parts of the speaking tests depended to a large extent on a student's ability to convey a meaningful message related to specific tasks, which presupposed, above all, the knowledge of task-related vocabulary in order to utter those messages. Second, two of the seven scales employed were assessments specifically of vocabulary: precision in usage, and breadth of one's storehouse of words, both of which attained significant r's with the MLAT Part III (r = .503, \( P < .005 \) and \( r = .370, P < .05 \), respectively). Furthermore, the scales for fluency, comprehensibility, and quantity of information (task-oriented) all presumed and were greatly dependent upon knowledge of relevant vocabulary. Two of these scales also related significantly to MLAT Part III: fluency (r = .371, \( P < .05 \)) and quantity/task-oriented (r = .513, \( P < .005 \)).

Third, considerable emphasis in the present course was placed on the acquisition of a broad vocabulary base for increasing communication skills.

Because little emphasis was placed on grammar study in order to
perfect linguistic competency and only one of the seven speaking scales measured structure directly, it would seem logical that Part IV of the MLAT (sensitivity to grammatical structures) reached no significant r's with any speaking variable. These results are interesting in light of Carroll's (1967) statement regarding the predictive powers of the test: "The universally best predictor among the MLAT subtests is subtest IV" (p. 138). The lack of any predictive power of Part IV for the present study is also understandable, because, as Carroll (1967) mentions, that statement was based on MLAT data collected concurrently with achievement data rather than prior to language study; therefore, "...one is not permitted to infer that the test would be generally effective as a predictor if it had been administered before language study was undertaken" (p. 139). Furthermore, Carroll writes in the Manual (1959) accompanying the test: 

Thus far, however, there is no evidence that the MLAT is prognostic of the special skills or weaknesses which a person may develop in the advanced states of language learning (p. 23).

In summary, it would appear (1) that the Total MLAT was not a strong predictor of communicative proficiency for the students in this study (a finding also corroborated by Neufeld's [1969] use of the MLAT with criterion measures of speaking), and (2) that knowledge of vocabulary is highly related to speaking ability as measured by the researcher-developed instruments. Part III of the MLAT was the strongest single predictor of success in oral proficiency for this study, especially as that success was related to vocabulary acquisition.

A caution to be observed in interpreting these findings is offered by one of the authors of the MLAT. Although aptitude (Part III) was
found to be significantly associated with the level of attainment for this speaking test, Carroll (1967) warns that one must be very tentative in inferring strong prediction from this type of findings because the data herein obtained show only concurrent and not predictive validity.

**PERSONALITY**

Of the 16 first-order and the 4 second-order factors of the 16PF, the factor that was the best single predictor ($r=.501$, $p < .005$) of the Total Speaking Posttest was M, "Imaginative." (See Chapter IV for more complete descriptions of factors.) This factor also reached significance with Parts I and II combined (one-way interchanges in which students did not interact with the instructor) and Parts III and IV combined (two-way interchanges in which students and instructor verbally interacted). In addition, significant relationships were found between Factor M and five of the speaking scales.

These findings are consistent with the open atmosphere present in the three classes in this study, an atmosphere characterized by consistent opportunity for free expression of creative and imaginative ideas. While being imaginative was not prized over the inverse, it is possible that students tended to express more creativity than in "traditional" classes simply because more opportunities were present, and it was permitted and encouraged. In essence, the four parts of the speaking tests allowed for the same freedom as did the daily classroom activities in which this freedom was manifest. Built into the tasks presented to the students on these tests was the opportunity to offer imaginative responses that did not conform to a prescribed set of answers: while it was not necessary, there was ample occasion to "do-your-own-thing,"

with the full knowledge on the part of the student that no penalty would be exacted for such creativity, that the main purpose of the tests was the communication of his or her messages, whatever they might be.

In terms of specific skills, the imaginative student in this study also tended to perform well on scales of fluency, vocabulary/breadth, vocabulary/precision, structure, and quantity of information/task-oriented, all being factors highly related to the overall ability to communicate a message successfully.

The second and only other factor to correlate significantly \( (r = -.367, p < .05) \) with the Total Speaking Posttest was L, "Trusting" (the negative correlation is an artefact of the scoring procedure). Although this factor did not reach significance with individual test parts at the .05 level, it did correlate at \( p < .10 \) with Parts I and II combined and Parts III and IV combined, thereby indicating a supportive trend. This factor also related significantly with the vocabulary/breadth, vocabulary/precision, and quantity of information/task-oriented scales.

The significant relationships found between a "trusting" personality type and the speaking variables appear plausible given the psychological research base employed in designing the operational definition of a "learner-centered" classroom (see Chapter I). The two primary research sources were (1) Maslow's (1970) hierarchy of needs, chief among which is that for esteem—from and of others and of self—all implying trust and acceptance, and (2) Rogers' (1960) model of a teacher as a facilitator of learning who possesses qualities necessary for effective learning and growth by students: realness, acceptance, trust, and empa-
thetic understanding. (For a more detailed description of the criterial attributes of the concept "learner-centered," see pp. 5-19, Chapter III). To the extent that the learning atmosphere in which this study was conducted indeed reflected these psychological premises, the significant correlations herein reported may be tentatively considered to reflect reality for this study.

An attempt to compare these findings with prior theory and research, and further understand their implications, revealed no specific research studies relating personality traits to achievement in a learner-centered class. There are, however, precedents for using the 16PF in correlational studies with achievement where the learning environment is not a vital component part of the research. Neufeld (1969) found no significant relationships between the 16PF and total achievement; he did report, however, a trend with speaking and Factor E, "Assertive." Although his study also involved intermediate level university language students (but randomly selected), a comparison with his and the present study is difficult because (1) he used the standardized MLA Cooperative Achievement Tests that assess speaking proficiency in a manner different than do the tests employed in this study, and (2) it is assumed that language instruction varied to a large extent over the four different languages (and multiple sections) from which his students were selected.

In a more recent study, and one upon which the present research has built to a large degree, Bartz (1974) administered the 16PF to high school students and correlated the data with researcher-developed measures of communicative competency in all four skills. Because the Bartz communicative competency speaking test and scales have, in great mea-
sure, served as a model for those developed for this study, it was of interest to identify possible similarities in the correlations between the 16PF and achievement in the two studies; there were none, however. The only factor in the Bartz study that correlated significantly (from \( p < .05 \) to \( p < .10 \)) with the total speaking test, the four test parts, and all speaking scales was factor \( Q_2 \), "Self-Sufficient." Factors \( Q_1 \), "Introversion," and \( F \), "Sober," also reached the .05 level of significance with the total speaking test. The fact that none of the Bartz 16PF findings are in accord with those of the present study may to some extent be due to differences in learning environments and/or language levels. There were, nonetheless, in both studies identifiable, albeit different, personality types that tended to perform better on very similar tests of communicative proficiency. This fact strongly serves to reemphasize Bartz's recommendation:

... evidence does exist that certain personality factors do relate to the ability to communicate in a foreign language (German) thus confirming the desirability of further research in this area (p. 85).

Writing.

APTITUDE

No significant correlations were found between the total postcomposition and any part of the MLAT. Several significant correlations were attained, however, between certain composition scales and the MLAT. The Total MLAT correlated with the comprehensibility and vocabulary/precision scales (\( r = .415, p < .05 \), and \( r = .503, p < .005 \), respectively). Both of these scales were also significantly related to other parts of the MLAT: comprehensibility with Parts IV and V (\( r = .385, p < .05 \), and \( r = .364 \)),
and vocabulary/precision with Parts III and IV 
($r = .386$, $p < .05$, and $r = .451$, $p < .05$, respectively). Other significant 
relationships appeared to be with isolated scale parts displaying no 
apparent pattern.

The high correlations between the MLAT and the comprehensibility 
scale are of interest when considering the following definition for this 
global scale employed by raters in this study (see Appendix B for all 
scale definitions):

Comprehensibility refers to the ability of the 
student to make him/herself understood, to convey 
a message that would be understood by a non-Eng-
lish-speaking native speaker of Spanish.

This definition specifically focuses on a student's ability to use the 
total language in communicating a message and, in a sense, subsumes all 
the other specific scale criteria even though certain deficiencies not 
interfering with the communication process may be present in these cri-
teria. Bearing in mind the limitations discussed regarding the extent 
to which the MLAT can be employed as a predictor measure after language 
study has commenced, plus the related fact that the present data repre-
sent concurrent validity, it nevertheless seems logical, in real-world 
terms, that the Total MLAT should be so highly related with one's over-
all ability to successfully communicate messages.

The significant correlations of the MLAT III, IV, and Total with 
the vocabulary/precision composition scale follow a similar pattern as 
did those of the MLAT with the speaking scales. Although the Total MLAT 
just missed significance ($p < .053$) with the vocabulary/precision speak-
ing scale, Part III of the MLAT did significantly relate to the vocab-
ulary/precision speaking scale as it did with the parallel composition scale. These relationships between vocabulary use and the MLAT for both speaking and writing achievement measures would tend to corroborate the previous observation that in this study, knowledge and application of vocabulary were highly related to levels of achievement.

Another interesting observation from these data is found in the correlations achieved between Part IV of the MLAT and the comprehensibility, vocabulary/precision, and grammar (less verbs) scales. Part IV is defined as follows:

Words in Sentences. This part is thought to measure sensitivity to grammatical structure, and may be expected to have particular relevance to the student's ability to handle the grammatical aspects of a foreign language. As yet, it is not known how much scores on this part are a reflection of formal training in grammar; at any rate, no grammatical terminology is involved, so that the scores do not depend upon specific memory for grammatical terminology (Carroll and Sapon, 1959, p. 3)

The relationships between Part IV and these three scales seem plausible in the real world, based on the above definition. Sophistication with grammatical concepts would logically play a part in the overall ability to convey meaningful messages, in the precision with which one chooses and uses words, and, of course, in the actual application of grammatical structures.

Given prior theory and research in the professional literature that substantiate a positive relationship between aptitude and achievement, one would have expected that at least part of the MLAT would be correlated with the total postcomposition, a finding that did not materialize. The lack of such a correlation is even more puzzling upon inspection of
the intercorrelations of the scales with total postcomposition: except
for one scale (subject-verb agreements), all others were highly related
to the total posttest, correlations ranging from .416 (p < .05) to
.800 (p < .001). Nevertheless, it cannot be stated with certainty
whether the obtained correlations between the MLAT and scales form a
comprehensive pattern that can be generalized to the entire posttest,
even though the relationships are inherently meaningful as isolated
findings.

A comparison of these findings with those of prior research pre-
sents some difficulties. Although other researchers (Arendt, 1969;
Neufeld, 1969; Schulz, 1974) have employed the MLAT as a predictor vari-
able of achievement, including writing, none of their criterion measures
for writing involved a "free" composition with global and analytical
scales for evaluative purposes. In the studies of both James (1974) and
Jorstad (1974), student compositions were evaluated by using the "general
impression" method with a 1-5 scale to assess the extent to which stu-
dent ideas had been successfully communicated—regardless of vocabulary,
structures, or syntax.

In summary, no significant relationships were found in this parti-
cular study between aptitude and total writing proficiency; however two
scales, comprehensibility and vocabulary/precision, were highly predict-
ed by the Total MLAT and MLAT Parts IV and V and III and IV, respective-
ly. Whether these findings would be true in replicative studies would
depend in large part on their sample size and reliabilities obtained on
the total test and scale parts. Further discussion is presented under
"Recommendations for Future Research."
PERSONALITY

No factor of the 16PF correlated significantly with the total post-composition. Of the significant correlations that were found, only very minor trends emerged between specific factors and scales.

Personality Factor M, "Imaginative" (the highest predictor of the speaking variables), correlated significantly with the global composition scales (1-4), the vocabulary scales (4-5), and the composition skills and vocabulary/breadth scales, all at $p < .05$, $r$'s ranging from .365 to .397. Similar relationships were found between Factor $Q_3$, "Undisciplined Self-Conflict" and vocabulary scales (4-5) ($r = -.424$, $p < .05$) and the vocabulary/breadth scale ($r = -.429$, $p < .05$). Both personality types, as described in the Manual, tend to be careless by nature, and absorbed by inward matters. In both instances, it would appear that this type of personality tended, in this study, to perform better on tasks where less precision was required.

Factor A, "Outgoing" and Factor F, "Happy-go-Lucky" also showed similar relationships with certain scales. High scores on both factors imply an effusive, extroverted type of personality and are also among the chief primaries involved in the loading of a second-order factor $Q_I$, "Experimenting" (Handbook for the 16PF, p. 116). Factor A reached significance ($r$'s = .377 to .415, $p < .05$) with the subject-verb agreement, grammar (less verbs), and verbs (scales 6-8) scales. Factor F had significant relationships with the subject-verb agreements ($r = .357, p < .05$), spelling/accents ($r = .574, p < .001$), and additional structures (scales 9-12) ($r = .392, p < .05$) scales. These findings would indicate that the extroverted, good-natured personality type in this study performed
better on writing tasks involving greater attention to precision for
detail, e.g., grammar, verbs, spelling, etc.

The results of one other personality factor attaining significant
relationships with two scales were very similar to those described above
with Factors A and F. Factor I, "Tenderminded," correlated significantly
with vocabulary/precision (r = .355, p < .05) and subject-verb agree-
ment (r = .512, p < .005). However, while the tasks with which Factor I
correlated also required definite precision for detail, the personality
type is in no way similar to those represented by Factors A and F.

Once again, when perusing the professional literature for theory or
research with which to compare and evaluate these findings, the same
problem arises as did with composition scales and aptitude. Those stu-
dies already cited that employed the 16PF as a predictor variable of
writing achievement (Bartz, 1974, and Neufeld, 1969) used no "free" com-
positions nor scales with which to evaluate the ability to communicate
in writing. Therefore, the present findings cannot be said to corroborate
or differ from previous research or, in fact, from real-world intuitions
about what type of personality succeeds better in communicative writing
proficiency. As of the present, the foreign language education profes-
sion has made comparatively small strides in advancing knowledge with
respect to composition evaluation and even less concerning which person-
ality types might achieve better in this area. It is entirely possible
that the question investigated here is still too complex in the real
world--given the state of our present knowledge--for any meaningful,
significant relationships to have emerged from this very limited study.
In addition, considering the very experimental nature of the scales de-
veloped for this study—based in large part upon teacher intuitions and experiences with specific areas that tend to comprise the total evaluation process of compositions—meaningful results may have to await further reevaluation and refinement of these or similar scales.

For now, because of (1) the low reliabilities obtained on the composition scales, (2) the many limitations inherent in this study, and (3) the lack of prior theory and research to build upon, all that can be reported with complete assurance is that, for the present study, no personality traits were found to be strong predictors of overall writing proficiency as measured by instruments used in this study. Data indicated a minor trend for (1) the imaginative and undisciplined personality type to perform better on tasks requiring little attention to detail, and (2) the extroverted, good-natured, and sensitive types to excel in areas where precision for detail was necessary.

Research Question 2

The zero-order correlations between attitude towards course and the other predictor variables showed no significant relationships. These findings are not surprising given the disaccord in the professional literature with respect, at least, to relationships between attitude and achievement. Nevertheless, it was expected a priori, based on the literature and real-world experiences, that certain types of people, defined by their personality and language aptitude, would probably prefer a "learner-centered" classroom. Given the severe constraints and limitations inherent in the present study (discussed in detail in the "limitations" section below), the lack of significant relationships may
be in large part a function of the various technical problems described throughout this study. It is also likely that other variables or sets of variables not included in this study might be better predictors of attitudes towards this course.

The attitude scale itself does not help explain the absence of significant relationships with the predictor variables because it emerged as a very reliable measure ($r=.972$, KR-8, or $r=.970$, coefficient alpha). Inspections of the student responses revealed a total mean-item response of 6.17 on a scale of 7, where 7=strongly positive attitude towards the course. (See Appendix B for a copy of this scale.) While this high mean-item response suggests that, overall, the majority of the 32 students liked a learner-centered course, no indications were found of specific personality types who tended to favor this course over other foreign language courses. Several possible explanations might be hypothesized.

A first hypothesis, and one related to a major limitation in this study, is the small sample size ($N=32$). Although relatively little variance was found on the attitude scale (standard deviation = 1.20), there was nonetheless some variability that could not be explained. While it is possible that no relationships exist, it is also conceivable that the variability present might have been more meaningful had there been a larger $N$. The argument that the absence of significant correlations was a function of a low standard deviation must be tempered, however, by another fact. Other measures in this study that employed a metric of six, as compared to the seven-interval scale of the attitude
measure, also had low standard deviations and yet reached significant
correlations with other predictor variables. For example, the speaking
scale, "quantity/task-oriented," had a posttest standard deviation of
.28 and still correlated significantly with the MLAT Part III
\(r = .513, p < .005\) and the Total MLAT \(r = .357, p < .005\).

One might further hypothesize that the lack of significant rela-
tionships could be related to the restricted nature of the sample.
Spanish 105 was a volunteer course, and one might have expected a priori
a higher attitudinal/motivational level from students enrolled in a
major-minor class. This theory, then, might presuppose a smaller range
in class membership than would be found in a required course. There-
fore, it is possible that what little variability there was in the atti-
tude measure could be attributed to chance occurrence. On the other
hand, although entering students may have held higher attitudes than
most towards language study per se, attitude as assessed in this study
was towards the specific course design and component parts and, there-
fore, was not predicated upon a positive attitude towards foreign lan-
guage study in general--although the two types of attitudes may well be
highly related. (The reader is referred to the research of Baker
et al., 1974, which clearly shows that specific personality types pre-
fer different modes of instruction.) It is conceivable, for example,
that highly interested and motivated language students might not enjoy
a learner-centered language course (as well as vice versa).

Another possible hypothesis is that the three instructors in this
study were, in part, responsible for the course's overall success.
Specifically, the instruction in these three classes (apart from the course model itself) was most likely of excellent to superior quality. Two of the three instructors were recipients of university-wide distinguished teacher awards (chosen one of five from among about 2,000 teaching associates, by a committee who frequently visited their classes). The third instructor had twice reached finalist position for the same award (in the top ten). To this researcher's knowledge, the possibility of a cause-effect relationship between the teacher variable and student attitudes towards a learner-centered class has not been investigated. Therefore, some implications of this inference are worthy of consideration. The course in this study could be labeled "anti-traditional" in that it was taught quite differently from other language courses at this large university, as was substantiated by the results of the "Student Perception Scale" administered at the end of instruction. (See Appendix B for a copy of this scale.) The role of the instructors was one of manager, facilitator, and creator of very personal learning atmosphere and activities. Judging by "traditional" standards, this represented a more passive role with less teacher control. At the same time, the role and participation of the student in daily activities were consistently greater than in traditional classes. The students were also polled at the beginning of the course to ascertain their particular interests, and periodic mini-evaluations of the course, via informal written feedback, were requested with suggestions for improvement.

The above leads one to question, then, the possible interaction of or differentiation between the teacher and the model for the class it-
self, i.e., can the latter successfully exist without the "stellar" teacher? Certainly, a crucial a priori assumption is at play in this question. When the operational definition for a learner-centered classroom was being created, clarified, and refined, its success was strongly and knowingly predicated on a teacher who is personally committed to Rogers' (1960) model of a teacher as a facilitator of learning. To the extent that such a teacher is involved with a learner-centered class, he or she is highly related to the success of that class, in the opinion of this researcher. What is not known from the present study, however, is the relationship(s) (if any) between these three particular instructors and the positive attitude their students held towards their course.

Finally, one can also posit an alternative which, although not anticipated, is related to the heart of this study: can the lack of significant relationships between attitude and the other predictor variables of interest be viewed as lending support to the research base for this study (as outlined in Chapters I and II), i.e., that a learner-centered class is indeed educationally and personally a healthy and meaningful place to be...no matter who one is as defined by personality, aptitude, and achievement level? Acceptance of this suggestion in toto would be naive, however, for the literature as well as common sense suggest that all learners (and other people) are unique entities and not prone to enjoy identical stimuli and phenomena. But it may be plausible to postulate that the learning environment (or specific parts of it) was amenable and meaningful to enough students in this study, regardless of their uniqueness, that any individual differences existing in reality, in respect to this question, could not be discerned. Or
reversed, the results may imply that in order to enjoy a learner-centered classroom, one did not necessarily have to be a high achiever (as some research indicates for "traditional" instruction), or be a composite of specific personality traits, etc.

In spite of the interesting nature of exploring rival hypotheses, they nevertheless remain postulations for the moment. The question of identifying specific personality types who might prefer the type of course in the present study will be addressed further under "Recommendations for Future Research."

Limitations

As stated in Chapter I, the fact that only 32 subjects participated in the present study greatly limits the ability to understand and interpret the obtained data. Because of the small N, it is very possible that relationships that exist in reality might not have been observed. Sample size also affected the statistical procedures that could be employed--it was not possible to use multiple regression analysis to identify a collection of variables capable of predicting achievement and/or attitude.

Another limitation, one which sharply affects the generalizability of present findings, is that the 32 subjects were not randomly selected from a larger universe of subjects: they were members of the only three classes of intermediate conversation and composition offered during the Spring Quarter, 1976. Strictly speaking, therefore, any results that appear to be especially relevant to the present research should be interpreted very cautiously and with respect only to members of the three classes that participated in this study. Any extension of generalizability could only be tentatively made to other university-level conver-
sation and composition courses whose learning environment duplicates the present definition for a learner-centered classroom, including the curriculum, evaluation, and teacher and student behavioral components.

A limitation of a critical nature (described in detail in Chapter IV) that severely restricts the interpretation of data analysis and the overall ability to generalize is the violation—without other recourse—of a basic procedural assumption: because of low posttest reliabilities, the partial correlations between the variables of interest in the first research question—in and of themselves unreliable estimates—could not be subjected to corrections for attenuation, the procedure recommended in the measurement literature (Linn and Slinde, 1977; Lord, 1974) to correct for low and unstable partial correlations. Therefore, the various relationships and trends suggested by significant partial correlations must be understood to possess a relatively high degree of instability and uncertainty, a problem which, in turn, has the potential for implying that observed relationships may or may not exist in reality. Likewise, other relationships that do exist could have been obscured. Thus, the results herein reported must be interpreted with the most extreme caution.

A final limitation is of a precautionary nature. Two of the variables in this study labeled "predictor" were measured in the last two weeks of the course: aptitude and personality. If these variables were indeed intended to predict future learning and attitude, then it is plausible to expect that they would have been measured at the beginning of instruction. The administration time of the 16PF, however, does not
differentially affect its predictive power because the personality factors being measured by this instrument are considered to be stable and unalterable traits (Tatsuoka, 1978).

The extent to which the MLAT could be used as a true predictor of language success for this study is open to question. Carroll (1959) writes that the MLAT is intended to be given before any language study if it is to serve as a predictor of how well one will learn a foreign language. It is questionable, however, whether the MLAT scores obtained in this study would have varied had the test been administered earlier. Carroll calls attention to the fact that previous language training has had (from a 1959 perspective) little effect on MLAT scores. The reader is reminded, however, of the research of Politzer and Weiss (1969) which showed that, for their study, aptitude scores could be increased via prior language study, but the gains were not large. Carroll states also that

...any relation between MLAT scores and amount of previous language training may simply be the result of self-selection—the tendency of those who have been initially successful to continue choosing foreign language study, . . . (Manual, p. 21).

His contention is particularly relevant to this study: the present learners were, most likely, already the more successful language students. Furthermore, if some relationship did exist between prior language study and MLAT scores, there is little reason to believe that the ten-week course in this study would have exerted a greater influence upon the scores than the students' 40 weeks of previous language instruction. Therefore, it is assumed that the time of administration of the MLAT would have have little or no differential effects on the data obtained.
from the present study.

Conclusions and Implications

In Chapter I, it was posited that the adaption of instruction to the individual presupposes a greater knowledge of what each learner brings and contributes to the learning situation. Stemming from this observation were two questions related to learner-centered education, questions upon which the present study was premised, i.e., what types of learners would hold a positive attitude towards a personal approach to foreign language learning, and what kinds of students would learn well in such a classroom environment?

In answer to the first question, the only conclusive finding was that in general, the majority of the students held very positive attitudes towards this learner-centered class. The present study was unable to identify specific types of learners that tended to favor the course over other foreign language courses. It may be that given the complexity of assessing attitudes in relation to other predictor variables, better research procedures will be necessary to either confirm the above findings or discover specific relationships between selected learner factors and attitude towards a learner-centered class. Pending such research, a major implication of this finding is directed to the classroom teacher of conversation and composition courses: the learning environment and personalized learning activities implemented in the course in this study were well enough received by the students to suggest a continuance of such courses, as defined by the operational definition. Present theory and research also lend support to this assertion. This in no manner is
incompatible with, nor intended to negate, the need to further expand our knowledge about the individual in relation to personalized language learning at all levels of instruction.

In answer to the question of who achieves well in a learner-centered environment, several findings have been noted. While no strong, substantive relationships were found between personality types and aptitude with total communicative writing ability, there was a strong tendency for the imaginative, trusting individual with a broad base of English vocabulary to perform better on the communicative speaking tasks, a finding quite compatible with the theoretical basis for this study. While there are reasons to question whether these relationships are legitimate and would reappear in subsequent studies, some implications can nonetheless be drawn on the basis of these data.

Each personality factor in the 16PF is comprised of two bipolar definitions: one for a low and one for a high score on a given factor. Thus, if the imaginative, trusting personality type achieved well in the present course, then by definition, the counterpart type—defined as practical and suspicious—could be expected not to do as well. Therefore, an implication to the profession is that this type of course may not provide certain types of people optimum opportunities to achieve as would another type of course. Clearly, there is insufficient information present to substantiate this inference, but it does again point to the pressing need for further research and the need to continue investigating appropriate learning environments to accommodate different types of students.
In addition to these two major conclusions, others emanating from this study have serendipitous implications for the profession at large—the classroom teacher and the researcher alike.

Throughout the present study, the precision of use and the breadth of Spanish vocabulary, as measured by speaking and composition scales, have consistently been significantly related to success in both speaking and writing tasks. The prominence of vocabulary was first manifested when—from among all the rating scales—it correlated the highest with the total speaking and writing pre- and posttests. The speaking and writing vocabulary scales also achieved significant relationships with the MLAT, Part III. This conclusion serves to reiterate to foreign language educators that (1) vocabulary acquisition and usage do play a crucial role in total language proficiency, and that (2) vocabulary per se should be systematically taught as an entity as legitimate as grammar, pronunciation, etc., and not relegated to chance happening.

Inspections of the correlations of speaking test parts with the total test revealed that pretest Part IV (interview-information getting) was most highly related (r = .92) to the total pretest and that Part II (monologue) attained the highest correlation (r = .93) with the total posttest. A major implication of these findings is that if time constraints prevent administering lengthy speaking tests in a course similar to the present one, either Part II or Part IV would be the best indicators of total speaking proficiency as measured by these tests. Part IV seems a better alternative because (1) it more closely approximates the real communication process and (2) its combined pre- and post-test reliability (r = .86) was higher than that for Part II (r = .77). In
addition, the total pretest reliability ($r=.80$) was greater than the posttest reliability ($r=.68$). Likewise, if time were a mitigating factor in administering speaking tests, the vocabulary/breadth scale would appear to be the best single estimate of a student score, having correlated the highest with the total pre- and posttests.

A question was posed in Chapter III about the advisability of including an "amount of information" scale for evaluating speaking tests. In attempting to generate data concerning the types of students who tend to be "talkative" in a second language, "quantity/task-oriented" and "quantity/extra task-oriented" scales were included in the present study, the latter being the scale of interest because almost all students completed the speaking tasks. Inspections of the correlations between the "quantity/extra task-oriented" scale and aptitude revealed no significant relationships. Three significant correlations between this scale and personality factors emerged, but none was substantively interpretable or formed part of the reported trends for the 16PF. Rather, they appeared to be isolated, chance relationships. Thus, it would seem that "talkativeness" in a foreign language was not systematically related to personality and aptitude.

"Talkativeness" was related to language proficiency, however, although to a lesser extent than other scales. Inspections of the correlations between the "quantity/extra task-oriented" scale and the total pre- and posttests revealed low $r$'s ($r=.63$, pretest; $r=.52$, posttest) in comparison with the high correlations of other scales (e.g., .875 to .947). In fact, the same inspection but for the "quantity/task-oriented"
scale showed even lower $r$'s with the total tests ($r = .41$, pretest; $r = .48$, posttest). A conclusion to be drawn here is that the present speaking tests were not heavily biased in favor of the student who was extra-talkative beyond completing the required task. These findings also lend statistical justification for not including "quantity" or "amount" of information as a tool for assessing speaking, at least in conversation courses such as the present one, because this scale was not so highly correlated with total achievement as were the other scales. Pending further research, and because of present limited knowledge about relationships between personality and achievement, the question herein posed would still seem to be deserving of consideration by foreign language educators as they develop speaking tests for classroom use or for research studies. If "amount of information" is included as a criterion by which to evaluate student language proficiency, the following question still begs to be answered: is a student so evaluated being judged solely on his knowledge of the language?

A final conclusion of this study has implications for classroom teachers as well as researchers. As discussed in Chapters I and II, this study was conducted under the assumption—and one supported by the various professional literatures—that learner-centered education is a positive and personally meaningful approach to educating individuals. It was further assumed that the effects of such an experience would be heightened when it was ascertained which types of individuals would most benefit from it. Although little can be stated with any degree of confidence about the type(s) of student(s) who best liked and learned
in this environment in the present study, this very finding has served in part to substantiate the research base on which this study was predicated. That is, the model for a learner-centered classroom was not rejected by the students—in fact, they reacted very positively to it. This fact can be said to offer some validation for the researcher’s intuitions about personalizing instruction in this study and further imply that, because the theory base herein employed and the practical application of the same have successfully coincided, the profession at large should cautiously but seriously continue to consider various ways to make foreign language learning more personally meaningful to its constituents. Meanwhile, the recurring necessity to continue investigating the types of questions posed in this study is strongly recognized and affirmed. In so doing, the operational definition for a learner-centered classroom presented in Chapter I may constitute, in the opinion of the researcher, a significant contribution to future research efforts that attempt to unravel and understand the infinite complexity that forms the totality of each unique learner.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Several findings and conclusions reported here are suggestive of directions which future research might take in building upon aspects of this study.

As noted in the review of the literature, the development of tests and scales for evaluating communicative speaking and writing proficiency at the intermediate level of language learning has been an area of
neglect in the foreign language profession. While there were models from the first-year level to guide the development of the speaking evaluative measures herein employed, the composition scales were conceived almost in a vacuum. There is clearly a need for more ground work and field testing to refine these or similar instruments. Especially in the case of the composition scales, it will be necessary to reevaluate the scale criteria chosen: it may be possible that a condensed or varied version might prove more effective and reliable than the 12 used in this study. Inherent in the total refinement process is the necessity to train raters so that their interjudge reliability is already high and stable before they attempt to rate research data. Hopefully, such research might provide direction for classroom teachers in the use of such scales.

Some significant but very tentative findings were reported regarding speaking proficiency, personality, and aptitude, indicating that some relationships were present in this study, even though it is difficult to understand with any confidence the nature and implications of those relationships. Because communicative proficiency (especially in the speaking skill) has been receiving increased attention as a legitimate goal in foreign language learning, further research is called for to investigate the nature of the learner in relation to speaking ability, particularly in a learner-centered environment where he is invited and even expected to communicate openly and frequently.

If any or all of this study were to be replicated using the present operational definition, several changes and/or additions would be recommended in order to increase the possibility of more conclusive findings.
A larger sample size would alleviate many of the problems that severely limited this study and would also allow for the inclusion of more predictor variables believed to be related to learning, e.g., motivation, self-concept, learning styles, etc. For purposes of generalizability, such research would ideally be conducted in universities in various parts of the country.

It is also possible that with better overall research procedures, a replicative or partial replicative study might be able to substantiate or reject the present findings regarding attitude towards a learner-centered class, assuming that the present attitude scale were used in conjunction with other predictor variables in a setting consistent with the operational definition provided herein. Furthermore, a factor analysis of the attitude scale could conceivably further identify which specific aspects of the course were preferred and by whom, thereby helping to explain better any variance found on the scale. Such findings could have direct implications for the classroom teacher in the creation of personalized learning activities.

Final recommendations involve the operational definition for a learner-centered classroom. The question has been raised about the extent to which the inherent success of such a course is contingent upon the teacher. Future studies employing this operational definition might prove able to provide data for the further investigation of this relationship. Also of interest would be to ascertain if this definition (along with the attitude scale) could be successfully employed in language courses of different levels, especially those in which the stu-
dents were not present on a voluntary basis. Finally, given the axiom that "no one operates in a vacuum," foreign language educators included, studies employing an adapted version of the operational definition and the attitude scale in non-language courses might offer further insights and directions to be taken by the foreign language profession in its attempts to know more about the learner, especially in relation to learner-centered education.
Appendix A

Pilot Study

1. Pilot Student Perception Scale
2. Pilot Attitude Scale
Opinion Questionnaire for Spanish 105

Each quarter, student attitudes and recommendations are solicited for the purpose of evaluating Spanish 105. This questionnaire is part of that on-going process of evaluation and course refinement. Spanish 105 has gone through many changes in the past year, largely due to student input. Our hope is that the course will continue to reflect the multiple needs and interests of both students and instructors. Thus, we would appreciate your honest reactions to the following questions.

All of your answers will be kept strictly confidential. No one will see them except Spanish 105 instructors and they will not know who you are since you are not asked to give your name.

It is very important that you answer each question as accurately and honestly as you can: the value of the questionnaire depends on this.

Instructions

This questionnaire asks you to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with a series of statements about your experiences in Spanish 105.

Please read each statement carefully, and then circle the number that best describes how you feel. (An explanation of the numbers is right above the statements.)

N.B.: 1. Please mark each statement according to your first impression—it is not necessary to take a lot of time for any one question.

2. Respond to every statement. This is very important.

3. Keep in mind that there are no "right" answers—please
give your personal opinion.

4. Pay no attention to the numbers in the right hand margin. They are to help us punch your answers onto IBM cards.

(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>CAN'T</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>DISAGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>(Do not write in this column.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>(1-3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel that I have more responsibility in 105 than in other language classes for keeping classroom activities moving.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3

2. I feel that my opinions are more accepted by my instructor in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3

3. I feel more of a desire to help my classmates in their learning in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3

4. I feel that my classmates accept me as an individual more in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3

5. I feel that there is more of a variety of learning activities for me as an individual in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3

6. I feel that I trust my classmates in 105 more than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3

7. I feel that I matter more as a person in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3

8. I feel more open to others' feelings in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3

9. I feel that there is a more accepting atmosphere in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3

10. I feel that I have higher expectations for myself in 105 than in other language classes.  
    +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3

11. I feel that my instructor accepts me as an individual more in 105 than in other language classes.  
    +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3
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| 12 | I feel that my class performance is being evaluated in a less arbitrary manner in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 13 | I feel better about myself as a person in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 14 | I feel that there is more opportunity for personal choice and options in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 15 | I feel that my classmates are more willing to help me in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 16 | I feel that I am more accepting of my instructor as a person in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 17 | I feel that I have more responsibility for my own learning in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 18 | I feel that there are more opportunities for me to pursue my own creative interests in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 19 | I feel that the atmosphere of 105 helps me feel more confidence in myself as a Spanish student. |
| 20 | I feel that I value the opinions of my classmates more in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 21 | I feel that I can depend on my classmates for help more in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 22 | I feel that I am more interested in getting to know my classmates in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 23 | I feel that I have more control over my personal progress in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 24 | I feel that I have more say-so in determining the nature of classroom activities in 105 than in other language classes. |
| 25 | I feel that my ideas are more accepted by classmates in 105 than in other language classes. |

(Do not write in this column.)

+3  +2  +1  0  -1  -2  -3

(18)  
(19)  
(20)  
(21)  
(22)  
(23)  
(24)  
(25)  
(26)  
(27)  
(28)  
(29)  
(30)  
(31)
| AGREE STRONGLY | AGREE MODERATELY | AGREE SLIGHTLY | CAN'T DECIDE | DISAGREE SLIGHTLY | DISAGREE MODERATELY | DISAGREE STRONGLY | (Do not write in this column.) |
|----------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| +3             | +2               | +1            | 0           | -1                | -2                 | -3                |                            |

26. I feel more of a desire to interact with my classmates in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (32) ___

27. I feel that I trust my classmates in 105 more than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (33) ___

28. I feel more free from rejection in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (34) ___

29. I feel more of a sense of belonging to a group in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (35) ___

30. I feel that my classmates value me more highly in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (36) ___

31. I feel that I make more of a contribution to classroom activities in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (37) ___

32. I feel that I respect differences in others more in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (38) ___

33. I feel that I play a more important role in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (39) ___

34. I feel more free to express my opinions in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (40) ___

35. I feel that I trust my instructor in 105 more than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (41) ___

36. I feel that the non-threatening atmosphere of 105 makes me feel less apprehensive about communicating in Spanish.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (42) ___

37. I feel more free to "be myself" in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (43) ___

38. I feel more secure about sharing my feelings in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (44) ___

39. I have more of a feeling of personal success in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (45) ___

40. I feel that I have more freedom to work at the pace at which I learn best in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (46) ___

41. I feel more free to disagree with my instructor in 105 than in other language classes.  
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (47) ___
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>CAN'T DECIDE</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>DISAGREE STRONGLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Do not write in this column.)

| 42. | I feel less competition with my classmates in 105 than in other language classes. | +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 |
| 43. | I feel more free to disagree with my classmates in 105 than in other language classes. | +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 |
| 44. | I feel that I receive more encouragement from my instructor in 105 than in other language classes. | +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 |
| 45. | I feel that I am more able to judge my personal performance in 105 than in other language classes. | +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 |
| 46. | I don't worry as much when I make errors in 105 as in other language classes. | +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 |
| 47. | I feel more able to develop my own potential in 105 than in other language classes. | +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 |
| 48. | I feel more accepting of conflicting ideas in 105 than in other language classes. | +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 |

If you do not object, please answer the next two questions. (Circle the number)

1. What is your sex? 1. female 2. male

2. Which age category do you fall into?
   1. 17-17   2. 20-22   3. 23-25   4. 26-29   5. 30-33   6. 34-over

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!
Part A  (Attitude Scale - Pilot Study)

This part of the questionnaire asks you to indicate the extent to which you react positively or negatively to various aspects of Spanish 105.

Please read each statement carefully, and then circle the number that best describes how you feel. (An explanation of the numbers is right above the statements.)

N.B.: 1. Please mark each statement according to your first impression—it is not necessary to take a lot of time for any one question.
2. Respond to every statement. This is very important.
3. Keep in mind that there are no "right" answers—please give your personal opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Circle one number on each line)</th>
<th>(Do not write in this column.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY POSITIVE</td>
<td>MODERATELY POSITIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Communicating in small groups.  
2. Discussions on aspects of Hispanic culture.  
3. My personal relationship with my instructor.  
4. My instructor’s enthusiasm about the course.  
5. Having my composition corrected during the writing seminar.  
7. Correcting my paragraphs.  

(1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY POSITIVE</th>
<th>MODERATELY POSITIVE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY POSITIVE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY NEGATIVE</th>
<th>MODERATELY NEGATIVE</th>
<th>STRONGLY NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. The freedom I have as a 105 student  
9. The manner in which my instructor treated all students.  
10. Doing role plays and skits.  
11. Discussing my own ideas about topics instead of just talking about the topics themselves.  
12. My instructor's understanding of student problems.  
13. Preparing and doing oral presentations.  
14. Being able to rewrite compositions.  
15. My instructor's daily plans for classroom activities.  
16. The responsibility I have in keeping classroom activities moving along.  
17. The type of criticism given to me by my instructor about my overall work.  
18. The opportunities to use Spanish in creative ways.  
19. The extent to which I am treated as an individual.  
20. Being encouraged to be an active participant in classroom activities.  
21. My instructor's attitude if I am not prepared.  
22. The writing seminars.  
23. My instructor's expectations for me to be successful.  

(Do not write in this column.)

(12)  
(13)  
(14)  
(15)  
(16)  
(17)  
(18)  
(19)  
(20)  
(21)  
(22)  
(23)  
(24)  
(25)  
(26)  
(27)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRONGLY POSITIVE</th>
<th>MODERATELY POSITIVE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY POSITIVE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY NEGATIVE</th>
<th>MODERATELY NEGATIVE</th>
<th>STRONGLY NEGATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. My relationship with my classmates.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. The amount of feedback my instructor gives me regarding my progress.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The oral mid-term in my instructor's office.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Classroom activities in which I have a major role.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Discussions involving the whole class.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Writing paragraphs as organizers for classroom discussions.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. The extent to which my instructor encourages me to think for myself.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. The two informal written and/or oral progress reports.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Having the freedom to choose my own topic for the oral presentation.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. The way my instructor encourages open discussions.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Getting to know my classmates as people.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. The extent to which I feel free to disagree with my instructor.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Listening to others' oral presentations.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. My awareness of how I am being evaluated.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Hearing my classmates talk about their own views.</td>
<td>+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Do not write in this column.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY POSITIVE</th>
<th>MODERATELY POSITIVE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY POSITIVE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY NEGATIVE</th>
<th>MODERATELY NEGATIVE</th>
<th>STRONGLY NEGATIVE</th>
<th>(Do not write in this column.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. The extent to which I have gained new insights into myself and others through 105.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Having the freedom to choose my own topic for the oral mid-term.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Being able to make errors while talking without constant interruptions of my message for grammatical corrections.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Not having any written exams.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. The extent to which the oral mid-term allowed me to show how well I can communicate freely in Spanish.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Having the freedom to choose my own composition topic.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The extent to which my instructor takes part in classroom discussions.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. The topics of the &quot;lecturas especiales.&quot;</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. The daily evaluations as a system of evaluating one's ability to speak.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. The extent to which I am free to &quot;be myself.&quot;</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Being evaluated only on my individual progress.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Taking and discussing in Spanish sample questionnaires related to discussions.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The variety of classroom activities.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Knowing where I stand in class and what is expected of me.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. The informality of the class.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY POSITIVE</td>
<td>MODERATELY POSITIVE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY POSITIVE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY NEGATIVE</td>
<td>MODERATELY NEGATIVE</td>
<td>STRONGLY NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>The way my instructor encourages students to become actively involved in the classroom activities.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>Classroom activities in which I offer my own opinions.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>Not being compared to others for my progress and evaluation.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>The extent to which my instructor is an accepting person.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>Being asked to be imaginative in classroom activities.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>The extent to which I feel free to express my own opinions.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.</td>
<td>The way my instructor accepts different points of view from students.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>My instructor's ability to be flexible.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>The way grading is handled in 105.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>The extent to which my instructor treats me as a responsible person.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>My instructor's overall competence to teach Spanish 105.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>My instructor's willingness to take a stand on a topic or issue under discussion.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>The total classroom atmosphere.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>My instructor's acceptance of my ideas while I am communicating orally.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
68. Writing paragraphs as tools for learning to write in Spanish.  
+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

69. The way my instructor encourages students to be accepting of differences of opinions.  
+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

70. The oral mid-term in my instructor's office.  
+3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

Part B

In this part of the questionnaire we would like you to tell us a little about yourself. There are two sections to this part. Please do not leave any questions blank.

SECTION 1: These are questions to tell us something about your experiences in school and with languages.

1. What is your rank in the university? (CHECK ONE) (5)
   ( ) 1 Freshman  ( ) 5 Graduate student
   ( ) 2 Sophomore  ( ) 6 Continuing Education
   ( ) 3 Junior  ( ) 7 Other (please write in:)
   ( ) 4 Senior

2. Did you study Spanish in high school? (CHECK ONE) (6)
   ( ) 1 Yes  
   ( ) 2 No  
   IF YES: How many years? (7-8)
   How many years ago? (9-10)

3. Have you ever lived/studied abroad? (CHECK ONE) (11)
   ( ) 1 Yes  
   ( ) 2 No  
   IF YES: For how many months? (12-13)
   Where? (14-18)

4. Have you ever traveled in a Spanish-speaking country? (CHECK ONE) (19)
   ( ) 1 Yes  
   ( ) 2 No  
   IF YES: How long? (20-22)
   How long ago? (23-24)
   Where? (25-27)

Go on to the next page.
5. Have you ever studied any other foreign language(s)? (CHECK ONE) (28)
   ( ) 1 Yes ——— IF YES: What language did you study and for how many years? CHECK EACH LANGUAGE YOU HAVE STUDIED AND WRITE IN THE NUMBER OF YEARS OF STUDY. (29-41)
   ( ) 1 French: ______ years
   ( ) 2 German: ______ years
   ( ) 3 Italian: ______ years
   ( ) 4 Russian: ______ years
   ( ) 5 Latin: ______ years
   ( ) 6 Other: ______ years
   (Write other language(s) here: ______________________)

6. Why are you studying Spanish 105? (CHECK ONE) (42)
   ( ) 1 Spanish is my major field.
   ( ) 2 Spanish is my minor field.
   ( ) 3 Spanish is a requirement for my major.
   ( ) 4 Spanish supports my major field.
   ( ) 5 I simply like Spanish.
   ( ) 6 I plan to travel or work in a Spanish speaking-country.
   ( ) 7 Other (Please write in: ______________________) (43)

7. Do you have the opportunity to speak Spanish outside of your Spanish class(es)? (CHECK ONE) (44)
   ( ) 1 Yes ——— IF YES: With whom? CHECK EACH ANSWER THAT APPLIES. (45-56)
   ( ) 2 No
   ( ) friends Spanish-speaking
   ( ) teachers Spanish-speaking
   ( ) family non Spanish-speaking parents
   ( ) family non Spanish-speaking brother(s)/sister(s)
   ( ) family other family (please write in: ______________)
   ( ) other (please write in: ______________)

8. Do you plan to visit a foreign country within the next two years? (CHECK ONE) (57)
   ( ) 1 Yes ——— IF YES: Where? _____________________________ (58-60)
   ( ) 2 No Reason? _____________________________ (61-63)

9. Do you plan to take any more Spanish courses? (CHECK ONE) (54)
   ( ) 1 Yes
   ( ) 2 No
SECTION 2: These are questions to tell us about yourself.

1. In what year were you born? _________ (65-66)

2. What is your sex? (CHECK ONE) ( ) 1 male ( ) 2 female (67)

3. Is any language other than English spoken in your family? (CHECK ONE) (68)
   ( ) 1 Yes IF YES:
   ( ) 2 No

   a. What language?
      WRITE IT HERE: ____________________ (69-70)

   b. Who speaks it? CHECK ALL WHO DO (71-80)

      ( ) Yourself
      ( ) Your husband/wife
      ( ) Your father
      ( ) Your mother
      ( ) Your grandfather
      ( ) Your grandmother
      ( ) Your brother(s) and/or sister(s)
      ( ) Your aunt(s), uncle(s), and/or cousin(s)
      ( ) Others (please write in: ____________________ )

THANKS SO MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!!
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Dear Student:

Your help is being sought to take part in doctoral research that I am conducting at The Ohio State University. Because the research involves foreign language classes like Spanish 105, your input is vital to the study.

In the field of education, we are increasingly becoming concerned with the fact that not all people learn in the same way nor indeed profit from the same, uniform kind of instruction. It is very important, therefore, that research be done into the area of learner differences in order to accommodate individual needs, differences, and learning styles.

Specifically, I would like to find out (1) what particular abilities are involved in learning to communicate in a foreign language in a class like Spanish 105 and (2) how different types of students react to the kinds of activities that go on in 105. Of course, I cannot find these things out without your help. Therefore, I am asking you to participate in this study by taking two questionnaires, one of which will need to be taken outside of class time. The first one, which can be administered in class, is the Modern Language Aptitude Test and takes about 40 minutes. This test gives information as to how easily and rapidly students will learn a foreign language in classroom situations. It contains three short parts involving language usage. The second questionnaire is called the Sixteen Personality Factors Questionnaire and yields information about basic personality traits such as "reserved/outgoing," "practical/imaginative," etc. This test requires 40-60 minutes and can best be given outside of class. It can be scheduled for various dates and times so that you can take it at your convenience.

The results of both of these measures are guaranteed to be kept in the strictest of confidence. No one but myself will know your identity and no names will ever be used in any reporting. You may, however, be interested in obtaining your results on these two tests. I will be glad to provide you with the same if you should so request.

Of course, you do not have to take part in this study. If you do, you may also feel free to drop out at any time you wish. Please be assured that your participation or lack of the same will in no way affect your standing in the course. Naturally, I hope very much that you will participate.

It is hoped that the results of this study can take us one step further in improving foreign language instruction by providing us with more information about what materials, teaching techniques, and goals are appropriate for individual learners. Your cooperation in this research can help bring us closer to the goal of making foreign language study a successful and enjoyable experience for all students.
If you have any questions or wish to talk with me further regarding my research project, please feel free to contact me at either of the following places. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Patricia Boylan, Graduate Teaching Associate, Spanish
Office: 422-9537, 468 Cunz Hall
Home: 267-0220
The Ohio State University

I agree to participate in this research

Your signature
Spanish 105 Spring 1976
Texts: Armitage, Meiden and Neff, Fundamentals of Spanish
Zayas-Bazán and Lozano, Del amor a la revolución

Course goals: To improve your ability to express yourself in both written and spoken Spanish for (a) "everyday" writing and conversation and (b) "idea-centered" writing and conversation.

Conversation: Classroom participation

Your participation is the essence of the class hour in this course. In order for you to participate maximally, you will need to be consistently prepared in terms of vocabulary, ideas, and prior practice expressing them. Therefore, you may want to do the following:

a. make note of new vocabulary;
b. jot down ideas and questions that will arise from each assignment;
c. give yourself some daily practice in communication outside of class (for example, you might write a short paragraph related to the day's lesson, call a classmate and talk over the phone, go to the language lab and practice expressing your ideas in Spanish for 15-20 minutes before coming to class).

Chances are, if you have worked with the vocabulary and have tried expressing your ideas, you will find it much easier to speak in class.

Oral presentations:

You and one of your classmates will be responsible for forming a team to do an oral presentation in class. In order to prepare for it, you should choose a topic which is of interest to you and plan to talk about it for about ten minutes. Then, you should be prepared to lead a follow-up discussion on the topic.

Because conversation is a basic portion of Spanish 105, you do not want to present a reading or written speech. Instead, you should try to make your presentation in the form of a "charla." You may refer to a brief topic outline, but not to a written manuscript.

Two factors should be considered in choosing your topic:

a. It should be a topic taken from an original Spanish source (texts, newspaper, magazines, etc.);
b. It should be "discussable." A topic of current interest in the news or one side of a controversial issue usually lends itself to good discussion.

Because you will want your presentation to promote discussion, you will need to distribute a one-page handout (xeroxed or dittoed) to your classmates the day before your presentation. Your classmates will study the topic, learn vocabulary, and organize their own ideas based on the handout before coming to class the day of your presentation. This handout should be an interesting and to-the-point excerpt from the article or selection you have chosen from an original Spanish source. It should not be a summary of what you intend to say, but merely a point of departure. If well chosen, it will present a useful vocabulary as well as stimulate your classmates' thinking.

You will be given a schedule of dates of presentations. Also, you will be expected to meet with your instructor two or three days prior to your own presentation in order to finalize plans and to discuss any potential problems. It is your responsibility to make this appointment with your instructor.

All presentations must be given on the day assigned. There are no extra days on the syllabus for make-ups.

Composition: Paragraphs

You will be asked to write some short paragraphs several times a week. Although these will not receive an individual grade, they are an integral and vital part of the writing phase because they afford you the opportunity to make 'free' mistakes. Your instructor will provide you with a Tabla de Correcciones and will explain how this will be used for correcting paragraphs. (See the syllabus for topics for paragraphs.)

Formal compositions:

Seven compositions will be assigned during the quarter. (See the syllabus.) These should be an average length of one and one-half to two pages, double-spaced, typewritten. Several topics will be suggested for each composition if requested, but you will always have the option to choose your own topic. Unlike the practice paragraphs, these formal compositions will receive a grade. Any or all formal compositions may be re-written, corrected, and re-submitted within one week after your instructor returns them to you. Your instructor will then re-evaluate it
and raise the grade one letter if the re-write is satisfactory.

Writing seminars:

Once a week you will receive excerpts from student compositions. It is your responsibility to analyze and critique these passages which will then be discussed on seminar day. The purpose of these sessions is to help you develop analytical and critical composition skills and to become more acutely aware of style, syntax, and lexicon.

You will receive a schedule indicating when your own composition will be discussed. You will be responsible for handing in your composition on Wednesday of the week for which you are scheduled.

Writing folders:

You should keep all paragraphs and compositions in order in which they are written. They are to be handed in in a complete folder at the end of the quarter for the purpose of final evaluation.

**Evaluation:**

50% conversation; 50% composition

It is assumed that all students enter Spanish 105 with varied course backgrounds, linguistic skills, and travel experiences. For these reasons, you will be evaluated only on the basis of your own individual work. All work will be evaluated not only on the basis of quality and quantity, but also on a marked improvement in both.

**Evaluation of conversation:**

a. **Classwork:** Because a major part of your total evaluation is based on your daily oral work in class, this facet may best be met by regular class attendance and participation. Your instructor will be keeping a daily record of your performance in order to evaluate objectively your improvement.

b. **Oral mid-term and final exams:** For these individual exams you may prepare a topic of your choosing which you will formally present to your instructor and then both of you will informally discuss the topic.

c. **Oral presentations:** Your presentation will be evaluated on the organization and expression of your ideas and on your ability to communicate these ideas in Spanish.
Evaluation of composition:

a. Formal compositions will be evaluated on quantity, quality of grammar, organization in the presentation of your ideas, and improvement.

b. The short paragraph assignments form a part of total evaluation in terms of improvement.

c. There will be no written final examination.

Your instructor will give you a written report on your progress twice during the quarter.
29 de marzo
Introducción

30 de marzo
Temas especiales: **Compañeros de cuarto**
Escriba Ud. un párrafo en el cual Ud. describe su compañero de cuarto ideal.

31 de marzo
Lectura especial: **Un futuro por sólo $20,000,00**

1 de abril
¿Quién soy yo?
Escoja una persona bien conocida (viva o muerta). Escriba una breve descripción de esta persona para presentar en clase.

2 de abril
Lectura especial: **Los deseos**
Haga una lista de las cosas que más le gustaría hacer o tener. Ponga estos deseos en orden de preferencia. Luego, escriba un párrafo en el cual Ud. explica su primera preferencia.

5 de abril
Lectura especial: **Cuatro colonias**
Después de leer los cuatro anuncios, seleccione Ud. uno de ellos y escriba un párrafo en el cual Ud. explica por qué le llama la atención.

6 de abril
Tema especial: **La publicidad**
Escriba su propio anuncio sobre cualquier producto verdadero o imaginario. Trate de traer el producto a la clase y esté preparado para "venderlo" a sus compañeros.

7 de abril
Del amor a la revolución, p. 3, "Tarde de agosto"
Después de leer el cuento, escriba Ud. un párrafo sobre esta pregunta: ¿Por qué cree Ud. que el autor nunca va a olvidar esa "tarde de agosto"?

8 de abril
Lectura especial: **La vida social de los microbios**
Escriba un párrafo dando su propia interpretación de las teorías del doctor Gaudet sobre la vida social de los microbios.

9 de abril
Seminario especial de composición. Se discutirán algunas técnicas de composición y se criticarán unos párrafos de composición.

12 de abril
Lectura especial: **Autos + Peatones = Problemas**
Escriba Ud. un párrafo en el cual discute o las ventajas o las desventajas de tener un automóvil.

13 de abril
Lectura especial: **Valentía o locura?**
14 de abril  
Presentación Oral No. 1: ____________________

15 de abril  
Del amor a la revolución, p. 31, "Rebeldes"  
Escriba Ud. un párrafo en el cual describe el ambiente  
causado por una dictadura.

16 de abril  
Seminario No. 1. Todos los estudiantes deben entregar  
su primera composición formal. Se discutirán en clase  
as composiciones de ___________ y ____________.

19 de abril  
Lectura especial: Un hombre de mundo  
Temas y palabras especiales: Los animales  
Escriba un párrafo que comienza así: "Si los animales  
pudieran hablar del hombre, dirían que . . . ."  

20 de abril  
Del amor a la revolución, p. 41, "Fábulas"  
Escoja una de las fábulas y escriba Ud. una interpreta-  
ción.

21 de abril  
Presentación Oral No. 2: ____________________

22 de abril  
Actividades Especiales

23 de abril  
Seminario No. 2. Se discutirán los trabajos de _______  
y _________. Todos los estudiantes deben entregar  
su segunda composición formal.

26 de abril  
Presentación Cultural

27 de abril  
Del amor a la revolución, p. 57, "Crónica policial"  
Escriba un párrafo en el cual Ud. explica por qué el re-  
portero renunció del periódico.

28 de abril  
Presentación Oral No. 3: ____________________

29 de abril  
Lectura especial: Tres misterios y una solución  
Escriba un párrafo que presenta sus opiniones sobre la(s)  
superstición(es).

30 de abril  
Seminario No. 3. Se discutirán los trabajos de _______  
y _________. Todos los estudiantes deben entregar  
su tercera composición formal.

3 de mayo  
Del amor a la revolución, p. 75, "Mi padre"  
Escriba un párrafo en el cual Ud. explica cómo el niño  
define la masculinidad y cómo la define el padre.

4 de mayo  
Lectura especial: Las computadoras... ¿Un hacedor todo  
electrónico?

5 de mayo  
Presentación Oral No. 4: ____________________
6 de mayo  
Lectura especial: **Perspectivas: ¿Héroe o anti-héroe?**
Escriba un párrafo en el cual Ud. describe las características que debe tener un héroe.

7 de mayo  
Seminario No. 4. Se discutirán los trabajos de________ y ________. Todos los estudiantes deben entregar su cuarta composición formal.

10 de mayo  
Lectura especial: **El último de los gauchos**
Escriba Ud. un párrafo en el cual explica por qué el gaacho es un ser excepcional.

11 de mayo  
**Del amor a la revolución**, p. 81, "El Evangelio según san Marcos"
Escriba un párrafo en el cual Ud. da su opinión sobre esta pregunta: ¿Por qué mataron los Gutre a Espinosa?

12 de mayo  
Presentación Oral No. 5: __________________________

13 de mayo  
Lectura especial: **Refranes**

14 de mayo  
Seminario No. 5. Se discutirán los trabajos de________ y ________. Todos los estudiantes deben entregar su quinta composición formal.

17 de mayo  
Presentación Cultural

18 de mayo  
**Del amor a la revolución**, p. 93, "Las Linareces"
Escriba un párrafo en el cual Ud. comenta unos de los elementos cómicos del cuento.

19 de mayo  
Presentación Oral No. 6: __________________________

20 de mayo  
Lectura especial: **Una mujer moderna del siglo XVII**
Piense en una cosa por la cual Ud. se arriesgaría la vida y escriba un párrafo que explica el por qué.

21 de mayo  
Seminario No. 6. Se discutirán los trabajos de________ y ________. Todos los estudiantes deben entregar su sexta composición formal.

24 de mayo  
**Del amor a la revolución**, p. 141, "What Became of Pampa Hash?"
Escriba un párrafo en el cual Ud. describe al narrador del cuento. ¿Es oportunista, idealista, cínico,...?

25 de mayo  
Lectura especial: ¿Yo? ¿Nosotros?
Escriba un párrafo sobre una de las cinco preguntas al final de la lectura. Al llegar a la clase, esté preparado para expresar sus ideas sobre el individuo y la responsabilidad humana.
26 de mayo  Presentación Oral No. 7: ________________
27 de mayo  Actividades Especiales
28 de mayo  Seminario No. 7. Se discutirán los trabajos de _____ y _____; Todos los estudiantes deben entregar su séptima y última composición formal.
31 de mayo  Día feriado. No hay clases.
1 de junio   Lectura especial: ¿Comer... o no comer?
2 de junio   Presentación Oral No. 8: ________________
3 de junio   Lectura especial: Consultorio de Scarlett
             Escriba una carta a la doctora Scarlett. Explíquele un problema que Ud. tiene y pídale su ayuda.
4 de junio   Evaluación del curso
Speaking Pretest - Instructor's Copy

General Instructions (Read to student)

(Do not tape these instructions.) The speaking test you are about to take is a test of how well you can freely communicate in Spanish in various situations. While grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation are important for this test, the most important factor is how well you get your message across. Therefore, you should concentrate more on communicating your ideas than on speaking perfect Spanish. Use every means necessary to express yourself including gestures. Even a word in English when necessary will be acceptable. Say as much as you can in every situation and don't worry about minor errors. This test will not be graded.

Part I: Description (one-way) (Read to student)

(Do not tape these instructions.) You will see a series of pictures that depict a story about a boy and a girl. Take a few minutes to examine the drawings. Then, tell in Spanish the story that you think the pictures represent. If necessary, you may use a word in English. Once you begin, you will not be interrupted. Please take your time. (Give the student the pictures and a few minutes to plan his/her story. Then begin taping, first giving the student's name. When s/he finishes, stop the tape recorder and proceed to the next section.)

Part II: Monolog (one-way) (Read to student)

(Do not tape these instructions.) Assume that you have just won an all-expense-paid vacation for two on a quiz show. You are now going to talk with the person whom you have invited to accompany you. Take a few minutes to organize your thoughts. Then describe the trip to that person to see if s/he would be interested in going with you. Be sure to include the following information. (Give the student a "Student Copy" of the test. Allow a few minutes to plan the trip and study the information to be included. When the student is ready, turn on the tape recorder again until you have completely finished administering the test.)

Part III: Interview--Information Giving (two-way) (Read to student)

In this part of the test, you will play the role of a student being interviewed by an Argentinian university student. I will assume the role of the Argentinian interviewer. I am visiting my relatives in Columbus and I can neither speak or understand English. I am interested in knowing about student life at a big American university. I will ask you several questions in Spanish about your life as an OSU student. Please make every effort to communicate your messages in Spanish. Try to provide as much information as you can to each question.
1. ¿Cuánto tiempo hace que estás en la OSU?
2. ¿Cuál es tu especialidad?
3. ¿Dónde viven los estudiantes universitarios?
4. ¿Qué se hace para divertirse durante los fines de semana?
5. ¿Quién paga por tu educación?
6. En Latinoamérica, los estudiantes universitarios son muy activos en la política. ¿Cómo son los estudiantes aquí?
7. ¿Qué vas a hacer después de graduarte?
8. ¿Hay deportes populares en la OSU?

Part IV: Interview--Information Getting (two-way) (Read to student)

In this part of the test, you will play the role of a Spaniard who owns a travel agency in Spain. Assume that I have just come to you seeking a job as a travel guide. I am French and speak fluent Spanish but no English. Try to conduct the following interview as naturally possible and ask me questions in Spanish to elicit the following information. (Give the student a "Student Copy"). You are not expected to translate these sentences: take advantage of your ability to paraphrase. Please take short notes of my answers in English or Spanish. Besides knowing how well you make yourself understood, it is equally important to know how well you understand my replies. (Any Spanish answers should be converted to English before the student hands them in.)

Instructor's answers:

1. Marie/Pierre Duval.
2. Pues, yo vengo de París, en Francia.
3. Es que me interesa mucho porque uno tiene la oportunidad de trabajar con mucha gente interesante.
4. No, ésta es la primera vez que voy a hacer este tipo de trabajo.
5. Pues, nada más he trabajado en una oficina.
6. Me parece que España es un país de contrastes. (pause) Además, cuesta mucho menos vivir en España que en Francia.
7. Conozco muy bien la ciudad de Madrid y la parte del sur de España.
8. Quiero un sueldo decente, por lo menos 11.000,00 pesetas al mes.
Speaking Pretest - Student Copy

Name __________________________

Part II: Monolog

Information to be included while discussing your vacation trip:

1. where you are going
2. how long you will be there
3. how you will get there
4. what you plan to do there
5. what you need to take along
6. when you plan to leave

Part IV: Interview - Information Getting:

Information to find out from the interviewee:

1. the interviewee's name
2. where s/he comes from
3. why s/he is interested in this type of work
4. if s/he has ever done it before
5. what other types of work s/he has done
6. why s/he chooses to work in Spain
7. what parts of Spain s/he knows the best
8. what salary is expected
9. when s/he will be ready to begin working

Space for recording short answers from the interviewee:

1. ____________________________________
2. ____________________________________
3. ____________________________________
4. ____________________________________
5. ____________________________________
6. ____________________________________
7. ____________________________________
8. ____________________________________
9. ____________________________________
Opinion Questionnaire for Spanish 105 (1)

Each quarter, student attitudes and recommendations are solicited for the purpose of evaluating Spanish 105. This questionnaire is part of that on-going process of evaluation and course refinement. Spanish 105 has gone through many changes in the past year, largely due to student input. Our hope is that the course will continue to reflect the multiple needs and interests of both students and instructors. Thus, we would appreciate your honest reactions to the following statements.

All of your answers will be kept strictly confidential. No one will know your identity except for Pat Byland, who will be in charge of collecting these data. Your names, however, will never be used in any reporting of any kind. Upon finishing this questionnaire, the copies will be placed and kept in the Romance Language Department Office (Cuns 248) until after the quarter is terminated.

It is very important that you answer each question as accurately and honestly as you can: the value of the questionnaire depends on this.

Instructions

This questionnaire asks you to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with a series of statements about your experiences in Spanish 105.

Please read each statement carefully, and then circle the number that best describes how you feel. (An explanation of the numbers is right above the statements.)

N.B.: 1. Please mark each statement according to your first impression—it is not necessary to take a lot of time for any one question.
2. Respond to every statement. This is very important.

3. Keep in mind that there are no "right" answers—please give your personal opinion.

4. Pay no attention to the numbers in the right hand margin. They are to help us punch your answers onto IBM cards.

(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CAN'T</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>MODERATELY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>DECIDE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>MODERATELY</td>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1-3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I feel that I have more responsibility in 105 than in other language classes for keeping classroom activities moving. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (7)

2. I feel that my opinions are more accepted by my instructor in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (8)

3. I feel that my classmates accept me as an individual more in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (9)

4. I feel more of a desire to help my classmates in their learning in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (10)

5. I feel that there is more of a variety of learning activities for me as an individual in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (11)

6. I feel that I trust my classmates in 105 more than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (12)

7. I feel that I matter more as a person in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (13)

8. I feel more open to others' feelings in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (14)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGREE STRONGLY</th>
<th>AGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>AGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>CAN'T</th>
<th>DISAGREE SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>DISAGREE MODERATELY</th>
<th>DISAGREE STRONGLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I feel that there is a more tolerant atmosphere in 105 than in other language classes.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I feel that I have higher expectations for myself in 105 than in other language classes.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I feel that my instructor accepts me as an individual more in 105 than in other language classes.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I feel that my class performance is being evaluated in a less arbitrary manner in 105 than in other language classes.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I feel better about myself as a person in 105 than in other language classes.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I feel that there is more opportunity for personal choice and options in 105 than in other language classes.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I feel that my classmates are more willing to help me in 105 than in other language classes.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I feel that I am more accepting of my instructor as a person in 105 than in other language classes.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I feel that I have more responsibility for my own learning in 105 than in other language classes.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I feel that there are more opportunities for me to pursue my own creative interests in 105 than in other language classes.</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Can't</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Decide</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. I feel that the atmosphere of 105 helps me feel more confidence in myself as a Spanish student.  
   (+3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3) (25)____

20. I feel that I value the opinions of my classmates more in 105 than in other language classes.  
   (+3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3) (26)____

21. I feel that I can depend on my classmates for help more in 105 than in other language classes.  
   (+3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3) (27)____

22. I feel that I am more interested in getting to know my classmates in 105 than in other language classes.  
   (+3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3) (28)____

23. I feel that I have more control over my personal progress in 105 than in other language classes.  
   (+3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3) (29)____

24. I feel that I have more say-so in determining the nature of classroom activities in 105 than in other language classes.  
   (+3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3) (30)____

25. I feel that my ideas are more accepted by my classmates in 105 than in other language classes.  
   (+3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3) (31)____

26. I feel more of a desire to interact with my classmates in 105 than in other language classes.  
   (+3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3) (32)____

27. I feel more accepting of conflicting ideas in 105 than in other language classes.  
   (+3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3) (32)____

28. I feel more free from rejection in 105 than in other language classes.  
   (+3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3) (33)____

29. I feel more of a sense of belonging to a group in 105 than in other language classes.  
   (+3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3) (34)____
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Can't</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Decide</td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>Strongly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. I feel that my classmates value me more highly in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (36)_

31. I feel that I make more of a contribution to classroom activities in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (37)_

32. I feel that I respect differences in other people more in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (38)_

33. I feel that I play a more important role in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (39)_

34. I feel more free to express my opinions in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (40)_

35. I feel that I trust my instructor in 105 more than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (41)_

36. I feel that the atmosphere of 105 makes me feel less apprehensive about communicating in Spanish. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (42)_

37. I feel more free to "be myself" in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (43)_

38. I feel more secure about sharing my feelings in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (44)_

39. I have more of a feeling of personal success in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (45)_

40. I feel that I have more freedom to work at the pace at which I learn best in 105 than in other language classes. +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (46)_
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agree</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>CAN'T</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
<td>MODERATELY</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>DECIDE</td>
<td>SLIGHTLY</td>
<td>MODERATELY</td>
<td>STRONGLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Do not write in this column.)

41. I feel more free to disagree with my instructor in 105 than in other language classes.
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (47) __

42. I feel less competition with my classmates in 105 than in other language classes.
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (48) __

43. I feel more free to disagree with my classmates in 105 than in other language classes.
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (49) __

44. I feel that I receive more encouragement from my instructor in 105 than in other language classes.
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (50) __

45. I feel that I am more able to judge my personal performance in 105 than in other language classes.
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (51) __

46. I don't worry as much when I make errors in 105 as in other language classes.
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (52) __

47. I feel more able to develop my own potential in 105 than in other language classes.
   +3 +2 +1 0 -1 -2 -3 (53) __

PLEASE ANSWER THE NEXT TWO QUESTIONS:

1. What is your sex?  
   1. male  
   2. female

2. In what year were you born?  

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP!!
(Attitude Scale - Main Study)

Opinion Questionnaire for Spanish (II)

This questionnaire is to help us evaluate Spanish 105. Specifically, it seeks your attitudes towards the various components that make up the entire course. Your honest reactions to the following items will greatly assist us in assessing and refining 105.

All of your answers will be kept strictly confidential. No one will know your identity except for Pat Boylan, who will be in charge of collecting these data. Your name, however, will never be used in any reporting of any kind. Upon finishing this questionnaire, the copies will be placed and kept in the Romance Language Department Office (Cumn 248) until after the quarter is terminated.

Instructions

Part A

This part of the questionnaire asks you to indicate the extent to which you react positively or negatively to specific aspects of Spanish 105.

Please read each statement carefully, and then circle the number that best describes how you feel. (An explanation of the numbers is right above the items.)

N.B.:  1. Please mark each item according to your first impression—it is not necessary to take a lot of time for any one question.

2. Respond to every statement. This is very important.

3. Keep in mind that there are no "right" answers—please give your personal opinion.
4. Please pay no attention to the numbers in the right hand margin. They are to help us punch your answers onto IBM cards.

(CIRCLE ONE NUMBER ON EACH LINE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRENGTH</th>
<th>MODERATELY</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>MODERATELY</th>
<th>STRONGLY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Communicating in small groups. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
2. The class discussions on aspects of Hispanic culture. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
3. My personal relationship with my instructor. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
4. My instructor's enthusiasm about the course. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
5. Having my composition corrected during the writing seminar. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
6. Working and talking in pairs in class. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
7. Correcting my paragraphs. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
8. The overall freedom I have as a student in 109. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
9. The manner in which my instructor treated all students. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
10. Doing role plays and skits. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
11. Giving my own opinions about topics instead of just talking about the topics themselves. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3
12. My instructor's understanding of student problems. +3 +2 +1 -1 -2 -3

(Do not write in this column.)

11-4
(5)______
(6)______
(7)______
(8)______
(9)______
(10)______
(11)______
(12)______
(13)______
(14)______
(15)______
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY</th>
<th>MODERATELY</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY</th>
<th>MODERATELY</th>
<th>STRONGLY</th>
<th>(Do not write in this column.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Preparing and doing oral presentations.  
14. Being able to rewrite compositions.  
15. The way my instructor encourages students to be accepting of differences of opinions.  
16. The responsibility students have in keeping classroom activities moving along.  
17. The type of criticism given to me by my instructor about my overall work.  
18. The various opportunities to use Spanish in creative ways.  
19. The extent to which I am treated as an individual.  
20. Being encouraged by my instructor to be an active participant in classroom activities.  
21. The way my instructor reacts if students are not prepared.  
22. The writing seminars.  
23. My instructor's expectations for me to have a successful experience in 105.  
24. My relationship with my classmates.  
25. The amount of feedback my instructor gives me regarding my progress.  
26. The oral mid-term in my instructor's office.  

(17)___  
(18)___  
(19)___  
(20)___  
(21)___  
(22)___  
(23)___  
(24)___  
(25)___  
(26)___  
(27)___  
(28)___  
(29)___  
(30)___
27. The daily classroom activities in which I have a major role.  

28. Large group discussions.  

29. Writing paragraphs to help organize my ideas for classroom discussions.  

30. The extent to which my instructor encourages me to think for myself.  

31. The informal written and/or oral progress reports my instructor gives in the fourth and eighth weeks.  

32. Choosing the topic for my oral presentation instead of having it assigned.  

33. The way my instructor encourages open discussions.  

34. Writing paragraphs as tools for learning to write in Spanish.  

35. The extent to which I feel free to disagree with my instructor.  

36. Listening to other's oral presentations.  

37. My instructor's availability to give individual assistance.  

38. Hearing my classmates talk about their own opinions.  

39. The extent to which I have gained new insights into myself and others through 105.
40. Choosing my own topic for the oral presentation.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (44)  

41. Being able to make errors while talking without constant interruptions of my message for grammatical corrections.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (45)  

42. Not having any written exams.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (46)  

43. The extent to which the oral mid-term allowed me to show my ability to communicate freely in Spanish.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (47)  

44. Having the freedom to choose my own composition topic.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (48)  

45. The times when my instructor takes an active part in classroom discussions.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (49)  

46. The topics of the "lecturas especiales."  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (50)  

47. The daily evaluations that my instructor gives for my oral classwork.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (51)  

48. The extent to which I am free to "by myself."  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (52)  

49. Being evaluated only on my individual progress.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (53)  

50. Filling out and discussing sample questionnaires related to class discussions (e.g. computer dating form).  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (54)  

51. The variety of classroom activities.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (55)  

52. Knowing where I stand in class and what is expected of me.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (56)  

53. The informality of the class.  
   +3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  
   (57)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRONGLY POSITIVE</th>
<th>MODERATELY POSITIVE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY POSITIVE</th>
<th>SLIGHTLY NEGATIVE</th>
<th>MODERATELY NEGATIVE</th>
<th>STRONGLY NEGATIVE</th>
<th>(Do not write in this column.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54. The way in which my instructor encourages students to become actively involved in the classroom activities.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

55. Classroom activities in which I am expected to offer my own opinions.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

56. Not being compared to other students for my progress and evaluation.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

57. My instructor's acceptance of my ideas while I am communicating orally.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

58. Being asked to be imaginative in classroom activities.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

59. The extent to which I feel free to express my own opinions.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

60. The way my instructor accepts different points of view from students.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

61. My instructor's ability to be flexible.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

62. The way grading is handled in 105.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

63. The extent to which my instructor treats me as a responsible person.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

64. My instructor's overall competence to teach Spanish 105.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

65. The total classroom atmosphere.  
+3  +2  +1  -1  -2  -3  

(68)____ (69)____
Part B

In this part of the questionnaire we would like you to tell us a little about yourself. There are two sections to this part. Please do not leave any questions blank. (Please pay no attention to the numbers in brackets and in the right hand margin.)

SECTION 1: These are questions to tell us something about your experiences in school and with languages.

1. What is your rank in the university? (CHECK ONE) (5)
   ( ) [1] Freshman ( ) [5] Graduate student
   ( ) [2] Sophomore ( ) [6] Continuing Education
   ( ) [3] Junior ( ) [7] Other (please write in:)
   ( ) [4] Senior

2. Did you study Spanish in high school? (CHECK ONE) (6)
   ( ) [1] Yes → IF YES: How many years? (7-8)
   ( ) [2] No How many years ago? (9-10)

3. Have you ever lived/studied abroad? (CHECK ONE) (11)
   ( ) [1] Yes → IF YES: For how many months? (12-13)
   ( ) [2] No Where? (14-18)

4. Have you ever traveled in a Spanish-speaking country? (CHECK ONE) (19)
   ( ) [1] Yes → IF YES: How long? (20-22)
   ( ) [2] No How long ago? (23-24)
   Where? (25-27)

5. Have you ever studied any other foreign language(s)? (CHECK ONE) (29)
   ( ) [1] Yes → IF YES: What language(s) did you study and for how many years? CHECK EACH LANGUAGE YOU HAVE STUDIED AND WRITE IN THE NUMBER OF YEARS OR QUARTERS OF STUDY. (29-58)
   ( ) [2] No

Go on to the next page.
High School

[29] French: ___ years; ___ quarters
[32] German: ___ years; ___ quarters
[35] Italian: ___ years; ___ quarters
[38] Russian: ___ years; ___ quarters
[41] Latin: ___ years; ___ quarters
[44] Portuguese: ___ years; ___ quarters
[47] Hebrew: ___ years; ___ quarters
[50] Other: [Write other language(s) here: ___ yrs. ___ qtrs.]

6. Why are you studying Spanish 105? (Check all that apply)

( ) 59] Spanish is my major field.
( ) 60] Spanish is my minor field.
( ) 61] Spanish is a requirement for my major.
( ) 62] Spanish supports my major field.
( ) 63] I simply like Spanish.
( ) 64] I plan to travel or work in a Spanish-speaking country.
( ) 65] Other (Please write in: ____________________)

7. Do you have the opportunity to speak Spanish outside of your Spanish class(es)? (Check one) (58)

( ) 1] Yes → IF YES: With whom? CHECK EACH ANSWER THAT APPLIES.
[2] No

( ) friends 59] native speaker
( ) teachers 70] non-native speaker
( ) family 71] native speaker
( ) 72] non-native speaker
( ) 73] parents
( ) 74] brother(s)/sister(s)
( ) 75] grandfather
( ) 76] grandmother
( ) 77] aunt(s)/uncle(s)
( ) 78] cousin(s)
( ) 79] other (Please write in: ____________________)

8. Do you plan to visit a foreign country within the next two years? (Check one) (6)

( ) 1] Yes → IF YES: Where? ____________________(7-10)
[2] No

Reason? ____________________(11-13)

Go on to the next page
9. Do you plan to take any more Spanish courses? (CHECK ONE) (14)
   { } [1] Yes
   { } [2] No

SECTION 2: These are questions to tell us about yourself.

1. In what year were you born? ________ (15-16)

3. What is your sex? (CHECK ONE) ( ) 1 male ( ) 2 female (17)

3. Is any language other than English spoken natively in your family? (CHECK ONE) (18)
   { } [1] Yes—IF YES:
   { } [2] No
   a. What language(s)?
      WRITE HERE: ____________________________ (19-21)

   b. Who speaks it? CHECK ALL WHO DO. (22-33)
      ( ) [22] Yourself
      ( ) [23] Your husband/wife
      ( ) [24] Your father
      ( ) [25] Your mother
      ( ) [26] Your grandfather
      ( ) [27] Your grandmother
      ( ) [28] Your brother(s) and/or sister(s)
      ( ) [29] Your aunt(s) and/or uncle(s)
      ( ) [30] Your cousin(s)
      ( ) [31] Others (please write in: _________________________)

THANKS SO MUCH FOR YOUR HELP!!
Speaking Posttest - Instructor's Copy

General Instructions (Read to student)

(Do not tape these instructions.) The speaking test you are about to take is a test of how well you can freely communicate in Spanish in various situations. While grammar, vocabulary, and pronunciation are important for this test, the most important factor is how well you get your message across. Therefore, you should concentrate more on communicating your ideas than on speaking perfect Spanish. Use every means necessary to express yourself including gestures. Even a word in English when necessary will be acceptable. Say as much as you can in every situation and don't worry about minor errors. This test will not be graded.

Part I: Description (one-way) (Read to student)

(Do not tape these instructions.) You will see a series of pictures that depict a story about a man and two boys. Take a few minutes to examine the drawings. Then, tell in Spanish the story that you think the pictures represent. If necessary, you may use a word in English. Once you begin, you will not be interrupted. Please take your time. (Give the student the pictures and a few minutes to plan his/her story. Then begin taping, first giving the student's name. When s/he finishes, stop the tape recorder and proceed to the next part.)

Part II: Monolog (one-way) (Read to student)

(Do not tape these instructions.) Assume that you have just witnessed a crime and have called the police. You are going to talk to the policeman about the hypothetical crime. Take a few minutes to organize your thoughts. Then describe what you have seen, being sure to include the following information. (Give the student a "Student Copy" of the test. Allow a few minutes to plan the hypothetical crime and study the information to be included. When the student is ready, turn on the tape recorder. When s/he finishes, do not turn off the recorder again until you have completely finished administering the test.)

Part III: Interview--Information Giving (two way) (Read to student)

In this part of the test, assume that you are an American student studying in Mexico City and are walking down the main street, La Avenida de la Reforma. The local Hugh DeMoss stops you in order to conduct a roving man-on-the-street survey for his evening news broadcast. The subject of the survey is "Views of American students living in Mexico." I will assume the role of the newscaster and you, the role of the American student. Please make every effort to communicate your messages in Spanish: they do not have to be long.
1. Aquí en México aparecen varios programas en la televisión importados de los Estados Unidos. Muchos de estos programas están llenos de violencia. ¿Qué piensa Ud. de la violencia en la televisión?

2. Hemos oído que Uds. los norteamericanos están celebrando el aniversario "bicentennial". ¿Qué piensa Ud. de esta celebración nacional?

3. Se ha dicho que el papel de la mujer latina tradicionalmente es un papel de un "ama de casa" y nada más. ¿Cómo ve Ud. el papel de la mujer norteamericana en contraste o en comparación con el de la mujer latina?

4. Los estudiantes norteamericanos que vienen a México parecen tener más libertad que los jóvenes mexicanos. Parece que el concepto de la moralidad es diferente en los Estados Unidos que en México. ¿Qué opina Ud. de la moralidad como existe en los Estados Unidos?

Part IV: Interview—Information Getting (two-way) (Read to student)

In this part of the test, assume that it is Saturday night and that you are at a party at the Spanish House. While there, you have the chance to meet a young guest from Bolivia. I will play the role of the Bolivian visitor. You know nothing about me, but are curious to meet me to find out why I am there and also to practice your Spanish with a native speaker. Strike up a conversation in Spanish and ask me questions to elicit the following information. (Give the student a "Student Copy".) Try to conduct the conversation as naturally as possible. You are not expected to translate these sentences: take advantage of your ability to paraphrase. Please take short notes of my answers in English or Spanish. Besides knowing how well you make yourself understood, it is equally important to know how well you understand my replies. (Any Spanish answers should be converted to English before the student hands them in.)

Instructor's answers:

1. Pues estoy aquí solo/a. Me invitó el Sr. Angelo, un amigo mío.
2. No conozco a casi nadie...menos a ti.
3. Me parece una fiesta muy divertida: hay gente alegre y mucha bebida.
4. Pues pienso casarme dentro de un mes, y éstas son mis últimas vacaciones solo/a.
Part II: Monolog

Information to be included about the hypothetical crime:

--what type of crime you saw
--what the criminal did
--where it took place
--when it took place
--what you think should be done to the criminal

Part IV: Interview - Getting Information

Information to find out from the Bolivian visitor:

1. If the visitor is at the party accompanied
2. If the visitor knows a lot of people at the party
3. The visitor's general impression of the party
4. The visitor's reasons for being away from Bolivia

Space for recording short answers from the Bolivian visitor:

1. __________________________
2. __________________________
3. __________________________
4. __________________________
Definitions Of Performance Factors for Evaluating

Speaking Pre- and Posttest

I. QUALITY

1. Fluency (adapted from the Peace Corps Language Proficiency Interview, ETS)

   Fluency does not refer to absolute speed of delivery, since native speakers of any language often show wide variation in this area. Fluency refers to the overall smoothness, continuity, and naturalness of the student's speech, as opposed to pauses for rephrasing sentences, groping for words and so forth.

   \[ X = \text{halting, uneven, fragmentary delivery; unnatural pauses} \]
   \[ Y = \text{effortless, smooth, even delivery} \]

2. Vocabulary

   a. Vocabulary here refers to the precision of semantic usage.

      \[ X = \text{inappropriate, incorrect words} \]
      \[ Y = \text{appropriate, correct words} \]

   b. Vocabulary here refers to the breadth of student vocabulary relevant to the communicative situation.

      \[ X = \text{meager, scanty vocabulary} \]
      \[ Y = \text{ample, rich, wide-ranging vocabulary} \]

3. Structure

   Structure refers to the linguistic correctness of the student's message, evaluated in terms of grammar (syntax, morphology, and phonology).

   \[ X = \text{linguistically inaccurate message} \]
   \[ Y = \text{linguistically accurate message} \]

II. COMPREHENSIBILITY

Comprehensibility refers to the ability of the student to make him/herself understood, to convey an appropriate
message relevant to the communicative situation.

\[ X = \text{message not understandable or appropriate} \]
\[ Y = \text{message understandable and appropriate} \]

III. QUANTITY

1. **Task-oriented**

Quantity here refers to the amount of information conveyed relevant to the communicative situation.

\[ X = \text{no relevant information conveyed} \]
\[ Y = \text{all relevant information conveyed} \]

2. **Extra task-oriented**

Quantity here refers to the amount of information provided beyond the communicative task.

\[ X = \text{only information necessary to complete task provided} \]
\[ Y = \text{extra information provided} \]

IV. LISTENING COMPREHENSION

1. **Part III of exam**

Listening comprehension here refers to the extent to which the student has understood the interviewer's questions. **Criterion:** more than one repetition of the question, and/or no answer, and/or an incorrect answer.

\[ X = \text{student didn't comprehend any of interviewer's questions} \]
\[ Y = \text{student comprehended all of interviewer's questions} \]

2. **Part IV of exam**

Listening comprehension here refers to the extent to which the student has understood the interviewee's answers. **Criterion:** the student's written representation of the answers in English.

\[ X = \text{student didn't comprehend any of interviewee's answers} \]
\[ Y = \text{student comprehended all of interviewee's answers} \]
Evaluation Sheet for Speaking Pre- and Posttests

Student name ________________________________

Tape letter ________________________________

Rater ________________________________

Instructions:

Use the following six-point scale for all of the performance factors below, X and Y being defined in each case under "Definitions of Performance Factors for Evaluating Speaking Pre- and Posttests."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>______</th>
<th>______</th>
<th>______</th>
<th>______</th>
<th>______</th>
<th>______</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremely</td>
<td>Quite</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>Quite</td>
<td>Extremely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part I: Description (One-way)

1. Quality: fluency
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
2. Quality: vocabulary (precision)
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
3. Quality: vocabulary (breadth)
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
4. Quality: structure
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
5. Comprehensibility
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
6. Quantity: task-oriented
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
7. Quantity: extra task-oriented
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

Part II: Monolog (One-way)

1. Quality: fluency
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
2. Quality: vocabulary (precision)
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
3. Quality: vocabulary (breadth)
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
4. Quality: structure
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
5. Comprehensibility
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
6. Quantity: task-oriented
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
7. Quantity: extra task-oriented
   X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
(Evaluation Sheet for Speaking Pre- and Posttests, p. 2)

Student name ________________________

Tape letter ________________________

### Part III: Interview—Information Giving (Two-way)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Part IV: Interview—Information Getting (Two-way)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>X____:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:<strong><strong>:</strong></strong>:____:Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Definitions of Performance Factors for Evaluating Pre- and Postcompositions

1. Comprehensibility

Comprehensibility refers to the ability of the student to make him/herself understood, to convey a message that would be understood by a non-English-speaking, native speaker of Spanish.

\[
\begin{align*}
X &= \text{message not understandable} \\
Y &= \text{message understandable}
\end{align*}
\]

2. Complexity of Linguistic Attempts

This category refers to the attempts on the part of the student--and perceived by the rater--to engage in linguistic structure that goes beyond simple subject-verb-rejoinder-type constructions. The criterion here is the attempt itself, and not the success or lack of success of the final product.

\[
\begin{align*}
X &= \text{complex linguistic structure not attempted} \\
Y &= \text{complex linguistic structure attempted}
\end{align*}
\]

3. Composition Skills

This category refers to those composition skills that are not language bound. The following are some techniques to consider:

a. overall organization, development of (idea(s)

b. introduction to the topic
   (1) introductory paragraph, planting of idea
   (2) link of first paragraph with subsequent paragraphs

c. paragraphing
   (1) contribution of each paragraph to total composition
   (2) development of topic sentence/idea within each paragraph
   (3) internal coherence of each paragraph
   (4) sentences, details that support paragraphs

   d. overall flow, sequencing
      (1) from paragraph to paragraph
      (2) within paragraphs
      (3) linkings, transitions between sentences

\[
\begin{align*}
X &= \text{composition skills lacking} \\
Y &= \text{composition skills strong}
\end{align*}
\]
4. **Breadth of Vocabulary**

This category refers to the richness and range of student vocabulary.

\[ X = \text{meager, scanty vocabulary} \]
\[ Y = \text{ample, rich, wide-ranging vocabulary} \]

5. **Precision of Vocabulary Usage**

This category refers to the precision of semantic usage of student vocabulary.

**Error Examples:**

- Estoy de California.
- Lo compré para $5,00.00.
- La música es ruido.
- Carmelita es excitante.
- Luis llevaba palpitaciones azules.
- Tengo suceso en esta clase.

(Anglicism)
(poor dictionary choice)
(false cognate)

6. **Verbs: Subject-Verb Agreements**

This category refers to the correctness of the verb ending for the subject used.

**Error examples:**

- Yo miró el cuadro de Dalí.
- Se dicen que....

7. **Verbs: Choice of Tense/Mood**

This category refers to the appropriateness of tense and/or mood employed.

**Error Examples:**

- Si trabajo este verano, tendría más dinero en el año entrante.  
  (incorrect tense in sequence)
- Fui a la tienda todos los días.  
  (incorrect tense)
- En el siglo XIX los indios comen gente.  
  (incorrect tense)
- Esperan que tú llegas a tiempo.  
  (incorrect mood; tense depends upon context)
- Tenían miedo que yo esté enferma.  
  (incorrect tense)
- Tenían miedo que yo estaba enferma.  
  (incorrect mood)
8. Verbs: Formation

This category refers to the correct formation of any verb and/or verb component.

Error Examples:

Juan _____ hablando. (omission verb component)
Paco _____ acuerdo de la cita. (omission, reflexive component)
Pensan venir hoy. (spelling error)
Queríamos nadar. (accent lacking)
Ellos venieron muy tarde. (irregular stem)
El libro fue escrito. (irregular participle)
Marta se sentó allí (stem changing verb)
Yo busqué el cenicero. (orthographic change)

9. Agreements in General (less verbs)

This category refers to the correctness of any utterance falling under the rubric of agreements (less verbs): adjectives/nouns—pronouns; object pronouns; reflexive pronouns; subject pronouns (agreeing with known antecedent).

Error Examples:

Estos linternas son rojas. (noun-adjective)
Yo las tengo: son mía. (pronoun-adjective)
Esa casa lo vendí por poco dinero. (noun-object pronoun)
A nosotros se gusta el vino. (reflexive pronoun)
¿Quién está a la puerta? Ah, es la. (subject pronoun)

10. Other Grammar (less verbs)

This category refers to the linguistic correctness of the student’s message in all other grammatical categories than those mentioned above.

Error Examples:

La carne no compró por Memo. (nonsensical statement)
Aquí está la casa quien quiero comprar. (incorrect relative pronoun)
Llamé ___ Miguel por teléfono. (personal "a" missing)
___ Vida es sueño. (definite article missing)
A pesar de que los niños fueron al museo. (sentence fragment)
José se casó a Lupe. (incorrect preposition)
Yo ___ quiero ninguno de los dos. (incorrect or missing negative)
Nunca me compras nada flores. (incorrect or missing negative)
Lo vendí por un peso; y Juana lo compró por diez. (punctuation)
11. **Spelling/Accents**

This category refers to the correctness in orthography (less verbs).

**Error Examples:**

- Fui a españa, (capitalization)
- La pasta dentrifica... (spelling)
- ¡Que lastima! (accents)

12. **Overall Syntax**

Syntax refers to the way in which words are correctly put together to form native-like phrases, clauses, and sentences.

**Error Examples:**

- El vendedor estos tres libros hoy me trajo.
- Es un inteligente estudiante.
- No es una buena cosa que pensar en.
Evaluation Sheet for Student Compositions

Instructions:

Use the following six-point scale for performance factors numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4 below, X and Y being defined in each case under "Definitions of Performance Factors for Evaluating Pre- and Postcompositions."

1. Comprehensibility
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

2. Complexity of Linguistic Attempt
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

3. Composition Skills
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

4. Breadth of Vocabulary
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

Instructions:

Use the following six-point scale for rating performance factors numbers 5 through 12 below according to definitions listed in above source.

5. Precision of Vocabulary Usage
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

6. Verbs: Subject-Verb Agreement
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

7. Verbs: Choice of Tense/Mood
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

8. Verbs: Formation
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

9. Agreements in General (less verbs)
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

10. Other Grammar (less verbs)
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

11. Spelling/Accents
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y

12. Overall Syntax
X ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: ______: Y
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Frequency of Occurrence</th>
<th>Frequency of Error</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Precision)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less verbs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Other Grammar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(less verbs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Spelling/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Overall Syntax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(Composition Tally Sheet for Raters, p. 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>#6 Error S/V Agr.</th>
<th>#7 Error T/M</th>
<th>#8 Error Formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. participle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2</td>
<td>(pres./perf.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. pres. progressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. imperfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. imper. progressive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. preterite</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. conditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. pres. perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. pluperfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. future perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. condit. perfect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. pres. subjunctive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. imper. subjunctive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. present perfect subjunctive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. pluperfect subjunctive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. passive voice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. commands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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